MONTREAL – GNSO - BC Open session
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 15:15 to 18:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, everybody, and welcome to the BC open meeting. The record can start. It's started? Okay. I'm Claudia Selli with AT&T. I proposed that we do an [inaudible] and then we start with our guest that is already here, Cyrus Namazi from GDD. Let me start with [inaudible] and then we go into our conversation. Barbara?
BARBARA WANNER:	Barbara Wanner, US Council for International Business.
PAUL MITCHELL:	Paul Mitchell, Microsoft.
TIM SMITH:	Tim Smith, Canadian International Pharmacy Association.
SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:	Susan Kawaguchi, CNA Consulting.
MASON COLE:	Mason Cole, Perkins Coie.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

MARK DATYSGELD: Mark Datysgeld, Governance Primer.

CHRIS WILSON: Chris Wilson, Amazon.

ANDY ABRAMS: Andy Abrams, Google.

JOHN BERARD: John Berard, Credible Context.

SCOTT MCCORMICK: Scott McCormick, Reciprocity.

MARIE PATTULLO: Marie Pattullo, AIM, European Brands Association.

JAY SUDOWSKI: Jay Sudowski, Handy Networks.

[ROGER]:   Roger [inaudible] Consult.

[DAVID SNADE]: David [Snade], WebPros Group.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Jimson Olufuye, Contemporary Consulting.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Cyrus Namazi, ICANN Org.

KAREN LENTZ: Karen Lentz, ICANN Org.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve DelBianco, Net Choice.

CLAUDIA SELLI: And thank you very much to Cyrus and Karen for being here with us today. I would pass the floor to you if you want to kick off with some introductory remark and then we can open up the floor for questions from members to have an exchange.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you very much, Claudia and BC, for your invitation. If you recall, earlier this year, before Marrakech, we embarked on the preliminary planning for how to actually go about a future round of new gTLDs. The policy development work for subsequent procedures round is in the final stages of completion at the moment. Their timeline is suggesting

the early part of next calendar year for their policy recommendation to be completed and be submitted to the GNSO for consideration.

Considering the complexity of this program, having gone through it once back in the 2012 round, on the Org side we've begun essentially putting together some basic assumptions focused on the operationalization of such a policy.

the primary reason that we're doing this exercise is because considering how long we think it would take to actually plan, implement and operate a program for taking in new applications and ultimately processing them and then signing contracts, delegating them into the roots, we had to begin making assumptions based on the information that we have. And we shared these assumptions with the various parts of the ICANN community, leading up to the Marrakech meeting and in fact afterwards in telephonic conferences or webinars.

So, based on the good feedback that we have received from the community, we've updated these assumptions. So, with your permission, we wanted to actually walk you through what we've learned based on the conversations we've had with the community and then what we plan to do going forward from here.

My colleague, Karen, has a few slides that actually sort of capture these updates for you which I'll now hand it over to her to walk us through it.

KAREN LENTZ: Okay. Thank you, Cyrus. Can we go to the next slide? So, the key piece of this agenda is obviously to tell you what we heard in terms of

feedback on the assumptions document and I'll try to go through that briefly, so that there is enough time for questions and discussion among us. So, next slide, please.

So, as Cyrus noted, the background to us developing these assumptions had to do with looking ahead to the operational pieces of once the policy work is completed, putting in place or figuring out what we needed to put in place to be able to handle another set of applications. And I'll emphasize that this operational planning piece is distinct from the policy development process. So, the implementation work will be driven by the outcomes of the PDP that's happening right now. Next slide.

So, there were eight categories in our assumptions doc. They were on timeline, application and planning, policy implementation readiness systems, operational processes, people, and costs. The ones that are in the darker color there are the ones where we received feedback. Next slide.

This is recapping when we first developed this document was back in May. We shared it around the ICANN 65 timeframe, had some discussions at the previous ICANN meeting and continued to receive input from many of these groups in the following months, including the BC. So, thank you for providing that. And here at this meeting, we're sharing with the Board and others who are interested what the feedback is that we've received. So, next slide. Okay, next slide.

So, I'll go through these in the order of the assumptions in terms of what we heard. So, the first one was around completion of processes. The

assumption was that policy implementation, readiness, and operational processes would be completed prior to the opening of the next round. There was some feedback on this one seeking more definition around what the proposed timeline is, what the prerequisites are. Some concern, I think, that some – [inaudible] anyway – to suggest that ICANN Org was in full implementation mode for a subsequent round while the policy process was going on.

But what this assumption was meant to suggest is that the expectation is that all of these readiness activities and operational processes, as well as the policy implementation, will be completed in advance of having an open next round.

In terms of the timeline and prerequisites, because this came up in a few places, the Board has not set a timeline or a set of prerequisites at this point. It's waiting for the policy development to be complete but I think is very aware that there is interest in upcoming discussions around what the prerequisites need to be. Next slide.

