

Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting

Registries Open Session Meeting

Tuesday 16 October 2012 at 09:00 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.

David Maher: Okay. We're trying to get started. We're having trouble getting the Adobe screen up and running. But in order to save some time and because we have a big agenda, I'll start out with the first item, which is the introduction of participants. We're not going to take a regular roll call but I'm the current Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. May name's...

Cherie Stubbs: (Would you see)...

David Maher: Oh.

Cherie Stubbs: Good morning everyone. Just a couple of housekeeping details. Because of the room rearrangement it's going to be very important if you have something formal to say to please step up to one of the microphones that are provided in each side of the aisle.

And this will be recorded. And if you would so kindly start the recording for today, 9:00 am. Thank you. And I don't know if we have anyone on the call yet.

Man: You got (Cary) on the call.

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you. Thank you David.

Barbara Knight: Barbara Knight is here as well Cary Carp.

Cherie Stubbs: Barbara. Yes Barbara from VeriSign has joined. Thank you.

(Barbara Knight): Thank you.

David Maher: Thanks. At my right is Keith Drazek, the alternate Chair who will become the Chair of the Stakeholder Group after this meeting or after Thursday I believe. to be perfectly accurate. Our Treasurer is Ken Stubbs. The Assistant Treasurer is Mike Palage, who will become the Treasurer after this meeting. And Jon, do you want to introduce the NTAG.

Jon Nevett: Sure. Thanks David. So the - we're very considered - considerate of the registries to invite the NTAG Officers to set up here, so thank you for that. It's Jon Nevett, Chair of NTAG.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer, DotGreen, Treasurer.

Krista Papac: Krista Papac, Aremi Group, Secretary.

David Maher: Thanks. Our Councilors are here also. I see Ching Chiao. Jeff Neuman I believe is not here yet. And Jonathan Robinson I'm sure will be here shortly.

We apologize for the layout of this room. Some of you may remember the way it was set up in Senegal and apparently we're trying to recreate the atmosphere of Senegal this morning. This is not what we asked for.

The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda itself. Are there any additions to the agenda?

Man: We have the agenda up on the screen.

David Maher: Go ahead Chuck.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Is there a button at the bottom of that - Okay. There we go. Thanks a lot. Chuck Gomes. David, I'd like to request an agenda item preferably in the morning when more of us are here. It can be towards the end of our morning session, whatever works best for you.

There's a statement I want to make that I will disclose when I make it. It's secret. I would like to have - it'll just be a very brief agenda item. Okay? Is that all right?

David Maher: That's okay. When do you want to do it?

Chuck Gomes: I'd rather do it in the morning session rather than the afternoon because we tend to get a lot of disappearance in the afternoon. So I'd like it when most of us are together.

David Maher: Okay. Will do. Okay. There nothing else, then the meeting with the ICANN Board, which is at 1 o'clock and I believe in the Metro - in this - the room adjacent to this, Metro East. And we do have some work to do on that agenda.

We suggested four items for discussion with the Board and the Board came back with four separate items that we're - Whois Review Team report; the review team on security, stability and resiliency, their final report. Number 3 is the structure of ICANN after we acquire 1000 new members or so in the Registry Stakeholder Group; and finally disclosure of patents.

I need suggestions first as to who would like to be invited to discuss these with the Board. First is Whois. Is there someone here who's on the Review Team? It would be ideal to have some member of this group. Chuck. Okay.

The Security, Stability, Resiliency Review Team, do we have any members here who are on that team? I don't see any. Then the structure of the Stakeholder Group when we have more top-level domains. I think I can do that. I'm involved in the Resources Working Group and also a number of meetings about the amendments to the charter and various other issues.

Then we get to patent disclosure. As it happens I'm a registered patent attorney. And if there's no one else who wants to jump into that, I can volunteer. Any other suggestions for the discussion with the Board? I think the topics that we suggested, the Trademark Clearinghouse, new top level timing, the actual metering and so on, budget planning and strategic planning schedule.

I will just introduce them briefly and ask for volunteers. For Trademark Clearinghouse if Jonathan is here, we can probably ask him to speak to that one. The new TLD timing I can handle that. Budget planning, Chuck, can I volunteer you? And strategic planning schedule, do we have anyone who's active in - Chuck, so you - pick you again? (Paul) yeah, good idea. Thank you. Okay.

Any other thoughts on the Board agenda? The next question then would be the agenda for a joint meeting with the registries and registrars. I suggested a number of items to Matt Serlin and I talked to him yesterday. And he agreed that he had nothing to add to that.

The list is pending motions before the GNSO Council, which will probably refer to them - well, here's Jeff. Welcome. Come up. Join the table. Then the second is changes to our respective group bylaws and rules of procedure to avoid conflicts in cross over and voting.

This is presumably after vertical integration although the questions may arise even before vertical integration. This is something we've been talking about for several meetings. I'm not sure there's anything new to add but we'll find out from the registrars.

The other three more topics, RAA negotiations, standardizing in the onboarding format and general issues. If we get to those items in the meeting Matt and I I'm sure will work out how to handle those or who should lead the discussion. Any other thoughts on the joint meeting agenda? Keith, go ahead.

Keith Drazek: So this is Keith Drazek. Currently on the agenda we are supposed to be going to the Harbour AB Room to join with the registrars for the joint session. That's a significantly smaller room than this one. So I have this morning proposed to Matt Serlin and Mason Cole that they come here instead. So that hasn't been confirmed yet but just stand by for further information on that. Thanks.

David Maher: Thanks Keith. Moving along then to the - we now have the agenda up on the screen. Thank you. Our first item is the NTAG, an update from Jon Nevett.

Jon Nevett: Thanks David. We had a meeting yesterday of the NTAG. It was very well attended both by members as well as future members, other applicants who haven't joined the NTAG yet. And ICANN staff came in full force, which is - which is great. So we had a full agenda.

For those of you who don't know NTAG is the New TLD Applicant Group. It's an interest group under the Registry Stakeholder Group. And as of now we're comprised of about 80 members representing almost 900 new TLD applicant strings.

Fifty percent of the members are one-string applicants and over 75% of the members have applied for five or fewer strings. Great diversity of applicants.

Everyone from IDN to GOs to large applicants and everything in between. So very strong meeting.

We're looking at a number of issues related to the timing of new TLDs. The Trademark Clearinghouse was discussed. The URS was discussed. The new draw proposal that ICANN put out last week obviously was discussed.

We are talking about recommending to ICANN a intercessional meeting between the six month lag between this meeting and the Beijing meeting to do two things; one, give the community another opportunity to tie up any loose ends with the new TLD program. So be - maybe we'll call it the new TLD summit or something like that.

And be it in the Clearinghouse if there's still loose ends on that, URS or anything else and also give the opportunity for the GAC to get together to discuss their advice. If we wait until Beijing and then they have a delay, the whole program will be delayed again.

And so we look for consensus of the members of NTAG, which is not easy to get considering the diversity of business models. But on timing issues we've been very strongly about getting consensus. We have had what six statements in the last seven or eight weeks. And so been very active and it's been a very good group.

One other issue on timing we've been talking about is the (balloting) limit on new TLD root entry and getting to the bottom of that and seeing what kind of flexibility there may be on that.

Essentially it's all an effort to make up for past delays or existing delays in the new TLD program and see where we could work together to - as applicants - as an applicant community to push the new TLD program across the goal line.

Any questions or anything? (Adrian).

Adrian Kinderis: Thanks Jon. Adrian Kinderis from ARI Services.

David Maher: Could you give you name and the top level domain applied for.

Adrian Kinderis: And the top level domain.

David Maher: Or company.

Adrian Kinderis: Motion Picture Registry.film. Adrian Kinderis, take your order as you wish. Jon, I just wanted to - just when you're describing the summit, you said and the GAC. And I just want to caution you to decouple the two just because I don't want people to think that it's an and proposition. It could well be an or proposition. Because if the GAC (don't meet), we could still do a summit.

And I think it makes sense to - we want to - I think it makes good sense to stress to ICANN the importance of the GAC meeting their timeline and that we give every opportunity for the GAC to do so full stop. At the same time if it makes sense to do a summit, we should do a summit. So I just wanted to just clarify.

Jon Nevett: Fair point. That's great. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks David. Chuck Gomes from VeriSign, .name. By the way, I didn't get up to talk about this but I think Adrian's suggestion is very good because nothing would help more than the GAC itself to have a meeting where they can work together, which is something we've talked about before. So that's a very good suggestion.

But I wanted to talk about the 1000 name limit. I think it's fine to explore that a little bit further. What I would recommend that you do is do a little exploring

behind the scenes with some of the technical liaison groups. And also maybe with (Heather) from the GAC because that's a big issue with them.

Before, you know, before going - that's probably the best way to pursue that because my prediction, and I don't really want to come across pessimistic, but I think it - that's probably a hard one to change at this point. You know that as well as I do. But I would just suggest you do some exploring to those key groups that are going to be - that the Board would go to in that particular issue.

Jon Nevett: Yeah. Thank you Chuck. Actually we set up a subgroup of - we set up - I think we're up to eight or nine subgroups have been tagged. One of them on this 1000 limit. And maybe we shouldn't call it that because they have been reaching out to SSAC and RSAC and the GAC as well. So they are doing that.

But, you know, there are two issues. Is it 1000 limit? And then it - should it be lumpy or smooth? In other words, should it be 20 a week or could there be more ebbs and flows in that even if they keep 1000. So they're looking at all those issues and seeing if there's some wiggle room there.

And it might be the kind of thing - I think Kurt mentioned this that there might be - we'll have to see how it goes. Maybe we start with 20 a week and then - and ramp up if there aren't any issues or something like that. So they're all - they're talking about exploring that. So but thank you. Thank you for the advice. That's helpful.

Ken Stubbs: Ken Stubbs, Afiliis. I have two concerns. The first concern that I have kind of parallels what Chuck had indicated in that instant and discussions I've had with members of the GAC. It would appear that for them at least 1000 is a very well call it hard, whatever you want. It's something that they're very comfortable with and they're not really anxious to even waste their time (as that was put) discussing any changes there.

My biggest concern would be creating efficiencies to ensure that when they start to roll these things out that we don't have those kind of issues. I think we - it's very important for us to create an environment that makes people comfortable with a practical number being rolled out on a regular basis. If there's a lot of trepidation, I believe that it will take a lot longer then.

Number 2. I think it's extremely important not to push too hard because the ultimate decision on how many names a week goes into the root is not really in the ICANN purview. And I have a feeling that people that have their foot on the brake there are going to be very reluctant to discuss exactly how they plan to do it at this point in time.

I think it's just a matter of staying close to the situation and making sure that they give us enough advance notice so that we can work our business plans based on that because if it's 20 a week and you got a bad - you get a bad draw, it would not be necessarily in your best interest to crank up the marking program 8-1/2 months in advance, you know, whatever it may be. Thank you.

David Maher: Thanks Ken. We're waiting for Kurt Pritz and Akram Atallah to talk about the new gTLDs. But in the meantime one of the - the next agenda item, the Trademark Clearinghouse; we have in fact two sets of draft comments. The one that has been voted on by the members of the Stakeholder Group I found after getting it to straighten out is a plagiarism of the NTAG comments.

But the plagiarism has been excused thanks to Jon. So the current status is we have a long set of draft comments on the Trademark Clearinghouse, which has been approved so far by eight - I believe eight of our members. I believe that there are some other voting members who are here who might be willing to give additional support. Or does anyone have comments on - Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan: I supposed David I've got a couple of comments. I think the - coming into this meeting we have significant concerns about the substance of the operation and mechanics of the Trademark Clearinghouse. And so that - and that - and much of that is covered with - covered by and dealt within the NTAG letter, which is why it's of value.

I just - the one point on the public comments is those public comments are very specific to two documents which are a subset of the entire Trademark Clearinghouse process and that's the matching rules and the proof of use.

So that's one point really. We need to decide whether we really are responding to what the public comment is requesting or whether we are making a more general point about all of the issues and concerns of the Trademark Clearinghouse.

And then second on the issues and concerns of the Trademark Clearinghouse I mean we - some - I've - there's been some discussions with senior ICANN people that have indicated a significant spirit of openness to responding to the proposals on the clearinghouse and just generally a much more open spirit of working cooperatively, collaboratively on these issues.

So it's moving pretty fast, which makes it slightly challenging. I actually did get a note from (Karen) late last night saying she was receptive to - and they would accept the comment period being open for another week but they hadn't - they haven't updated the Web site yet.

So it's all moving quite fast. And I'm not quite sure how we respond to that. But I thought that that information on the table we can perhaps be a little more informed about how we deal with it. I don't know if you want to say anything more on that Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. And just to provide - this is Jeff Neuman, .NeuStar. Oh we know this is the Registry Stakeholder Group so .biz. Sorry. So we have had several

conversations, as Jonathan said, with ICANN senior staff and have had some very good high-level discussions. And we do believe that they are open to considering each of the models that we have proposed.

I think on the Sunrise I believe that they will - I believe that that will be successful in our proposed implementation, which we call kind of the PKI model, which if you were at the clearinghouse session yesterday you heard Chris Wright from ARI talk about.

So I do believe that that's going in a very positive direction. And I think that that will be the model that's adopted assuming, you know, we're still waiting for feedback from the intellectual property owners and others. But I definitely have some good feelings about that one.

And I do think that the discussions on the claims, the trademark claims have come a long way as well. If you were at the Trademark Clearinghouse session at 5 o'clock yesterday, you know, there was a lot of back and forth and certainly some different viewpoints that were expressed.

And I think there's some concepts that need to be further explored. And I think there's some realizations as well that were made by both sides. But (I don't even know) if they were both sides because it - that basically implies that it's very adversarial.

I think the thing that we're trying to get a full understanding of are really what are the concerns of the Intellectual Property Constituency and the attorneys. And short of a realization that no matter what we do this data by the very nature of the trademark claims service is going to be out there in the public.

And there was a notion what one of the primary drivers of - in the design of the system they way ICANN did it and the way that we were working around it was really what is the value of this data - this trademark data and how protectable is it actually in law or otherwise.

And, you know, you heard the back and forth if you were there yesterday that some intellectual property attorneys believe that this data that's - even though on the individual query basis of an individual trademark is data that is publicly available, right.

So if I go back a step, the whole purpose of the trademark clearing service is when someone applies for a domain name in the first 60 days of what we call general availability and if that matches a claim that was in the clearinghouse, that perspective registrant would receive a notice that says, you know, you're applying for a domain name that matches this trademark in the clearinghouse that's owned by this party in connections with these goods and services.

Are you sure you want to proceed? And if you do proceed, you may be subject to a UDRP or a dispute proceeding. And then the registry would collect the acknowledgement. Yes I'm willing to proceed.

The very nature of that service is to actually disclose the information. And so the real concern that when you boil it down from Intellectual Property Group is whether this data in bulk is something that's protectable. And you hear difference sides have different viewpoints.

So I think that needs to be discussed. I think we need a better understanding of the intellectual property view and the reality of that view. And then we also need to take into consideration ICANN's concerns of running what's called a centralized model, you know, because it puts them in the path of the critical registration.

So there's a lot of discussions that are ongoing. I think some very good discussions with ICANN senior staff. And I think that, you know, I'm happy to report that it's moving in a positive direction and that, you know, I don't think ICANN has settled on any particular method.

So those discussions are going. Obviously your voices are very important as to what you believe is the way to go and the tradeoffs for each model and just as important as from the rest of the community. So a lot of what's going on as Jonathan said it's kind of fast and furious but I think all in a positive direction.

David Maher: Thanks Jeff. I see that Kurt and Akram are here. Like to invite them up to the platform and (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: David, while they're coming, it's Chuck Gomes. Could I just - a 30 second comment.

David Maher: Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: First of all, thanks for the good job done yesterday. But (Jonathan) I - in case - or Jeff, in case you're the ones heading the discussion with the Board, I think it would be a really good idea in follow up to the GNSO discussion with the Board in terms of not only listening but dialog and interaction to point out that that did happen that session and that's the kind of thing we were looking for.

Keith Drazek: So this is Keith Drazek. I think the - on the Trademark Clearinghouse and IP claims, Sunrise discussion yesterday, I thought it was a really, really valuable exchange. And it was a dialog I think that was long overdue. I think Jeff, you and Chris did a fantastic job yesterday in terms of presenting, you know, sort of the argument and I think, as I said, it was a very valuable session.

Looking at what we have before us now in terms of comment periods and all that, Jonathan was absolutely right in that the comment period that is open today is very specific on a couple of documents. We've received from (Karen) assurance that we have a week's extension.

So I think we need to re-look at the comments that we have drafted and pulled together on that particular issue. And I think the expectation now is that

whatever comes out of the Trademark Clearinghouse discussions and dialog that's been going on this week that there may very well be another public comment period for that.

So I think it's incumbent upon us as a Stakeholder Group to basically take a step back, re-look at the comments that we've drafted and utilize the week that we've been given.

David Maher: Thanks Keith. Akram and Kurt, you're welcome to our Stakeholder Group meeting. At this point the floor is yours.

Akram Atallah: Thank you very much for having us here. We have shared and time and the effort that the team has put in to resolving all of these list of issues that we have to get ready for as we do the new gTLD as well as (tackling) with the transformation of change that this poses on the constituency and on the team here.

And looking forward to seeing your best thinking on the best way moving forward for the Stakeholder Group. That will be a very interesting problem. I will let Kurt do some talking and I would like to spend more time responding to your questions so that we can, you know, make sure that we understand each other moving forward.

Kurt Pritz: Well this is a homey way to talk. As is traditional, I think we just want to respond to your questions. We see - we saw before the meeting you put some items on the agenda and we're prepared to talk about those or other items if you want to create any other business line item afterwards.

But, you know, that's fine. That's great idea that we're in favor of. So we'll open it up to questions. (Tim), go ahead.

(Tim): Yeah. Just want to talk a couple seconds. A few months back we had a meeting in Marina del Rey. And we discussed the challenges before your group especially (unintelligible) in terms of staffing and building up.

I'd very much appreciate it if maybe you can give us an update as to how things are going in that area specifically with reference to staffing levels to manage the new TLDs and support services for the current and the newly (unintelligible).

Akram Atallah: So there are a lot of plans in place to support the incoming new registries. We have a - from the first time actually we have on the new gTLD a customer support center. That customer support center will be expanded and will be the first line of support for all of the new registries.

So not only through the application process but after the application process is done they will become the - then they move up to be the supporting the first issues and tickets that will come in for - from the registries and registrars groups.

And we have plans to expand that from the doubling in size. Right now it's about five - probably about ten by the time we get into the first delegation. Geographically it's also now in - it has presence in Europe. We would like to also expand that to the Asia time zone so we have coverage in the same time as for the three major time zone areas.

We are also expanding the (SG) Team. And we are changing the support level on the (SG) Team to make it more product managers or service managers if you want and account managers so that you have the second level of support for issues.

We are also trying to integrate all of our services through a single portal so that we have - all of our registries will have a single place to come in and

answer their requests and issues and then get the - get that process through the - electronically so we can have feedback.

And if you noticed in the presentation that (Favi) made yesterday that he said that there are internal systems that will be coming online into the MyICANN and that would be one of the systems that be on MyICANN as well.

So all of these plans are in place. We're progressing on them and we plan to be ready for the incoming onslaught of many more registries. And so that's where we are right now. And I think that we're doing pretty good. So no concerns at this time.

(Tim): Just a quick follow up and personal acknowledgement. I think we'd very much like to thank the work that Karla Valente's been doing for us. She's really put out Herculean effort and she's done a great job in keeping us up to date and really very, very valuable to the constituency. Thank you.

David Maher: Anyone else. I can't see the table so speak up. I can't believe that all the questions on new gTLDs have now been answered. Ray, thank you.

Ray Fassett: Ray Fassett, .jobs. Two questions. One would be on the new drawing concept is it one ticket, one wrong ticket per application? Okay. And the second one is are we still on track for publishing the confusingly similar list in early November? The contention sets?

Kurt Pritz: Yeah. That was in the presentation we gave yesterday. So you can look it up. But it's November I think, isn't it. So let me just look up the presentation and I'll let you know.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think the first thing we presented to the GNSO it said November 1. But I think it might have been a typo that you just left of it because yesterday it was November 2012. And I don't know if that was a typo because you left off

the two in the first presentation or whether you actually thought it was November 1.

Man: (Unintelligible) probably continue.

Kurt Pritz: It was November 1 in the last (applica) Webinar you did.

Man: (Unintelligible) we can update (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign.net registry. Okay. The - I didn't get a - in fact I got out of line yesterday because it was such a long line in the questions on new gTLDs because I thought it was more important that a lot of the questions be answered rather than my statement.

And my statement was a positive one because I've been very impressed with the way the ICANN Team has been working to support applicants to help them be successful to do a variety of things. And I - since I didn't have the opportunity to do that yesterday because of the queue being so long, I do want to state that today.