So, this one was on application volume and the assumption we had in there was that the volume in the next round would be roughly the same as we got in the 2000 round. So, approximately 2000 applications. There was quite a bit of feedback on this one, mainly because it was seen less as a planning assumption and more as an estimate. So, it was not intended as a statement that ICANN Org believes that we'll get 2000 applications, but rather we need to have a basis to start looking at systems and resources and what types of requirements we're going to have, so the 2000 number is what we were using for that. But there were

a lot of questions about what was the rationale or is there data to support that number, suggestions around using a more definition or more ranges or volume tranches in terms of how we might plan for different volumes rather than just using a single number and also suggesting that we undertake market research or outreach to try to get more insight into the application planning.

We haven't proposed any at this point for a few reasons. One, it's a very ambiguous group to try to identify who we need to do outreach to in terms of potential applications but that's something that has been expressed as a potential suggestion to help go into these assumptions. Next slide.

So, this one as on prioritization and the feedback here was just to reiterate that it will be up to the PDP to provide a recommendation on prioritization, how it will be done. The assumption was that we assume that some sort of prioritization or sequencing will be required to process the applications that we do receive in a future round. Next.

So, this one we also got a lot of comment on. This is on the delegation rate. So in the 2012 round, there was a maximum established saying that we wouldn't delegate more than 1000 new gTLDs in a year and we received quite a bit of feedback on this along the lines of noting that this wasn't necessarily a requirement in terms of the security of the root zone. I had kind of an administrative rationale behind it at the time but we got feedback suggesting that a numerical limit is not really the right approach in terms of how we think about the root zone and it growing. Rather, suggestions that we should focus on the rate of change, have

more study on just around the rate of change and also some recommendations to make sure that we can postpone a delegation if there is some sort of instability happening and that we develop monitoring an early warning capability.

This one I think we have noted this feedback and this is an assumption that we expect to update. We don't have a replacement update – or sorry, a replacement assumption – for it at this point because this is the subject of work that is going on in the PDP and elsewhere. So, we expect to have a replacement assumption for that one. Next slide.

So, this one is on ongoing procedures. This one I think we will clarify. The assumption read that there would be an annual application window of one to three months with subsequent windows happening during the same timeframe, once every year. So, we got questions about that one as there haven't been any conclusion from the PDP Working Group about what the ongoing nature of the rounds or windows or other procedures would be and other suggestions that are not necessarily agreeing with the assumption that every window would be the same. So, instead of an open general window, having predefined categories or specialized windows for certain instances.

So, what we really intended to convey in that assumption is that in terms of designing infrastructure within the organization to support the application process. It's not something that we're designing for one round only but rather we want to put in place something that is repeatable and that can be used going forward. So, I think that's one that we'll clarify. Next slide.

This one was on policy implementation and the assumption was that based on what we know from the work of the subsequent procedures PDP thus far, there will likely be changes through the program implementation. So, there will be new things and new requirements that we need to implement.

The couple of questions or feedback that we got on this one was questions around how we would work with an IRT to implement these policy recommendations given that this type of policy is a little bit different than what we typically do with implementing a new consensus policy that results in new requirements on registries and registrars.

I think we are considering what the best way to organize that work is but it will certainly be the case that there will be stakeholder IRT working with us on that.

There was also a suggestion here from this group to include an assumption on DNS abuse and that that would be addressed by the SubPro Working Group in the advance of any future round and that was I think noted not just for this assumption but for a few others as well.

In terms of DNS abuse, I think that it's obviously a broad issue being discussed this week not only in SubPro but in other contexts as well. So, this set of assumptions is primarily operationally focused. It by no means covers every assumption that relates to a future round of the program or what the work is leading up to the program. So, I think it's an issue that's being identified as a priority not necessarily in the venue of these planning assumptions. Next slide

This one is one that I think is also a clarification. The assumption was that we would outsource critical application functions such as evaluation and objection processing to expert firms with the required subject matter expertise.

There were questions about this in relation to another assumption which was in the systems section noting that internal knowledge and expertise would be prioritized and as little as possible to be outsourced. So, questions about how those things went together – and I think that' something to clarify as well is that from the systems perspective, we wanted to keep much of the knowledge and development of the system that we will need to maintain for several years in house, whereas this assumption on outsourcing has to do with application, evaluation, and things where subject matter expertise is needed. For example, a legal rights objection. Who's qualified to do that? Who's qualified to look at IDN applications and IDN tables and various things? So, this assumption is focused on those pieces where subject matter expertise is needed. Next slide.

This one on cost. Our assumption was that tracking of program readiness, cost should begin as rapidly as possible in order to capture development costs prior to launch of the next round. And that comprehensive cost planning for readiness and operations is critical to accurate reporting and management of cost. So, nobody particularly disagreed with this assumption but there were questions about how that tracking is expected to occur and when. Next slide.