Now then I - on top of that I would like to bring up one subject and that's the subject of the clarifying questions, which we spent a lot of time on yesterday. The - in the case of - for example, back in registry service providers, and we have quite a few of those in this room, where we are supporting a lot of applications.

And in case there's a clarifying questions with regard to especially tactical questions or things like that, the two-week period might be challenging to support all of our applicants.

Now we're hoping that a lot of them will be duplicates so it may not be quite that hard. But I sensed yesterday in the session that there is - you are considering some flexibility in that.

And that's a factor that I don't think came out yesterday that is important because we want to be able - we want to I know other backend registry services providers here want to do the same to make sure we assist those that we're providing services for in responding to those. So I just raised that as a factor to keep in mind.

And then last comment is that I think part of the reason you're not going to see a lot of questions here today that most of us are realizing that there are specific sessions on some of these topics this week and so there may not be a need for duplicating what's going on there.

David Maher: Thanks Chuck.

Kurt Pritz: With regard to the clarifying questions I want to make a couple comments. One is my understanding is that the backend providers actually did a really good job in filling out the applications because my understanding is they're not cookie cutter. The evaluators report to us that the backend providers have tailored their response to the needs of each registry, each applicant; so that's kind of good. It doesn't allow us to take advantage of economies quite as much. But it speaks for wealth in the process.

And as far as setting the time for answering clarifying questions, there's kind of two ways in going about it. One way is to hold the two weeks and allow, you know, requests for extensions. The problem I see with that one is it could be sort of never ending.

And the other would be to say okay, it's four weeks but then it's, you know, it's four weeks. So if you don't make it then come back for extended evaluations. And the negative impact to that is in certain cases, you know, would be pushing some applications out to four weeks.

So we're trying to - and I'm saying these two options because we're looking for input because we want to provide enough time - we want to get the applications through (unintelligible) too. So those are kind of two options we're thinking about. But surely we'll provide some accommodation in some way.

((Crosstalk))

David Maher: Oh please, go ahead.

Akram Atallah: I just want to thank Chuck for his comment. I think that it's also important for the staff who has been working very hard on supporting the applicants to hear that. They've been working non-stop and I want to recommend (Jan) and her team on the customer support center for working at any time, any hour, whenever it needed to make sure that we have responsive as possible.

And you can understand how, you know, 1900 applications and we have five or six people trying to keep everybody in tune to what's going on. It's a daunting task. They've been doing a hell of a job. So thank you.

David Maher: Thanks (Werner) why don't you go ahead and then Jon Nevett.

(Werner): Thank you. My questions are about objections, specifically community based objections. It's one of the most difficult types of objections to do because nobody has any experience with it. And we have a couple things that totally unclear. Specifically when will the objection be heard? I'm hearing different things. Will the documents say that the objection only be heard one month after the end of the objection period?

If that is true, of course, it means that nobody's going to file the objection before the very last moment. Moreover I've seen the document saying that the community priority (bill) is going to be after that. So any reasonable, you know, Council for a community will then look at the situation saying look, I

mean we have a community-based application on behalf of the community.
(unintelligible) a couple of other ones.

The only way to be sure that there's - no accident happened is to go through with the objections anyway. So in that case the community priority and evaluation has no point whatsoever. People have to, you know, there will only be one left at a very high cost.

Now does ICANN think that is quite responsible to saddle the communities with such high cost specifically as we do not know how much a community valuation actually costs (out) in terms of the panel costs, which is say is going to be more than - I forgot, 20K. But what I can see it could easily be at those rates 150K a piece.

And if there is a number of standard applications that actually (unintelligible) (in good fashion) one or two occupied the position of a community but it's quite expensive for that community.

And finally, is the - is there any way to change that for instance to have the community objection heard now so at least you would have some value of case law that all of us could see would actually be - what is actually happening?

And the other one actually have an extension of the objections here for those that actually have a community priority so these two weeks or one month after the closing of that it would still be (unintelligible)?

Kurt Pritz: So (Werner), I didn't understand one of the last points of your question when you explained the two options. I understood the last option about extending the objection period.

(Werner): Okay. There's two things separate (in options). One of them would be to have the objection heard immediately upon filing. One month after filing is going to

be, you know, it's going to be heard. That would actually provide the entire ICANN community to at least get some visibility to know what you're talking about instead of having all the community objections heard at the same time.

So nobody can learn from one another. And it would also mean that some communities could go ahead with a good example and show that it's actually possible to defend the interest of the community.

The other one is if your community doesn't have enough money to do that, you know, in the community organization because not all of the communities are rich. Whereas speculative applicants usually have quite substantial funds available.

If they want to rely on the community priority valuation, they at least should be able to have security feature that after that, you know, should it go wrong because these 14 points are not very well defined quite (frankly).

So it is high risk. So if at least thereafter they're able to do an objection because, you know, the community based evaluation - the priority valuation we have (gone) wrong.

Kurt Pritz: So are you saying settle the contention early?

(Werner): That would also be an option. But say if - I would prefer to have the community and priority valuation as early as possible. But I would also like to have the ability to hear objections immediately rather than waiting till the end. If it has been filed (unintelligible) to go ahead.

And finally to have in the case where the community priority valuation takes place at least one-month time after the end in case it went against the community so the community can make objections.

Kurt Pritz: So this takes a white board and 20 minutes, right. The purpose of our community objection isn't just to be filed against community labeled TLDs but any TLD that, you know, that abuses a community label. So a community objection can be filed regardless of whether a TLD is registered as a community.

And then there's a - so I'm not sure I got all your question. But the guidebook lays out the timeline for how objections are processed, right, because there's an objection, then there has to be time for an answer, then there has to be time for a reply, then there's, you know, a decision or adjudication or whatever you want to call it.

So that timeline is fairly set. And I don't know if that can be contracted in any way because we have to allow the parties the time to do their paperwork with regard to the dispute resolution.

And then another point is that, you know, the objections are loser pays. Right. So a community files an objection and wins, I think they don't get their filing fee back but they get the, you know, most of their costs back because they filed a valid objection. And, you know, that serves to encourage bona fide objections and discourage, you know, sort of frivolous ones.

So how that all - and the decision, you know, the choice about when the objection period should end balances many different interests, you know. It's fairness to applicants who need some certainty in their life.

ICANN's ability to keep a vibrant dispute resolution period open for a long period of time, the lack of transparency about an objector deciding to make an objection and keeping the objection in their back pocket while the registry continues to absorb cost. So all those factors come into play. And, you know, the complexities you introduced are very interesting too, you know, which can come first and how.

So I would - what I'd like you to do because there's an opportunity to discuss this. You know, we posted this new batching scheme for public comment and a feature of that is that in the timeline the objection period ends on September - March 13 rather.

So what I would encourage you to do is kind of - I've heard your objection before. You know, kind of describe it in that comment period so we can - so we can kind of lay out the timelines on a white board somewhere and maybe discuss it some more with you amongst ourselves and see if there's, you know, a better solution than the one we have.

(Werner): Okay. I think that it is still possible to just that because the way it is right now I believe you have a design bug. So I would welcome an opportunity to talk about this.

David Maher: I think next is Jon Nevett and then Jeff and then Ray.

Jon Nevett: Yeah. Actually I was - I had a question about community as well. In a situation where you have a community applicant and a non-community applicant for the same strings and to (Werner)'s point, if we could work out the community review panel coming earlier, it would help in a lot of ways.

Just like string similarity reviews and that's trying to figure out who's (in the) contentions that having that early community valuation panel results would obviate the need for an objection by a community that's successful would give clarity to all applicants in that contentions that - are they going - if the community is successful, then the others are out. So it doesn't matter. And it would help clarify those things.

So I would encourage you to take a look at those panels and see if we can get that early that would solve (Werner)'s problem about the objection period and it would give clarity to these other applicants (unintelligible).

Kurt Pritz: That's not so different in saying, you know, we'll do - we'll get the initial evaluation results out as soon as we can so we can have the objections after that because that would obviate the need for a lot of objections.

Jon Nevett: So it is dissimilar. And (unintelligible) to that, if you want to bring out your white board, we could do that too. But to me it's similar to the - to getting the results out of who's in your contention site. Let's figure out who's there, who's eligible and take it from there.

Kurt Pritz: So the principle is that we want to encourage the parties to settle it amongst themselves, right. So if there's some way for the parties to say - for the parties to meet and say we've settled it or we've agreed not to settle it. Is that - we don't want to get in the way of that because we think that's the best solution.

And then the second solution is the community priority examination. So if there's...

Jon Nevett: Not knowing community priority resolution results gets in the way of what your first goal, which is getting the contention sets to work it out amongst themselves because they don't know. You have this one applicant out there that says hey, if I succeed, I get 100%. So I'm not talking to you.

David Maher: Jeff, then Ray, then Ching.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I'm going to change gears. I don't know if the two of them are still in the community, okay. I'd be okay if they wanted to go first and then I'll change gears after them.

Ray Fassett: Okay. Thanks. Ray Fassett, jobs again. I think Jon this might be a comment to you. I think there's an important point here in that the community priority evaluation is triggered by the applicant. And the question here is how long -

what's the timeframe of when the applicants can trigger the community evaluation?

I assume that they applicant that has checked the community box can trigger the community evaluation after the objection period has ended. And I think that's causing part of what the discussion here is about.

But there's no - the idea from what I understand of the process anyway is the idea is not to do the community evaluations automatically for all applicants that have decided to check the box but instead that community evaluation only happens should that applicant that's checked the box invoked a community evaluation for which then that applicant has to pay the fees for that evaluation. Does that make sense?

So you can't move it up. I don't see how you move - how do you move up the community evaluation?

Kurt Pritz: All right. So the community evaluation, I'm looking up the guidebook. But the community evaluation occurs after initial evaluation. If there's no objections then the community evaluation occurs. And I don't know if the guidebook, you know, provides some time period between the end of initial evaluation and the start of the community priority evaluation in order to provide the parties to the opportunity to settle it.

The community priority evaluation only occurs in cases where there's contention and where that, you know, contention hasn't been settled by a meeting of the parties. And a meeting of the parties happens during the whole of initial evaluation and I think sometime thereafter. Right.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. I think - it seems ambiguous to me as to how long the parties have to resolve amongst themselves before the community applicant is required to invoke the community evaluation. And I don't know if that's by design or still be figured out.

David Maher: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. I think one of the things that I just kind of put this on the radar. It's not something we need to address here but it's something that's likely to come up in the next few months or so as we get closer to implementing the new TLDs is the code of conduct, which is what Specification 9.