EN

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How many more slides do you have?

KAREN LENTZ: This is the last one. So, this is the feedback received that's not about any particular assumption but was general feedback that we received. In general, people were supportive of the transparency and appreciated our sharing the planning assumptions. There were a few points in there from this group around DNS abuse issues, around suggestions on how to increase universal acceptance as part of considering the future of the program and also suggestions including completing previously committed reviews of the prior round and approval of recommendations from those reviews.

Also, a few notes from the Registry Stakeholder Group that perhaps we might consider including the degree of certainty in each of those assumptions and a plan for what we would do in case any of those assumptions were not born out and urging us to continue the planning process.

The last piece was from SSAC also expressed concern that the previous round seems to have introduced some TLDs with high rates of abuse and concern that we would proceed with a future round prior to some work being done over on the metrics and mitigations in that area.

So, that covers all of the feedback received and I will turn it back to Claudia for any questions.

CLAUDIA SELLI:	Thank you very much, Karen. I will open the queue and Steve is the first one to start for the questions.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Karen and Cyrus. Only about ten minutes for Q&A. thank you for acknowledging the BC. The volunteer fatigue is only partly overcome by people realizing people read what they've written and we had great participation. Jimson and Marie worked on this. Mark Datysgeld. And I appreciate that you called out the BC's focus on DNS abuse, on global south participation which was low last time, universal acceptance and then a contention set. So, I have two follow-ups.

On contention sets, we would be missing the mark if all we did was hire experts. We have to give those experts guidance and we did a terrible job in the last round on guidance. Simple example, singulars versus plurals. We had experts who were equally qualified who came back with opposite conclusions. Remember that, Andy? We went through this. Opposite conclusions about whether adding an S or plural form was a contention. We've got to fix that with procedures. And if that requires policy making, then you need to get it into our queue for policy making. I don't think it's there right now.

Then I wanted to bring to mind the DNS abuse. We learned in the session that you were in the main room just now that one of the main tools to combat abuse is the registry agreement because it includes specification 11, a public interest commitment. We pretty much learned that that is useless, that ICANN can't do anything with the PIC spec against the registrars who simply put a notice up that don't enforce

anything. That is a fair characterization of what we learned in that discussion today and that is a terrible surprise to all of us. And that would indicate that moving ahead with just the base RA in its current form is not sufficient to address DNS abuse because we have learned that the tool we have in there against DNS abuse is useless.

So, I would ask you about how do we solve these two deficits in the current planning horizon?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you very much, Steve. I'll address your second question and I'll turn it over to Karen on the first one in terms of procedures. In particular, I think you pointed out singular versus plural and all that.

The subject of what I call DNS infrastructure abuse, just to be I think a bit more accurate, as you pointed out was a topic of discussion when you had your session with the Board just prior to this session.

And I'm really happy to see, frankly, that the entire community seems to be, for lack of a better term, abuzz on discussions on how to deal with it. So, it's not really related to a subsequent round or a future round. I think it's sort of a core issue for our industry, for our community, to address and the conversations, at least from the looks of it, at this stage are now beginning to go into the right gear and the right formation for all the various parts of the community to come together and come up with a definition of it, come up with a resolution to it, come up with a way to actually measure progress against a particular plan.

And whatever that becomes, hopefully then, in some shape or form, becomes reflected as an obligation based on [inaudible] the organization can have the right tools to track it for compliance and take action whenever necessary.

On policies and procedures, hopefully we've learned what are called the release 1.0 which is happened in 2012. We've learned a great deal. Have there been areas that could have better? Yes. We actually published – Karen, correct me if I'm wrong – about two years ago a complete review of the 2012 round which really is a very comprehensive program. In fact, it addresses specifically what Steve pointed out, and if you haven't seen it, it's a very comprehensive long document. But my intent in bringing that up is to tell you that we've actually done an in-depth look, and in fact part of the reason that I'm adamant for us to start this thinking, this process, the assumptions and all of that is to get a head start so that we can have the right resources at the right time, identifying the right issues and then addressing them. Did you want to add anything, Karen?

KAREN LENTZ: I'll add to address your comment, Steve, on contention sets. From what I've seen in the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, they are actually specifically looking at the questions of singular and plural and attempting to provide guidance on that as well as looking at the contention resolution procedures that were in place.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	And it will be explicit this time. Our experts will not be confused.
KAREN LENTZ:	I think it's a really tough area, obviously, that the group is working through but I think likely some of the BC members are part of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, so I would continue to press for solutions there.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	I do think, though, that you have misunderstood my point about DNS abuse. You're right. We're abuzz about it and we're also disappointed to learn that we don't have the tools in the current contract to stop it. Yet to be confirmed by ICANN Legal but I think that's probably only hours away, that the public interest spec is of no benefit. ICANN cannot use it to enforce.
	If that's the case, despite all the work we did about it and the expectations we had, then we have a missing link between now and the next round. We will either spend a few years on a PDP on DNS abuse or a few years modifying the base registry and registrar agreements to address it in a way that is enforceable. This will set the timeframe way back if we don't find a way to do something about that.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	Other questions? No? Okay. Well, thank you very much, Cyrus and Karen. Thank you for coming here.

CRYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you very much for the opportunity, Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: So, we have with us Professor Jan Scholte from the University of Gothenburg. Welcome. The idea is to present your ICANN legitimacy study and we're happy also for members to ask questions or make some comments. I will leave the floor to you for some initial remarks.

JAN SCHOLTE: Okay. Good. Thanks very much, Claudia. Thank you, and Steve, and everyone else for having us here. Even more, thank you for contributing to this study. It was anonymous and confidential so we can't look at you and name you by name but we can say thanks very much and you know who you are.

So, I'm Jan Scholte. [inaudible] and I at the University of Gothenberg in Sweden have been conducting this study on legitimacy at ICANN. So, if we can skip to the next slide please.

Just a reminder, it's an academic and independent study. It's funded by the Swedish Research Council. It's not commissioned by anyone. We're academically curious. And if you can do something with what we did, then we're happy.

STEVE DELBIANCO: You're selling yourself short. The first slide contains something you're all going to need to pay attention to. This presentation was developed

for the BC. This is going to have special data about the BC, not just the same presentation Jan has given to every other group.

JAN SCHOLTE: There's a bit of that. But it's going to be high adrenaline because we don't have much time. We've got a lot of things we'd like to say. So, we're going to tell you about how ICANN's legitimacy looks from outside ICANN and how it looks inside ICANN and then variations within ICANN between stakeholder groups, social class groups, and regional variations. We're going to say a few things at the end, then, indeed about your own constituency.

Headline message just quickly for you to take with you. Legitimacy for ICANN on the whole is not so high that you can be complacent and not so low that you are to be alarmed. Do with that what you like.

And there's no particular Achilles heel in the sense that there's a particular part of ICANN that's waiting to [inaudible] but there's also no particular vanguard that is ready to take the whole thing forward.

Our notion of legitimacy, just for you to … Oh, I'm supposed to emphasize these are descriptive statistics. There's no statistical significance calculated. There's no causal analysis. So, don't make too much of this.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We won't if you won't.

JAN SCHOLTE:	Good. So, legitimacy. For us, a lot of you asked us in the questionnaires: what do you mean by legitimacy? We said we're not telling you but now we will tell you. Our understanding of legitimacy is that the belief that a governor has the right to rule and that they rule in an appropriate manner. Or in less academic language, you think ICANN has the right to make rules and that you feel you should obey them. Next slide

Legitimacy is important. Thankfully, you think so, too. We asked you in the survey: do you think legitimacy is important? And you can see 80% of you said extremely important. Most of the remaining 20% said quite important and there's a bit of a rump that isn't convinced.

Legitimacy important because you told it secures ICANN's mandate, it gets people to participate, it brings ICANN resources, it allows ICANN to take decisions and get compliance, and it allows ICANN to hold its own in the competition with other institutions.

So, legitimacy, important. So, when we try to figure out how much legitimacy ICANN has, it has consequences. If you let us go to the next slide.

Just to remind you where the answers are coming from. Everyone in the ICANN Board between 2015 and 2018 talked with us. So, that's great. You know who they are. ICANN community, 305 people. ICANN staff, 132. Wonderful response rate there.

Just to say, you'll look at this and say ICANN staff will have too much voice in all of this. We've weighted the figures. So, when you get these

later figures, community voices will be four times as strong as staff voices because that reflects the proportion of participation in ICANN.

We're also going to tell you about outsiders. So, we talked to some people who are involved in Internet governance but not in ICANN and we talked with 860 elites in Russia, Germany, Brazil, South Africa, Philippines, USA and we'll tell you what they thought. We didn't do a public opinion survey because I don't know if you've walked up and down the streets and asked people about ICANN, but we thought it's not worth spending tens of thousands of dollars to find out that nobody knows about it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Did the outsiders do the same survey that us insiders did?

JAN SCHOLTE: They did not do the full survey. They answered the questions about confidence in ICANN.

STEVE DELBIANCO: What do you mean by elites?

JAN SCHOLTE: Elites, people in leading positions in organizations that seek to be politically influential. So, that means politicians, it means government officials, it means certain academics, it means civil society, activists, it means business executives and it means media. I could get into the

details but it would take too long. There's a technical report 25 pages online if you want to see what we asked and what we did.

So, if we go to the next slide, this will show you where ICANN comes out. You need to go one back. There you go. So, this is confidence in global governance institutions, ICANN amongst 14 different global governance institutions. Now you can read this both positively or pessimistically, depending on your inclinations.