I think there's - I've been in a number of conversations where I think there are a number of provisions to that code of conduct that are being interpreted very differently. And while the language is fairly broad, I think it would help to have a consultation with registries, registrars and applicants as to what does that code of conduct really mean in terms of practicality, in terms of what is the separate of functions really mean.

I mean obviously the guidebook says they're a separate legal entity. But as we all know you could have wholly owned subsidiaries that are registries and registrars. But ultimately there's a reporting team, a management team. There's general administrative functions. And to what extent can there be overlap between different staffs and, you know, that includes things like legal and billing and all sorts of things.

So you have to (tell a language) in Specification 9 but I really think we need to drill down before registries actually launch as to what do those mean in practicalities. And maybe we need to come out with some sort of guidance or - I don't want to say regulations but some (sort) of rules so that registries and registrars know or have a better idea of whether what they're doing is in violation of that code or not.

David Maher: Thanks Jeff. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you David. Okay. I also like to change gear. Sorry to jump off the topic. But I think from this - from the opening speech that we hear, you know, (unintelligible) for those of you who are using a non-English as your (unintelligible) or other - I mean you're celebrating in other scripts.

I think to give IDNs a kind of the first (pilot) a chance to go live or even go through the first phase to go through the (evaluation) process is really a big plus to you guys to make a position on whether it's from the (guts) or it is from a (unintelligible).

My - actually it kind of is a common (unintelligible) question is that we have seen this took place during the IDN ccTLD Fast Track. But we've seen that. We celebrate that. And we realize that there's a probably why didn't we - the varying issues then use ccTLD Fast Track. We did have put together a team at the Board level to make sure the synchronized IDN on variants for - actually (unintelligible) did happen and we managed that right.

And another point is that the community also have I mean observed and actually we can see from dashboard of other sources of the ICANN budget and actually revenue is that those ccTLD Fast Track, you know, beneficiary entities we did look forward to seeing then to, you know, to really to make contribution to this.

So let me take that point back to the gTLD, you know, gTLD sphere is that we probably want to do this right first of all, you know, we did saw a good progress for the VIP - for the label generation you seen actually working on that.

I'm just - I'm offering kind of a word of caution is that we would like to make sure that it took place in time and this will be done right. And in terms of I guess - if you go in (room) where we asking about, you know, once you get IDN variants, how much you're going to pay, say ICANN how much you're going to contribute to the community.

I guess this is about talking about six months or several months down the road. It is about time maybe through the NTAG, maybe just talk to the IDN applicant, you know, getting them into one - under one roof and talk about, you know, how much exactly I mean, you know, they have to contribute. I mean it is better to put those things first and (unintelligible). Just my two cents.

Kurt Pritz: So thanks for those comments and I'm sure you're aware of all the IDN variant work that's going on and the three projects that are being undertaken this year all with the goal of when those three projects complete, then the next project is the project for implementing, you know, the delegation of variants.

And I - for me being the non-technical person, you know, the more important of those, sorry, is - and where you could participate is this user experience group because we want to show that the delegation of variants will result in a good user experience and the anecdotal evidence from, you know, the variants we've delegated so far could be an indicator of that.

And then these are gTLDs with whom we'll contract, right. So what are the rules around - what are the rules around and what rules should be put in the contract because it'll be controlled at the registry level probably and not, you know, at root so, you know, and what are the rules that - should we put in there to ensure that every registry provides a good user experience. Your input there would be really beneficial I think and then of course across the board on the TLD variant projects.

And then, you know, as far as cost I think, you know, ICANN is - has and will now that we're kind of fleshing out the model for how these things would be delegated and I think there'll be some non-negligible costs associated with the delegation of variants like this ongoing panel that will look at the sets of

rules and approve them that and those costs would be spread out over all the variants.

So I think that the fee is really a policy discussion but, you know, it looks like some fee that where that - all those costs would be, you know, where the project would be spread out and that would just be, you know, revenue control kind of fee.

Adrian Kinderis: Adrian Kinderis, Motion Picture Registry.film.

David Maher: Could you give your name and affiliation again?

Adrian Kinderis: Adrian - I'll do it in American accent. Adrian Kinderis, Motion Picture Registry.film. Thanks. I just wanted to address the proposal that's been for the prioritization draw. I think largely it's been mostly about community and well done for pulling that together.

One concern I have is around the inclusion of putting the IDNs first within that proposal. I think you've provided some decent rationale as to why IDNs could go first and I'm not necessarily against that standalone. I don't love it but I can see why you did it.

My concern is around that I believe it's opening - but in doing so you've opened the door for others to put their hand up. And I wanted to remind you that at least my reading of the guidebook is that all TLDs are created equal.

The guidebook may offer different pathways by which you go to secure you TLD. In the example of a geographic TLD you would have to go and get support from the local government, so on and so forth. That doesn't make it any better or worse than any other TLD. It's just a different pathway by which you have to go to secure it.

So I just want to be - would stress caution with respect to this prioritization of brands or geographics or communities or anything because I don't believe the guidebook has allowed for a prioritization. There's community but that's only in the selection of a community over a generic or open name space.

So I just wanted you to be aware and I'm certainly seeing that there's lobbying efforts now going on with GAC members and Board members around the other splintered groups or categories of TLDs that are applying and I don't think that's in the spirit of what you're suggesting and would prefer you just (output) as planned. Thanks.

David Maher: Jordyn, go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks. I'm Jordyn Buchanan from Google/Charleston Road Registry and we applied for (dot foo) among other things. So one thing I'm curious about. We got quite a bit more detail in the current draft proposal about various timing events.

But one thing that's somewhat vague in the guidebook and there's no additional clarity around in the proposal is what the sort of the contention process looks like and in particular what the timing of the event like when an option might occur, whether options would be run simultaneously, whether we would use the draw to sequence options, any of those questions.

Has staff given thought to what that process might look like? Maybe I'm just not reading the right document. Is it documented anywhere.

Kurt Pritz: When the options are going to occur?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah. And, you know, whether they all occur at once or whether they occur as soon as they're ready. Is there a delay from the time at which all the initial evaluations are posted for a contention set like...

Kurt Pritz: Right. So they occur when they're ready. So just going back to Ray's question and then because it kind of precedes yours; you know, the guidebook says that community priority evaluations can begin once all the applications in a contention set have completed the previous stages of the process.

So what the guidebook says is once everybody's had an initial evaluation, if there's no objections, the community priority can start at any time. It's based - it relies on the applicant to trigger the CPE. In other words, the applicant is the one that triggers that.

Then once if that is available, then that can be triggered. If it's not available, then the option takes place. And so for those - well I'll get to it but - so there's certain exceptions for geographic names but options just take place, you know, as soon as all the other previous.

Jordyn Buchanan: Right. So in the event there's no community or geographic being in the contention set, you expect as soon as the last initial evaluation was complete for - and there's no objections, you would move rapidly to an option? Is that the assumption?

Akram Atallah: We expect that everybody will resolve these issues before they go to option. And if they cannot resolve them, then we'll go to option. The option is the last resort.

Jordyn Buchanan: Understood. I'm - we're just - it may be helpful to know more about what the timing of the option looks like in order to help drive those conversations about resolving the contention on their own.

Akram Atallah: So I believe you have to let the initial evaluation finish to make sure that everybody's exhausted whether somebody's going to pass before they start negotiating with them. And so you have to do - let all the process play out before you go to the last resort.

So it's not going to be immediate as - immediately after initial evaluation that you jump into option. I mean that's not going to happen. You got to have some time to get all the parties say, you know, we've exhausted everything before we go into option.

Jordyn Buchanan: So that's fair but is there any specific guidance on what that timing looks like?

Akram Atallah: Anything in the guidebook?

Kurt Pritz: Actually I think there's something in the guidebook that says after a certain period of time.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah. I mean that'll be good. If you guys can figure it out.

Akram Atallah: We can get back to you.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fassett: And a related question to that. This is Ray Fassett at .jobs. And by the way, I want to mention I'm also involved in seven new applications and none of them are community applications.

But a related question to that would be is there a specific period of time that a community applicant has to invoke the community evaluation or can they hold everybody up for X period of time that they're in contention with before having to invoke or be an end point coming to where they have to make the decision that they're going to go down the path of a community priority evaluation, which by the way is a significant decision for those applicants to make because there is a cost that they will have to absorb for that evaluation.

Kurt Pritz: I don't know. I'll read the guidebook and get back to you.

David Maher: Any other questions? I - again (unintelligible) the table I can't see.

((Crosstalk))

Kurt Pritz: So on questions like this and some other issues that we think are helpful to applicants such as anticipated clarifying questions and the like, we intend to push out a number of blogs - they're not blogs but they're notices to applicants that were published either on the micro side or through the customer service centers.

So we'll make sure, you know, sort of an advisory that consolidates what's in the guidebook. We'll post that. And then did you want to ask a question because I was going to keep talking?

((Crosstalk))

Ed White: ...on Jordyn's issue. I believe in the original version of the guidebook.

David Maher: Could you give your name and affiliation?

Ed White: Ed White, Dot-Irish. There's about four months between the initial evaluation and the close of uncontested applications. And for applications that were contested, it could take up to 11 months after the initial evaluation. So presumably there'd be 4 to 11 months after initial evaluation according to the original version but it would help applicants to know based on the revised timelines what that's looking like for this year.

So, you know, based on what you said, at this point if initial evaluations are (unintelligible) that could be 4 to 11 months after that. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz: And those timeframes are maximum timeframes. In other words, they were set up to describe how long it would take to have all the applications pass through an objection process. So some disputes will be settled quickly. Some are complex, require big panels, take a really long period of time.

So what you see in the guidebook there will 11 months is like the last application we think passing through the process but we see a lot of - but it doesn't define sets of applicants or single applicants that want to go quickly that file objections quickly or respond quickly or want to get into, you know, contention resolution of some sort quickly, those were sort of maximum timeframes to get all the applications out as an indication.

It's meant to be an indication to everyone how long it might take to get the last application to the new gTLD process.

Just have a couple things to say. One is in response to Jeff's comment. You know, maybe we could, you know, convene some sort of team and we were thinking about like the temporary drafting team that we got together to discuss the code of conduct and maybe put better words to that and, you know, we could include IP people on that team if we (unintelligible).

But it'd be some mechanism that we could convene fairly quickly to get to that because we're kind of used to operating that mode. So we'll think about that. And if you guys would think about that, that'd be good.

And then so just an interest we have in the URS session that's coming up, you know, we want to make that a successful implementation. And I'm sure all of you know but the reason we're having the session and the issues we've identified is that the URS that was just a community created mechanism to protect trademark rights isn't meeting all its goals.

You know, we forecast that the cost of a URS case, you know, will approach the same thing as a UDRP case which is kind of not surprising because if you lay the two processes next to one another they're remarkably similar.

And alternative solutions -- that might be lower cost -- are being proposed -- one by WIPO and one by NAF -- we had sessions in Prague that proposed alternate solutions.

So I think there's viable solutions to this issue that could be implemented, you know, in plenty of time for new gTLDs and when the URS has to actually be up and running. I'm saying all this to request your support in participating in the session and supporting those models that you do in fact support.

You take a look at them and, you know, while we're interested in is making URS a truly cheaper, faster mechanism for suspending domain names that are, you know, clear cut cases of abuse. But recognizing that we had put safe products for registrants and the model we want to maintain those safeguards -- or some sort of safeguards that are equivalent.

So I ask you to come to that session and help us coalesce around a solution for it -- it will be good for the program and, you know, eliminate an area of risk for it.

If that was clear and I'll answer and questions if it wasn't because I'm really clear.

David Maher: Great, thanks very much Kurt and Akram, I think, yes. There seem to be no further questions so we very much appreciate your time and your responses.

The next item I believe is the demonstration of the information system -- are we ready to proceed with that? Go ahead, thank you, go ahead.

Denise Michel: (Unintelligible). Hi I'm Denise Michel and thanks for the opportunity to give you a quick demo and answer questions about My ICANN (unintelligible). This is the new information tool that Fadi unveiled yesterday as part of his opening remarks -- apologies for the oblique agenda item, but we were waiting for Fadi to announce it.

So while Francisco pulls up myicann.org website just to remind those of you who were not in attendance when Fabi was speaking about this. This is a new web-based multi-stakeholder platform that will allow the community to easily have - find information from the thousands of webpages that comprise the icann.org website.

And either go to this information portal or sign up for emails to have it delivered to your inbox. And to designate the specific topics that you're particularly interested in tracking.

This is not a replacement for icann.org -- that will always be the main repository and information source for ICANN information and the ICANN Community's work.

But what this portal does is provide you the latest information from anywhere on the ICANN public webpages and ease it into myicann.org in an organized way that makes it easy for you to stay abreast of activities and developments in the ICANN world.

So for those remote participants we've shared the screen of myicann.org. You can also just jump on your laptop and go to this website or your iPhones, iPads, Nexus 7, Androids -- this is fully mobile compatible. It's also low bandwidth to help ensure that people in developing countries and elsewhere with those issues also have access to it.

I'll run through the system really quick -- show you some of the features -- and then happy to answer any questions. I just wanted to take ten minutes to make sure that you're across this new opportunity.

So we're at the ICANN - we're at mycann.org Homepage. It's great to see the person with this computer has already created an account for themselves. But what you'll see here when you click on MyICANN - so if you haven't

signed in you go to this homepage for the first time you'll see a big button at the top that says Create an Account.

You don't have to create an account but - and you can just use the portal and go there and browse, look at the topics, streams, look at the calendar. But if you create an account it allows you to indicate what your time zone is for the master calendar, it allows you to indicate the different topics that you'd like to receive email about and how often you'd like to receive it -- once a week, every day.

It also allows you to have added features such as -- forwarding a particular article or information piece to someone else, saving it to My Saved Articles allows you to print it, link to it -- those types of things.

So back to the homepage -- the homepage features the most recent information that has been pulled from the icann.org website. And we've seeded this -- of course it's a beta -- deliberately released as a beta -- and we've provided you with some topics and streams to get started.

But we're very much interested in having the community -- and especially the power users in ICANN like yourself -- to tell us which topic streams you're most interested in following. So we plan on regularly adding additional topics after Toronto.

We also are interested in hearing about any features you'd like added, bugs that you find. We very much want this to be a tool that meets your needs.

So under Recent -- it's just a most recent information that's come through My ICANN that's been posted anywhere on the ICANN website for any of the topics that are listed.

All of the topics that include - as I noted once you create an account you can save particular articles and pieces of information that come through. We have

as topics, of course, all the key groups in ICANN - the Advisory Committee, Supporting Organizations, as well as the Board and the Nominating Committee.

In addition to groups -- then as I mentioned we have the key topics that we've already seated My ICANN with. We're picking up all the forms that are opened on ICANN's public forum page. And we have everything related to the Toronto meeting feeding into this site and you'll recognize the key topics that we've started you with.

We also have menus in your language -- when you create an account you have the ability to designate a language stream if that's what you want. And we have streams for each of the - in addition to English -- five (unintelligible) languages that ICANN posts information in.

Also on the homepage we have highlight key item. Here we have an opportunity for feedback on the internet governance and ICANN ecosystem maps that Fadi spoke about yesterday.

We have a Featured Events and Key Items that have been listed on the Master Calendar in My ICANN and events that are coming up this week. So we also have an All Topics tab right here -- so it's easy to find.

And just to give you a sense of what this does -- you can go to a topic like gTLD. It shows the most recent postings on ICANN's website in this area. Again, it pulls from lots of different sources and so the idea here for the gTLD topic stream is to pull from any information that's posted on the new gTLD Micro site, any letter that's sent to the Board and posted in Correspondence - - which is always a fun page to find on icann.org, any working group related to anything that has to go with gTLDs or new gTLDs should be pulled into this stream -- again, public information.

So we're - the idea here is to really do a cross-cut across all of the ICANN groups and webpages to pull things into this stream so it's easy to find.

So once you click on gTLDs and you click on a particular article or information that's listed here it will take you to, you know, a very cursory summary of what this is. And it will always include a URL that takes you to the Source Page -- again, this is an augmentation of icann.org and it will always link you back to the Source Page, the group - the session that is being run and all the information around that.

Each page will also have a more like this -- it takes key terms - key search terms and generates this. And the more you -- like any of these tools -- the more you use it the smarter it gets.

And again, once you create an account you can save this article to My Saved Articles, you can email it, print it, get a link.

And at the top of every page is icann.org. So you can always get back to the ICANN website. At the bottom of every page is Contact Us. This is a particularly important button because that's the place we want you to go to provide input on additional topics you want us to add to make My ICANN more useful for you.

And finally to wrap up I'll show you the Calendar feature. For the first time we've come close to having a master calendar in one place for everyone. The Calendar's listed on the right -- all of the major groups in ICANN.

We've also added all of the Toronto calendars here. The opening and closing dates for every public comment forum that's currently open. And to give you a sense of the power of this calendar feature -- we've also added security, stability and resiliency. We can also add topic calendars here.

Again, we're looking for your input on how to make this as useful as possible. Every event has just basic information -- title, date, where, where it's coming from -- always an originating URL so you'll link back to the information on each event.

And then one more feature before I lose my presentation -- at the bottom of each calendar is the (ICAL) button. It always you for each calendar stream to click on this (ICAL) button if you're interested in adding, say all of the GNSO events to your laptop calendar. You can click the (ICAL) button. It's compatible with -- not all -- but a large number of calendars.

It doesn't allow you yet to add a particular events to your calendar through this but you can add a whole calendar stream.

Those are the key features. Happy to answer any questions you may have and would encourage you all to create an account, use it and give us your feedback so we can make it better.

David Maher: Thanks very much. We're going to have a very short break. (Fadi) will be here at 10:45 so if you have a very brief question, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. It will be very brief and I can talk to Denise about it offline if you want. The log in - to create an account it doesn't ask for a password but when you log in it asks for a password. So, anyway, I can talk to you about it offline but I don't know if that's a glitch or if it's a user error.

Denise Michel: We call it a feature.

Keith Drazek: This is (Keith Drazek). I can actually address that. I actually just - while we were sitting up here I went and opened an account and Chuck, you're correct that when you first log in it doesn't ask for a password. But you're sent an email with a link. And if you click on the link it takes you back to the page where you can then input a password.

David Maher: Thanks Keith. Well, hello, break. You have to be back here by 10:45 precisely. (Fadi Chahade) will be here to speak and answer some questions.

It's 10:45. Actually 10:45. Mr. (Chahade) I don't believe is here yet so we'll get started on the rest of our agenda if you could all take your seats.

The first item remaining is the planning for the growth of our stakeholder group - working group update. We had a very good meeting yesterday. The Resources Working Group -- Keith do you want to give a brief update?

Keith Drasek: Yes. Thank you David. This is Keith Drazek. So as David said we had a meeting yesterday of the Recourses Planning Working Group of the Registry Stakeholder Group. And basically went through our agenda.

A couple of things were trying to accomplish and one is to sort of finalize our requests or maybe clarify our requests to ICANN that have gone in for their tool kit of services for fiscal year '13.

So we went through a quite extensive list of items and really sort of came to the realization that we need to come up with a, sort of a scope document or sort of a document that really provides in some - quite some detail what it is that we're looking for in terms of services, in terms of software, in terms of functionality -- to be able to ensure that the Registry Stakeholder Group and currently the (NTAG) have the tools necessary or available to do voting, to track voting and to have a better system for doing document review and document updates.

Everything that we do today is done via email and we're trying to find opportunities for efficiency in, you know, using some better software that would allow us, you know, basically be more efficient and, you know, as particularly as we grow.

What we're doing today we've really identified as not scalable so coming out of our Working Group session yesterday is I will be working to develop the Scope Document that we discussed in working closely with Cherie to really identify all of the, sort of activities that currently take place today in a very manual fashion.

And then really try to, you know scope it out so we can identify the best, most efficient, cost effective software programs that we can use to prepare for the significant growth in our stakeholder group.

So I will have that document substantially done -- maybe just in first draft -- but substantially completed by our next Stakeholder Group Call. And Cherie and I as I said we'll be working on the closely. Thanks David.

David Maher: Thanks Keith. Any questions or comments?

If not Ken could you give us the financial report?

Ken Stubbs: Yes. Hi my name's Ken Stubbs. I'm the Treasurer of the Constituency for the next three days, I guess. As it stands right now we have approximately \$53,000 in our account. We have -- as previously indicated -- budgeted funds for the (NTAG) initially a \$5000 trench and an additional \$5000's being held in reserve.

I submitted a Treasurer's Report to the constituency along with the projection - cash flow projection of approximately - Sheri I think it was about 30 or 45 days ago. Nothing has changed to indicate - if anything it was originally based on very conservative assumptions.

I believe we have an excess of 80 members now in (NTAG). My projections were somewhere in the neighborhood of 110 to 120. I would - I'm going to prepare another projection assuming that it will be closer to 150 by this spring.