So, the red line is ICANN. In a range of 14 global governance institutions, ICANN is coming in fifth. It's just .1 less than the UN. And it's coming out ahead of the World Trade Organization, the IMF, and various other bodies. So, that's a pretty positive read.

You might also want to have a positive read that says of the multi-stakeholder arrangements in here – so, that includes the [four stewardship] council and the [Kimberly process], it's coming out highest. And if you want to be really optimistic, you look at FIFA on the far left.

The other thing that you might want to do if you want to be positive, look at the green line and that is elites' average confidence in their own nation states, in their own national government. So, ICANN is doing better than their assessment of the nation states.

Okay. That's the cup half full. If you want be half empty, then you'll say behind that red line, 49.7% of world elites didn't know of ICANN. So, this red line is telling you about the half that have heard of ICANN. But you

got a bit of a legitimacy problem in the sense that you've got half of world elites after 20 years that don't know that ICANN is here.

[STEVE DELBIANCO]: Were you able to track the extent to which what people said they knew was correct? We've done work on this and found that a lot of what people know is completely false.

JAN SCHOLTE: Well, we did knowledge tests on the outsiders in the Internet governance. We asked them three questions about ICANN, so we could tell you – it's not in this but we did ask them about knowledge. Yeah.

Anyway, some of this is half full, half empty. The thing to say is once you get beyond Internet governance, the legitimacy base of ICANN is pretty narrow. Too many people just don't know about it and maybe that's just the way it is.

STEVE DELBIANCO: [The awareness space].

JAN SCHOLTE: Yeah. Okay, if we could look at the next one, then it's going to put ICANN in the midst of other Internet governance organizations. Then you see this is roughly ranked. You've got ICANN in the middle. You've got the RIRs and the IETF coming out with higher average confidence scores, higher legitimacy. And you've got the IGF, the national governments on

Internet policy and the ITU coming out lower. So, you want to do a broad brush of all of this, then you could say the more states there is, the lower the confidence or the more non-states you've got, the higher the confidence. That's a real rough brush assessment but that's kind of what you can see here.

Let me hand over to [inaudible]. She'll take you through some of the ICANN-specific figures.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Great. Thank you. Can we show the next slide, please? So, here we show the distribution of responses to the question how much confidence do you have in the current workings of ICANN overall? So, you can see the light blue bar that indicates the total of all the insiders. So, the Board, staff, and the community combined. Then we show the Board in orange. Gray, staff. Yellow is the community. And dark blue is the [inaudible] outsiders.

So, a positive interpretation when it comes to all of the insiders combined is that more than half of them indicate you have high or very high confidence in ICANN overall.

However, looking at more from the glass is half empty perspective, we can also see that when we look at the ICANN community specifically, about half of them indicate to have moderate or even less confidence in ICANN overall. And this share is even larger when it comes to informed outsiders.

So, what we did next is that we converted these responses to this question into numerical scores. So, respondents who indicated that they have very low confidence in ICANN overall, we gave them a score of 1. And respondents who indicated that they have very high confidence in ICANN overall, they got a score of 5. And based on that, we could calculate the mean, so the averages. Next slide, please.

So, on a one to five scale. Here we can see that the ICANN staff indicates that they have the highest confidence in ICANN overall. So, they report an average of 4.11. So, between high and very high, though leaning more towards high confidence. Then, comes the ICANN Board at an average of 4, so high confidence in ICANN overall. The ICANN community, which falls between moderate and high confidence. Again, the total of the insiders. Then we show the general elites that Jon Aarte was talking about earlier. They come closer towards the midpoint. And finally the informed outsiders who report an average of 3.18, so closer towards moderate confidence in ICANN.

So, this suggests that the closer you are at the heart of the ICANN regime, the more confidence you have in it. Next slide, please.

So, here we show a breakdown of confidence in ICANN overall for different stakeholder groups. So, we asked questions about confidence in ICANN overall, confidence in ICANN Board, in the multi-stakeholder community and in ICANN staff and we find rather little variation across stakeholder groups with a few exceptions.

So, when it comes to confidence in ICANN overall, we can see that academia, they have their highest confidence in ICANN, although this is

based on a relatively small number of responses. And they are followed by the government stakeholder group at an average of 3.58.

Then when it comes to confidence in the multi-stakeholder community we can see that the business other stakeholder group reported the lowest confidence in the multi-stakeholder community. And finally we can see that the government stakeholder groups report the highest confidence in ICANN staff, not only when you compare it to the other stakeholder groups but also when you compare the confidence in staff to the confidence in multi-stakeholder community and the ICANN Board. Next slide, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: To distinguish there, the business DNI are the businesses that are in the domain name industry, the contracting parties.