Other than that we have no extraordinary expenditures. We've been talking with ICANN negotiating with them to try to develop some support services that will make it easier to deal with voting and some of the other issues that we have -- Chris has been very helpful on - helping us to evaluate some of this.

We may end up having to purchase something if members of the (XCOMM) as well as the (NTAG) find that there may be a need to use software that they feel works more efficiently or is available on a more timely basis -- I'll let you know. But there is more than adequate funds in our budget and in the bank to deal with that.

I do have to apologize to you. The bank that I do business with is not the Hong Kong Shanghai Bank or some of the more modern banks. As a result I'm notified that wire transfers are hitting my account but it can take anywhere from ten days before they will provide me with the names of the remitters -- and it comes by mail.

So when I'm here it's there. So I apologize -- those of you who make queries - - either to myself or to Sheri indicated you wired funds. Please understand that I wish it was easy for me to just pull it up on the internet and see who the name of the remitter is but it isn't.

So as soon as I open my mail or as soon as I receive - if I receive a check I immediately notify Sheri as well as the person who is the remitter that the funds have been received.

Are there any questions any of you might have about this? Please don't hesitate to call me or contact me if you have any questions or need any assistance. Thank you.

David Maher: Thanks Ken. Roy can you give us an update on the on-boarding?

Roy Dykes: Sure David. Thank you. For those of you who don't know me I'm Roy Dykes and I work in Product Management at NuSTAR and over the last 15 or 16 months or so I've been, sort of the champion and leader within the Registry Stakeholder Group for the on-boarding effort.

And what that means is -- we've known for quite some time that registries request and require in a lot of cases this same information from registrars to on-board and (UTLD). And we want to find a way to -- as much as possible -- standardize that.

So over the last year plus I've been working with ICANN staff as well as some review here to collect information and run surveys as to what information's needed.

It's kind of a hard job though. And so while I'm happy to continue to champion it I can't take it on completely myself so I had a few discussions with ICANN staff and they did secure us a consultant last month.

This started to collect some of the information and at this very ICANN meeting also conduct a little bit more of an in-depth survey in terms of - with a goal of getting toward a base front document here in the fourth quarter of this year with a goal of having something developed early next year.

So that's the latest development is that the requirements document is being developed and a little bit more information is being sought on the registries and registrars. (Unintelligible) the registrars.

We're going to have another discussion on this topic in a joint meeting this afternoon. But I wanted to provide that update this morning. Feel free to contact me with any questions you have or if you have questions now I'm happy to entertain them. Thanks.

David Maher: Thanks Roy. Any questions?

(Jeff): I think this is one of just - or the first I should say of probably many efforts that we're going to have with the registrars and others to - as the new TLDs are being rolled out.

The more we can standardize these types of processes, the better for the community. And, you know, I'm sure the registrars -- I know they appreciate it -- and like I said this on-boarding is just step one. I'm sure they'll want other things standardized and I think it's a good thing that we're engaging in this early.

David Maher: Thanks (Jeff). We can move along then to do pending matters for public comment. The first one is the trademark clearinghouse where we've already had quite a bit of discussion. And I think the consensus is that we're going to use the extended comment period to refine the two drafts that are currently available.

Chuck do you want to speak to that or is somebody else?

Chuck Gomes: Real briefly, David. It doesn't, you know, like I think Keith pointed out earlier -- the comment periods that are open right now are with regard to two specific documents that our comments have nothing to do with.

So extending that comment period I don't see how that helps us at all? Am I missing something there?

Jonathan Robinson: Keith it's Jonathan - Chuck it's Jonathan waking up slowly. Yes, we did - my original drafts had a very small - not nearly as comprehensive as I've now seen, for example the IPCs response. But I draft some - couple of points on matching rules and proof of use.

So we did respond directly to that but that's - but the bulk of what we then went on to discuss was about the broader issues with regard to the trademark

theory housed and its relationship with the registries -- which are probably not appropriate for more than one reason for this comment to hear from us.

Jeff Neumann And all that said, any Jonathan maybe - I saw you reading the document - we were talking about it this morning. There are some comments that were filed by the IPC on the trademark clearinghouse on the document that are out there that I think are worthy of our attention.

I think they would - if you read the IPC comments they would like to focus more of the dispute resolution at the registry level. So it's the IPC's expectation that the registries get directly involved in disputes over whether - well maybe Jonathan you can go over it because I just saw it briefly, but.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I skim read it this morning and I think - I won't preempt our response to it but I think (Jeff) is absolutely right. What we need to do is read it carefully, see what they've said, see both the substance of what's being suggested and see whether we can support or be neutral or in fact consider going against any recommendations.

But it does look like there's been some quite comprehensive work by the IPC. It's definitely worthy of our attention and so that - but that's appropriate for the reply period as I understand it.

So there's no problem with that, the reply period opens today. Perhaps a sub-group of us can get on with reading that formally - reading it properly and formally responding to. So it's an opportunity there for sure.

Man: (Unintelligible). I know this is specifically related to the comment and found in the comments but I guess a question to Jonathan and (Jeff) -- I know there's some more discussions to be had this week -- on that -- on this topic. What do you anticipate when we come out of this week the next steps are going to be?

I mean, I know that's a - that's probably the same question you're going to be asking yourself but I'd love to know where we think this is - how this is going to get resolved, you know, relatively soon.

Jeff Neumann: So from my perspective, I guess, I think the best thing that could come out of this week is some sort of definitive proposal from ICANN that's acceptable to us that goes out for comment.

You know, and I think we're getting there. I think on the Sunrise we're there. I think on the Trademark Clearing - or sorry, the Trademark Claims -- I think what I would hope to get out of this is this whole understanding of a document that goes out that has the trade-offs and then collecting from the community which of the options or which of the trade-offs they're willing to live with.

But as I've explained to ICANN staff and to others and as others have explained -- you know, if we're going to really launch new gTLDs by Q3 - early Q3 of next year or potentially late Q2 these were - the requirements need to be finalized by - well, you know, two months ago.

But certainly by not later than the end of the year to have the hard requirements so that we can - you know, putting aside the trademark owners getting information into the clearinghouse which will take some time as well.

But for us to build our systems -- and if it's decentralized it's going to take longer for us to build our systems -- to build it, to test it and to make sure it's ready for prime time. You know, it's going to take a number of months.

So what we've impressed upon the staff and the Board is that this has to be done now and within weeks and not within months.

David Maher: Thanks (Jeff). I've just been told that (Fadi) is on his way so he'll be here very shortly. If there are any other comments on the trademark clearinghouse?

The next item, very quickly, the IDN Variance. (Unintelligible) anything?
Ching Chiao: Thank you David. I've also - over this weekend I've tried to went through the report has been put for public comment. And frankly speaking I think the group has, you know developed this - what do you call it - enabled generation rules in core based on the BI Integrate Report.

For myself, personally speaking, I have kind of trying to see in as a nation earlier in the earlier session is that how practical it would be to apply to the gTLD.

One thing in particular -- and I have shared it with several members and as well as earlier with Chuck -- is about - in particular the Chinese IDN in the usual practice they will have a set of what they call the preferred (unintelligible) which are the characters being used predominately.

So I think the report's trying to use a kind of a normalized procedure across different languages but in reality how this could be really - it kind of implemotive in the practical way. I think it deserve some additional work.

So therefore come to quick conclusion as to, you know, I'm still trying to get a sense of what exactly can be done. So actually Edmon's not here but I will hope that you can also have some input - and oh, Chuck you want to say.

Man: I believe (Cary) can you hear me. Can you take input from remote participants?

David Maher: Go ahead (Cary)?

(Cary Karp): There's going to be a presentation of this work on Thursday morning. And it in deed is as dense -- if not to say impenetrable -- as any aspect of the IDN work has been thus far.

There are in fact no comments posted on the report so I'm - there's anything that we feel has to be said we're going to have to say ourselves as nobody else is saying anything.

But, that said, I believe that's we're talking about a first iteration of a report that - the office of which also realize needs to be rendered a bit more -- I don't know -- light weight, I supposed, before it's practical utility becomes apparent.

So my suggestion to our group would be -- if anyone is sincerely interested in this we are going to have to say what we want to have said but wait until the presentation on Thursday to get some sense of the likely - the way the work is going to be continued -- whether or not any comments are left.

I won't make any comment myself on my own assessment of the practicality of this thing.

David Maher: Thanks (Cary). Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks David. Chuck Gomes. And I encourage Ching to develop some comments with regard to the issue raised -- I think it's helpful. Those of you that are doing IDNs and might have issues with variance going forward -- I'd certainly encourage you to read the report.

It's stuck - in the process itself is not that hard to follow. It often gets into some linguistic issues and some technical issues that are a little more complicated but you can understand the process without getting bogged down in those.

So I encourage you to read it and then it'll make more sense with what Ching puts forward. Because what they're proposing in this process are two panels - - and I'm not going to go into those -- there's a lot of detail that is in there. I mean, with my limited knowledge the proposal for the process looks okay -- considering it has to go across the whole industry.

But I - again, I reiterate, I encourage king - Ching to draft up some comments that we can all look at. And if you look at -- at least skim the report if you're doing IDNs -- it will - they will make more sense to you.

David Maher: Thanks Chuck. Francesco is (Fadi) on the way?

Francesco Arias: I'm looking into that. Sorry.

David Maher: Thank you. Well we'll keep on going. The next proposal -- the Proposed Bi-Laws Amendment to Align Board Terms -- does anyone see a need to prepare comments on that subject? I don't see any volunteers.

Community Input and Advice Process.

Keith Drazek: Thanks David this is Keith. I prepared and submitted to the list -- I think it was probably about ten days ago, I think -- some proposed comments. I'm sure in the document dump of pre-ICANN meeting not everybody has had a chance to review it yet.

But there have been some comments drafted for review. And I know that Chuck was involved in a panel -- I think yesterday -- on this particular topic. If we want to talk more substance around it I'm sure we can but comments have been circulated.

(Jeff), go ahead.

Jeff Neumann: Yes, no, actually I think it's a critical topic. I think unfortunately buried in with a lot of other things and other meetings that were going on. I actually would appreciate a little bit of talk on substance because this really goes to the heart of the matter of ICANN developing policy outside of the PDP.

And for me there's been a huge movement from others outside of our group to do that -- and that scares me because these are our contracts and, you know, if Chuck could provide an update I'd really appreciate that.

Chuck Gomes: Sure (Jeff). It's Chuck again. There weren't too many of you in the panel yesterday. There were only about 40 people in the room -- maybe less -- and a lot of those were staff and a few Board members.