JAN SCHOLTE: Registries and registrars.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And business other is us in this room.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, there is a bit of a break there in terms of our confidence versus the contract parties confidence.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Correct. Yes. Exactly. So, here we show a breakdown of confidence in ICANN for different regions. So, first we again showed an average of 3.54 and then we can see that respondents from Russia and Central Asia, they report the lowest confidence in ICANN overall at an average of 3.05. So, that comes close to moderate confidence. Then respondents from east, south, and southeast Asia report the highest confidence in ICANN overall, so an average of 3.83.

So, there's quite a large difference between the confidence amongst respondents, participants in ICANN from Asia and respondents from Russia and central Asia, although I should say we interviewed only a relatively small number of people from Russia and central Asia.

What is interesting about these results is that we cannot really speak of a global north/south divide because, if anything, respondents from Latin America and Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia report higher confidence or slightly higher confidence than ICANN than respondents from Europe and North America. Next slide.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, only among insiders or among everyone?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This is only insiders. The Board, staff, and the community.

JAN SCHOLTE: That's an important point because if we break down those general elite figures by country, then the figures for Philippines, South Africa, and so on are dead low, really low. So, the elites that are involved in ICANN are high but [inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: We work very hard to recruit and retain global south members in the business community and this would indicate that the extent that you surveyed them, they have more confidence in ICANN than North Americans.

JAN SCHOLTE: Yeah. If you get them to come in and they stay, then it's high. But if the people are outside, then it's dead low.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But their ability to communicate what they are learning here to a broader audience seems still very low.

JAN SCHOLTE: That would be a question. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, then we again looked at different social groups. Again, we cannot make any claims about calls or relationships. These are only just

descriptive patterns, so to say. I can also not point to statistically significant differences. But we hardly found any variation between men and women in terms of their confidence in ICANN. We also found little variation across age groups. We saw little variation between when it comes to English language skills although native English speakers give slightly less, they report slightly less confidence in ICANN than persons with medium to no English skills. And interestingly, people with non-native strong English skills, they report the highest confidence in ICANN. Again, I cannot say whether there is any causal relationship between the two.

Finally, we find that respondents who self-identify as white report lowest confidence and Hispanics report the highest confidence in ICANN. Next slide, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, white male English speakers who are sometimes accused of being overly controlling—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Careful here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: With respect to ICANN, not life in general. Those groups have the lowest confidence in the institution that they're accused of overly controlling compared to the non-native speaking English, compared to women versus men, global south versus north. Interesting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe they want more control.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I don't know. Wait a minute. They want more effectiveness, I guess.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, we found little variation, I should say. Actually, men have slightly higher confidence in ICANN than women.

So, now we look at the data specifically for the business other constituencies and we asked a question in principle. So, regardless of whether ICANN achieves the matter in practice, how important do you find that ICANN achieves 15 specifically aims?

So, this is basically about what ICANN should be doing or respondents think ICANN should be doing. So, the four most important aims are, first of all, to promote technical stability, followed by promoting technical security, to important policies in an unbiased way and to take decision based on the best available expertise. And the mean averages reported here are more or less the same as for the other stakeholder groups.

Then the four aims that [inaudible] considered the least important business other constituencies are to promote the fair distribution of cost and benefits of the DNI, to promote human rights in ICANN operations, to promote human rights in the DNS, and to promote democratic values in wider society.

These aims were also in other stakeholders often reported to be the least important for ICANN but to business other constituencies, they report even lower scores for these aims.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Who's represented in the slide?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The business other constituency. So, intellectual property, business constituencies, and Internet service provider.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The first two items on technical stability and technical security, those are the anchoring terms that we use for things like prohibiting DNS abuse. There wasn't a special line for DNS abuse and yet numbers one and two [of] where they live. So, our community rated it the very highest o all and significantly higher than everyone else.

JAN SCHOLTE: Yeah. And what you would say, the maximum score is five, so when the average is 4.95, basically you're saying this is has got to be done.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Only within. This is only the insiders.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not the contract lawyers.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. I understand. I was wondering whether you're talking about the business community in South Africa or the business community in some of the other [inaudible].

JAN SCHOLTE: We could actually do that breakdown but this is generic.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And then numbers 12, 13, 14, and 15 where we rated significantly lower than everyone else, those actually are items that are far outside of ICANN's limited mission.

JAN SCHOLTE: In your perception.

STEVE DELBIANCO: In the black-and-white words in the bylaws, actually.

JAN SCHOLTE: In the perceptions of the people as they answer this question. But you can see that if you're coming in at 3.47 on number 12 and the overall average is 3.78, it means that some other people are way up in the fours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, for example, civil society constituencies, they generally rank these aims higher and the roles are ranked higher amongst government stakeholder group.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Did any other group score as high as a 4.95 on any single item? I'm just wondering about that single-minded focus we have.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. There was a group who reported a score of 4.98 on one of these items. I cannot say on top of my head but I can give you the data afterwards. Next slide, please.

So, here we show how far ICANN is perceived to achieve these 15 aims in practice. So, we presented the same list of 15 aims and we asked to what extent ICANN is perceived to achieve these aims on a scale of one to five. Again, it's just business other constituencies.

And then we can see that the four aims that ICANN has perceived to do best is to promote technical stability, promote technical security, to give all stakeholders the opportunity to participate in policy making and to take decisions based on the best available expertise.

Then the four aims that ICANN is perceived to do least well is to promote human rights in the DNS, to promote democracy in the DNS, to promote democratic values in wider society, and to take decisions in a timely manner.

Now, to what extent is this problematic? So, as you can see on the previous page, several of these aims that are now listed amongst 12, 13, 14, and 15 were also considered to be less important for ICANN as far as the business other constituencies are concerned. So, as I mentioned earlier, other stakeholder groups might find these aims more important.

so, this need not be necessarily problematic. However, when it comes to taking decisions in a timely manner, the business other constituency actually reported the lowest score when it comes to the extent to which academic achieves this in practice. So, a score of 230 means between a limited and a moderate extent, leaning even more towards a limited extent.

However, when it comes to how important this is perceived to be for ICANN, the business other constituency reports a score of 4.64 on a one to five scale. So, this falls between quite important and extremely important.

So, we can see a big gap here between what is perceived to be important for ICANN and what ICANN has perceived to achieve in reality, in practice.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, just to clarify. Insiders, other than ourselves, ate the business community.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No. This is an assessment of the business other constituencies of ICANN.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Of ICANN.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly. Yeah. The extent to which ICANN achieves this in practice. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Reading this, number 14, everybody in this room agrees with this that but I don't think anyone in this room thinks its anything to do with ICANN.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The promotion of democratic values in wider society, in my life, yes, absolutely. But is that the job of ICANN? No. That's the job of other people.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, indeed, this is exactly what the data tells us about your constituency because when it comes to the question "do you think it is important for ICANN?" the bs other constituency also gave it the lowest rating and also say it's less important.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We think it's important but we can't solve world hunger in ICANN, either. And there's a certain mission that we do have to be conscious of here

JAN SCHOLTE: But the interesting thing is that not all people in the ICANN sphere think like that. So, when we look at other constituencies they don't give the same kind of scores. We don't comment on who's right or wrong. We're just telling you how people think differently.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I just wanted to give an explanation that we're not anti-democratic. We're just pro-mandate. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, but it's true. We asked specifically, "Do you think it is important for ICANN to do this?" And some constituencies would say yes and some would say, no, not for ICANN. Can I see the final slide, please? Thank you.

So, to reiterate what I mentioned earlier, in this presentation, we've only covered descriptives. So, we showed the levels and the patterns of legitimacy toward ICANN but only during the next steps we can look into causal relationships and explanations for these patterns. And ultimately, only when we have done these explanatory analyses, we could start thinking about what kind of reforms could potentially raise legitimacy beliefs even further or even higher.

And if you're interesting in this, we would be happy to report on these issues at ICANN 67 in Cancun. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Does that mean you do intend to take those extra steps? Okay. So, you've done the research or you will do it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We will. We continue.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, beautiful, and would report back. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I have Andy and then Mark in the queue.

ANDY ABRAMS: Thanks very much. So, this is kind of a snapshot in time from the way I understand it, which is useful. Two questions from me. Number one is, obviously, there are a lot of people who were not part of our survey group and trying to survey the world is [inaudible] impossible but trying to get closer to it is probably useful especially with the business community which is sometimes hard to reach because this is – feels a bit out of people's ambit a lot of the time.

So, I'm wondering are there plans to try to reach more business audiences outside of this insider group that already knows and is more or less bought in? That was question number one.

Question number two is about risks. I think it's extremely important for us not just to understand yes or no "does ICANN have a lot of likes?" but rather what do people perceive as potential threats? I think of the number of public institutions that have effectively fallen off a cliff in terms of their reputation of the last few years. If we're making a long-term investment in Internet governance and this multi-stakeholder process as the bedrock of it, then identifying the oncoming trains is probably a very, very useful way of approaching it and I'd be interested in knowing what the research shows. And if you're not capturing that, please do. Thanks.

JAN SCHOLTE: We're trying to reach more businesspeople outside, eyes. We're trying to beef up some of that data on ICANN outsiders who are aware of Internet governance but not, and we're trying to reach more businesspeople there. So, yes.