But we actually had a good discussion of that -- of the issues that you're concerned about. I had opportunity since I was on the panel to kind of raise those issues.

One of the things I suggested, okay -- I'll just finish this sentence. One of the things I suggested was that -- we need to work further on the concept of a community working group. Not just for heavy policy issues but for responding to advice when we need to as a community. And I can share more about that later.

David Maher: Thanks Chuck. Mr. (Chehade) is here and we welcome him and the floor is yours.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you. It's good to be here on the floor. So I think we are the most - well you've heard enough from me but I wanted to say something specifically to your constituency.

I've been a little bit disappointed -- some of the tone I've heard over the summer -- in that sometimes put you in, in my opinion, unnecessarily vilified position. I (unintelligible) and I think that there may have been things that occurred in the past that swung the pendulums towards making it okay for people to put your work into this kind of vilified tide of the business.

You're the people we should keep out of the room, you know, when you're having certain discussion. That's not (unintelligible) stakeholder. You are a key stakeholder and a stakeholder that makes a lot of things happen.

So you should be treated -- and I plan to change the balance. I'm sure some of your colleagues sitting at this table would be able to tell you that just in the last 48 hours I change my scheduled several times to spend time with them, to listen to them -- whiteboards and everything -- just talk openly -- understand your issues, understand what is on your mind, how we solve problems together.

And that will be the way we will work. So before we - the process is the process and I'd expect the process -- that's how we work. But I think (unintelligible) people of (unintelligible) and can come together also and solve problems.

And we will be doing much more of that to report. And I will be standing up for any one stakeholder be put into some unnecessary negative light. Just because they belong to a group that supposedly are all, you know, people who just care about their interests.

Now in return I'm going to ask you to also rise -- as I frankly must say today and yesterday -- I saw firsthand. I saw you rise to the occasion of also putting yourself in the shoes of others.

I mean, literally thinking what would the other constituencies think about this position and how can we maybe adjust our position so we can find a way to work together. This is how we should work.

And if I give you the commitment that your voice is going to be in its rightful place to solve problems what I ask back is that you also cross the line sometimes -- put yourself in the shoes of the other stakeholders and see their position. Otherwise we just won't advance.

And I would like you think of this in the context of what's happening around our community. It's very important to keep that in mind. We're not on an island. I said we don't want to be a fortress. We want to be an oasis. But we're not an island anymore.

We cannot act as if we are alone in the world. So we have to do things with responsibilities that frankly we didn't have to worry about before. It's just reality.

And so I ask us to rise to this moment. I mean, there are lots of changes happening in the industry and we need to think more strategically. Just saw the ccTLD in the last hour and they were - we were talking about the strategic plan of (ITEN) -- our strategic plan.

And I admitted publicly that I don't think we have a strategic plan. We have an operational plan -- that's easy -- we always can tell people what to do in the kitchen. But what use are we in? Where are we heading? Twenty-five top registrars in the world saw growth go down this year -- what does that mean?

So these are the questions I'd like to be engaged with your on. And I'd like us to rise to the level of thinking about. We're entrusted with that. We cannot just keep holding small positions -- we need to think of the big picture.

And I - my engagements would be just in the last two, three days have been remarkable. Frankly some of the most calm, wise meetings I've had in the last two years were with your committee.

And your - I come from the background that understand also your world. And so I appreciate it very much. And I thank you. I thank you for that, truly. For those of you that helped me on some of the meetings in the last few weeks. Okay.

David Maher: Thank you very much. And eloquent statement that I'm sure we will all take to heart. I believe you have a few minutes -- could we have questions from the forum?

Fadi Chehade: Sure.

David Maher: (Jeff) go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks and thank you (Fadi). I just want to say first hand my appreciation for not only the words that you said here and yesterday but actually acting on those. I think everything you said yesterday and today is one thing -- it's one thing to say them but I truly have the hope and have seen firsthand action behind those words -- so I appreciate it.

And we spent a little time this morning with a larger group here talking about Trademark Clearinghouse and the openness that we've seen from the highest levels of ICANN on considering both models and walking through the issues. Both from our perspective but also right's holders perspectives and we truly appreciate that and we believe in the end that we're going to come up with something that we believe works the best for the community at large.

It's not going to be perfect but - and there are going to be trade-offs but as long as we make it together with an understanding we're working toward a common goal I think it will be fruitful in the end.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you David and thank you (Jeff) for the great open of elective, you know, system that you - what you have just said is that since you're opening speech and, you know, people are seeing about (Fabi) says so, (Fabi) says so.

And even last night being out on (bi-racial) fifth anniversary dinner kind of, you know, brought us back to passion and these -- kind of why we build this

registry for the communities. So I'd just like to say that many of the (SGOD) (unintelligible) shared what you had trying to - fail to reengage of what the community actually need to work together. So I'd just like to echo that. Thank you very much.

Man: Yes, thank you (Fadi) very much for your comments. I'd like to point out over the last five - seven years especially a significant amount of the issues that have arisen between the various constituencies and various communities within ICANN are as a result of breakdown in what I would consider to be effective communications.

And what often would happen is that somebody - an inquiry would come in -- let's say it's not related to the TLDs or anything like this -- to an ICANN staffer. The ICANN staffer would -- in most cases -- immediately review - prepare a response to that inquiry.

The only problem is problem is that there was certain choke pipes - choke points within the ICANN organization that literally required every communication to go through a certain area.

Fadi Chehade: Legal.

Man: Right, legal. And so as a result what would happen is there would be enormous delays as a result of this. And I felt sorry - it was a morale problem for the staff because the staffer was the one who would end up taking the heat for not being responsive.

So if we can continue on both sides to make a commitment to be responsive and work towards clarity -- it seems possible. We all understand there's certain issues where you have potential (unintelligible) for hopes -- an interest or an obligation for public use disclosure that some of the things - got almost a little too far beyond the path. Thank you.

Fadi Chehade: Three things. All the barriers internally have been removed. People have been empowered. Many of them are grabbing this. Some of them are very afraid too -- it's a cultural change -- I'm working on it. But yes, we had a very deep down, very tired, very strapped staff culture -- doesn't change in a day.

But I'm working on it. I had a two hour meeting with all the executives here on Friday. Just to share with them that they now are empowered. And then I needed to explain to them what happens when they trip because they also were very afraid in the past of tripping.

So we established a whole new approach to this -- so that should start changing the culture at ICANN and move things more rapidly.

Second thing, unfortunately (Jean Francois Baril) couldn't be here with me right now -- I was hoping he would but he had another commitment. So I promised him I'll share this. I don't know if you have (unintelligible) please find him and say hi to him.

As I mentioned in my opening (Jean Francois) is a very senior, very capable, very effective business executive. I mean, he managed a \$30 billion purse for ten years. This is a very capable guy who's run the most efficient value chain on the planet according to AMR five years in a row. He knows what he's doing. He knows how to work with partners and build partnerships.

I brought him on board Monday to manage the relationships with the registrars and the registries and help me understand how to improve it. I'm hoping he stays on but for now I have asked him to be a consultant supporting me in that role. Maybe you could help me make him stay on.

He's a very, very knowledgeable guy and someone that I've seen build incredible consensus in the telecommunications sector in the early 2000's and outstanding -- just incredible passion, difference in values but a sense of business and understanding of what is it to be responsive, to the businesses.

So I think you'll be very pleased with that -- that's new also by the way. We didn't have that. Your requests at ICANN were kind of mumbled everywhere. And then I said, "Well who's responsible for this very important community and how do we make sure this community gets a response?" So that's already in play.

And then the third thing I want to tell you -- which again, back to (Jeff)'s point about action. So you - I don't want to be - I wish I could talk a lot less -- I just am so anxious to get things done now. But I'm being hustled meeting to meeting to talk more -- but let me just tell you, I'm doing things that you may or may not even know about to actually do your work at ICANN.

I mean, I was supposed to sign off on a contract ten days ago to get the whole Trademark Clearinghouse (unintelligible). And I refused. I looked at it, I said, "Did our community look at this? Are they willing to pay these fees, any fees?" How do you want me to sign a contract and I come sit next to all of you and tell you, "I'm here to listen to you."

I cannot implicate my son in a contract that I haven't discussed with him much less all of you who trusted me to do things for you. So I've already stopped that and I took a step back -- it doesn't mean I'm delaying the program now -- but I'm taking time. I've already had multiple meetings just here -- to listen to you, to understand what would work, what would (unintelligible) -- which is normal for me.

So, you know, without taking my words out of context you have someone now here who understands that you're running enterprises and you can trust me and (Jean Francoise) as he comes in to help me to make sure that we do not sign you up for anything that you didn't know about, you didn't give us your insight on and hopefully you have agreed to.

So that's my commitment.

David Maher: Those are by far the most encouraging words we've heard on that subject in a long, long, time. Thank you very much.

I'm sorry we weren't able to take more questions but obviously (Shahadi)'s time is very limited with all the things that are going on.

We have about 20 minutes before we adjourn for lunch and then the meeting with the Board. I think we should just go on down the list. Did we conclude the work on the Community Input -- was there anything further on that?

Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck again. So we didn't make any resolutions, we didn't conclude anything yesterday with regard to Community Input. What I want to point out - - the document that Keith just sent around -- which is the public comment thread that is open. There are a list of -- I don't know, nine or ten questions -- that it asked for responses for. It's really easy to go through so do that.

But on the bigger issues that Jeff is raising -- those are going to continue to be discussed. We probably will hit some of those in the Board - in a session with the Board today. But one of the points I tried to emphasize yesterday -- that it is that with input to the Board it doesn't make sense -- and some of you heard me say this over the weekend in the GNSO -- in a lot of cases it doesn't make sense to ask the GNSO Council for a position.

GNSO Council's role is to manage the policy development process. So the extent to which there's a question about that process it makes sense for the Council to take a position -- that's their mission, that's their role.

But to ask their position on a specific recommendation or issue that's not related to that process itself is not only very impractical -- because they

probably won't be able to come to agreement -- but secondly it's not in their mission.

Those kind of requests should go to the community. And that means stakeholder groups, constituencies and so forth. And then we should respond to that.

Now if the Council wants to be -- as came up over the weekend -- perform some sort of a coordinating, facilitating role that's fine. But it's not the Council's role to take positions. It's the broader community.

And certainly if any of you disagree with me on that I think it's consistent with the bi-laws -- let's talk about that. And that's the thing -- that's one of the key points that came out of the session yesterday.

We talked about how do you determine what's policy development, what's not? I refereed that - the audience back to our contracts and to the bi-laws with regard to what we all know very well is the picket fence.

There's some good criteria there. I also pointed out that the bi-laws say that the GNSO's responsibilities develop substantial policy -- not everything that's going to be proposed for policy is going to be substantial. If it is we will get nothing done if we have to go to a PDT on everything.

And so we talked about that in that session. Again, we didn't come to any conclusions but there was very good dialogue. And the CCNSO was represented, At Large was represented, the Board was represented and hopefully that's enough (Jeff) to give you a little gist.

I'm - I don't want to take any more time unless you absolutely need it. But I'd be glad to talk about this further. And it's something that we need to be very diligent on because as (Jeff) says our obligations under policy development procedures and particular consensus policy -- we have to fulfill those.

And if everything goes to a PDP it's going to be problematic not only for us but for the community.

David Maher: Thanks Chuck. I think we can move along then. The next item is implementing the global policy for post exhaustion (IPV) Core Allocation -- highly technical issues that I don't - there may be people here that are qualified to talk about that -- certainly not I.

Let's move along then. I'm reading the list here -- I wonder if there's a - Registry Stakeholder Group Charter revisions that's not open for public comment.

Man: So on that, I think two things. Number one is we should probably file a comment in support of our own changes. I think that's - it's self-evident we support it but we should probably indicate that.

I also want to just, you know, I've talked to a couple people around the community -- including some new applicants -- and I think there's some misunderstanding as to what the change is that we've proposed actually are.

So there's been a lot of discussion that I've heard in the hallways on our weighted voting system. Now while that's not a change that we've suggested, right? There's no real changes to that. I think...

David Maher: No, it's the same.

Man: I understand that and you understand that and some of us here understand that. But I will tell you that the community -- especially some new TLD applicants -- are looking at it for the first time -- it's posted. And there's a bunch of discussion -- and some concern -- expressed by the applicants that believe that these word (unintelligible) when we know they're not.

And believe that they - that the Charter favors the incumbents and that there's a concern that the new entrants will not have any kind of position or power to change anything.

And I've heard some negative comments to the extent of, well the incumbents are going to have more than 50% of the vote always and they've ensured that.

I think we need to do an analysis. I think we need to be able to stand behind our Charter -- even though they're not changes. Because I would bet that we are going to see some comments to that effect.

David Maher: Thanks. Any comments?

Jonathan Robinson: Well just, David- it's Jonathan. Just a minor comment and then on the back of that -- I mean, it actually makes me think that our - the comment that we submit should not be simply in support of what we've done but perhaps even go a little bit further in explaining the changes or, you know, highlighting some key points and essentially anticipating where there might be questions or issues arising.

David Maher: That's a good point. I think - sure as an action item volunteers who helped draft the statement on that subject. Vladamir go ahead.

Vladimir Shadrinov: I represent the applicants so (unintelligible). I've been with this community some time before. So this is regards to the counting process. I think it would - it would make sense to create some kind of model -- what happens if a particular register votes in what way. So we have a few really big registries here and a few smaller ones and there will be many and many other small - perhaps smaller or bigger ones.

So perhaps some research -- what happens if VeriSign votes this way, (unintelligible) this way -- like ten smaller registries votes in a position to

something. That would perhaps really help to understand if the existing rule would work or not.

David Maher: Thank you. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I'll be really brief because this is not the time to discuss the why the voting structure is the way it is. But I'd like to just point out to people that that voting structure -- the essence of it -- has been - was there since the beginning of the stakeholder group -- a constituency at that time -- way back in 2000 or 2001. And a lot of thought went into that.

So my suggestion -- and I think David -- this is what David was basically saying as an action item -- is that we have that dialogue with all the new people. And they can critique it, they can poke holes in it and so forth. But it was not done in a - just a way to give big players an advantage.

It was done to create some balance -- but let's talk about that -- and so that you at least understand where it came from and then let's look at it. And it may take a while for us to do that but let's do that.

David Maher: Thanks Chuck. (Jon).

(Jon): Thanks David. One question that I'm struggling with related to these changes and I guess the clarifying changes -- this is the most important one -- I think from my perspective and perspective of (NTAG) is that it enabled us to become an interest group under the Registry Stakeholder Group. And that Charter change clarified that right for us to organize so we think it's a good thing.

But the thing I'm struggling with is why is there a public comment period on it at all? Why is - when you're talking about a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder model process -- why is the Board even looking at clarifying questions on our Charter?

David Maher: That's an excellent question. I - (Jeff) volunteered but my own answer is that I don't think there is any good reason for public comment on the Charter that we put together. I've expressed my view that a -- what you might say -- a formal, legal review to make sure that the Charter conforms to the bi-law is sufficient and public comment is not needed. But the Board itself that it should be put out for public comment. (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so all changes are required to go through public comment period -- either it's our stakeholder group or someone else's. We've seen it before when the (NPOC) wanted to come into the NCSG -- their Charter was out for public comment. And so - I understand the point of it should be left internally.

We're only talking about a public comment period where those that may not have been part of the decision making in changing the Charter could offer their comments.

I don't see anything wrong with that. In fact, I think, you know, if any other group were to make changes we might want to have our thoughts in there as well. So, I mean, I don't see anything wrong with having the public comment period except for it delays things a little bit. But, yes.

Jon: If I could reply -- I'm not challenging the public comment process -- I think that's fine. It's public comment to the organization itself that's looking at making changes. If they're clarifying changes that don't violate ICANN's bi-laws -- I'm not sure why the Board of ICANN in the top-down fashion would be looking at this at all.

So the question is -- is the public comments to the Board to say, oh, we have problems with that and it violates bi-laws -- sure, we could - maybe that is appropriate.

But I'm hoping the Board doesn't take a precedent of saying bottom, you know, bottom-up organizations that want to change their Charter in a way that doesn't violate ICANN's bi-laws -- they should not be touching that at all.

Man: Thanks David and (Jon) thanks for raising this question. I think what we're seeing - well let me just first state that I also don't think there's really a problem or an issues with having it out for a public comment. I think that's reasonable, it's transparent. So, you know, it provides the community an opportunity to provide input and their thoughts. And I support that.

The question I think that we're talking about is -- does the Board, you know, should the Board be approving modifications or amendments to our Charter? And I believe -- maybe a little bit of speculation -- but I believe there are several Board members who think that in this particular case -- and maybe even more generally -- that the answer is yes, that they should be in that position.

Obviously I don't agree with that. And going back to the bottoms-up sort of model and, you know, basically that we should -- as a stakeholder group -- should be able to sort of establish our own rules of operation.

I think in this particular case what we're looking at is a change to our bi-laws or our Charter that is impacting potentially the structure of the community and the structure in it potentially impacting other stakeholder groups.

And I'll use a specific example, in Prague we heard concerns raised by other constituencies and stakeholder groups that the Registry Stakeholder Group was doing a land grab with regard to the (NTAG) -- the formation of the (NTAG). And that we were trying to basically build our numbers and capture all of the new applicants -- where some of those applicants may also have interests in the business constituency or the ISPs or the registrars or others.

So in the bigger context of the conversation that's been going on now for months about the impact of new gTLDs on the ICANN structure of the GNSO

-- I think that this particular topic -- because of the formation of the (NTAG) has raised to the level of visibility and concern at the Board because others have been going to the Board and saying, "You shouldn't just be letting the registries capture everybody."

And, you know, whether there's sound reasoning behind that or not -- I think that's the argument that's being made. So that's just a little bit of context in terms of my perspective on this.

Michael Palage: So Mike Palage -- DotCoop. But let me speak more in the capacity of when I served in the ICANN Board to perhaps give a little bit of background here. If you go back and you look at the ICANN bi-laws when ICANN went from ICANN 1.0 to 2.0 and this was when the DNSO became the GNSO -- there was a requirement the ICANN Board approve the Charter.

There was also a similar requirement that was talked about approving the Charter when the GNSO underwent its second iteration in 2008. So this is - there is some precedent. This is not something that they are just doing for the first time. So you can go back and point to it in the bi-laws.

I would agree that as a constituency or a stakeholder group we want to make sure that ICANN is applying this unilaterally across other stakeholder groups. I don't think we need to be distinguished. If this is going to be a standard I think they need to apply it equally across other stakeholder groups.

And just to sort of add to the point, you know, ICANN does find itself right now in the situation where anti-trust concerns have been raised and a court has recognized that it's an economic actor. And when you look at the fact that there are going to be 1400 new contracting parties coming in -- the sensitivities there -- I would - I guess I'm a little less critical for the ICANN Board taking that discretion.

Again that's just my own personal viewpoint as a former Board member. But again, I just want to share that background context for why they may be doing it.

David Maher: Thanks Mike. This, as I said, this will be an action item. And we now have about three minutes before we adjourn. There are three more items on this list.

The drawing issue that has just been announced -- there's been significant discussion here. Unless anyone wants to speak to that it would seem to me that this is another action item there's enough time so that as things develop at this meeting if we see a need to file comments we can take that up after the meeting. No objection to that?

The next item on the list is consolidating meetings strategy - ICANN consolidated meetings. Any comments or questions?

Then the next one is the application for a new GNSO constituency -- Public Internet Access Cyber Café Ecosystem. I wish them well. I don't really see a need for the stakeholder group to take action. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I agree with you. It's an interesting read. I think it's mostly for India but that's a good question to ask them. But that's not why I got up here.

Can I do my agenda item now -- my secret agenda item? Okay? All right. For - I don't even know how many years it's been but David has been our Chair for many years and has committed a tremendous amount of time -- not just chairing but he has also taken the lead -- and this I want to continue David on drafting a lot of initial documents that - and then we're able to comment on and develop into Registry Stakeholder Agreements.

Now I picked this time rather than the end of the day -- because at the end of the day we're probably going to be about half this many people -- and I think it's important to do this when most of us are here.

I (unintelligible) and I think everyone else too -- is I am sincerely appreciative David to all you've committed to the leadership to this group, to contributions in terms of our statements, to representing us in the community with the Board and so forth.

And so I think it's very important that we sincerely applaud what he's done for us.

David Maher: Aw shucks. (Unintelligible). Well thank you very much. It's been a great pleasure to act as Chair and I really appreciate the comments and the confidence that has been shown over the years.

And I'm not going away. I'll be here. And I'm ready to keep working for the welfare of the Stakeholder Group. So thank you again and we will adjourn for lunch. See you at the - the Board Meeting is Metro East -- adjacent to our room -- 1 o'clock.

So get there a little early to make sure we're all ready to go at 1:00.

Man: Is there no host?

David Maher: Yes, you're on your own for lunch.

END