It's not about likes, legitimacy. Legitimacy is about underlying confidence. That's why we talk about confidence, trust, underlying approval. It's not about liking particular policies. It's not about liking particular leaders. It's about buying into an institution.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	I meant likes more in the Internet sense. The whole point was is that confidence is something that exists in a moment in time. Isn't that what you're kind of capturing at this point?
JAN SCHOLTE:	We are but the supposition is that underlying reservoirs of confidence do not get lost with one scandal. They should have longer duration. But you're quite right.
	In terms of the oncoming trains, we had people give us a lot of qualitative verbalized answers as well as ticking boxes and we've got 529 transcripts which go for hundreds and hundreds of pages. We can look through those to try and see what people might see as possible trains. Yeah.
CLAUDIA SELLI:	We have the last question from Mark.
MARK DATYSGELD:	Thank you both greatly for your presentation. I'm Mark Datysgeld. I am a consultant to businesses but I do come from an academic background so I do have some methodological questions that I would like to present to you. I'm not against self-reporting as a mechanism. However, I do have some questions in relation to that.
	For example, the survey, the interviews, were conducted pretty much on the ground as far as I understand. You came to Internet governance

conventions and surveyed the people in person. And that brings to me the question of environment.

I'll give an example. Say it's a Brazilian person traveling to the Kobe meeting. They're 26 hours in a flight. They're jet-lagged. Their biological clock is reversed. When they're giving out the answer to you, clearly that will have a negative impact on the answers.

In an ICANN environment, in an Internet governance environment, we are often pressed for time. We haven't slept well. Often jet-lagged. So, [inaudible] implications directly for what kind of data is being extracted. And I don't think there's a good control method for that. So, that's my main concern with that.

My second concern would be with social desirability bias. I'm sure your very aware of it. It just means a broader audience is when, in self-reporting, you answer questions in a way that is found favorable by interviewer. And I'm not bringing this up in a vacuum because when I look at this informed outsiders confidence in ICANN overall.

9.8% replied did not know about ICANN. If we were doing this outside of this research, the correct answer would be 95%. People don't know about ICANN outside of [inaudible], let's say. So, that brings to me immediately the question of how much bias is being introduced in the research in the sense because people may want to look smart, right? Because that data … No matter how qualified the people are, it should be way harder than it is. More people should not know about ICANN than that. So, I would just bring these concerns. But at the same time,

congratulate for the effort. It's very admirable but I do have these concerns. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Great. Thank you. Thank you for these great questions. Yes, you're right. Of course there's always the impact of the environment and it's impossible to completely exclude this. But we would always do the interviews on a day and time chosen by the interviewee whenever that's a convenient moment for him or for her.

If it was not convenient to do this at an ICANN meeting because a lot of people are very pressed for time, don't have the time to do this, we offer to do the interviews via Skype. Actually, we did a large share of interviews via Skype also because not everyone is in a position to attend an ICANN meeting and that would include a lot of bias in the results.

Also, when it comes to social desirability bias – and you're absolutely right about that as well. We reduced this or tried to minimize this as much as possible but guaranteeing anonymity, confidentiality but also making it very clear that we're not commissioned by ICANN. We're an independent study. So, everything can be said.

And we have a number of questions that can be considered to be slightly more sensitive. And for this part of the interview, we switched from a so-called interviewer [inaudible] where we can see the answers that are provided to a private mode of serving where we cannot see the answers that were given. And so these answers were answered, so to

say, confidentially. So, these are common methods and survey methodology to reduce these problems that you mentioned and are correct.

JAN SCHOLTE: Also, just to say, with the informed outsiders in Internet governance, at the end of the questionnaire we gave them a couple of political knowledge questions about ICANN. So, we let them go through the whole survey and pretend to know whatever they knew, and then at the end we asked them some specific questions about ICANN, so we can control for their political knowledge.

MARK DATYSGELD: Could I suggest that you, for our knowledge and for how many services were carried out on the ground and how many were remotely carried out, I think that's a [valuable] data point, if it is within the scope of your research to eventually include on the final paper.

JAN SCHOLTE: It's 53% face to face and 47% over—

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, professor.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much and thank you for being with us today.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It was good. Thank you. I appreciate it.

CLAUDIA SELLI: I think we have our next speaker probably already here. Thank you very much, Jamie and Susanna and David for being with us today. Sorry for the delay also but we were taking in from the previous speaker an interesting discussion. So, I will leave the floor to you for some initial remarks and then we will open the floor for questions from the members if it's okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, first of all, thank you for having us and thank you for providing the questions in advance. The first two were on the open data platform. I would love to talk about the open data platform but I would make up most of the information. That's probably not going to be that helpful. So I will turn it over to Susanna for that portion of the presentation.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Hi, I'm Susanna Bennett. Thank you so much for making the time to have these questions for us and for us to share some background with you. Next slide, please.

So, I'm the Chief Operating Officer together with Victoria Yang. She's right here at the end of this table here. She's our Senior Operations Program Manager and we have been designated to program manage the open data program. Ashwin Rangan right there, he's our Senior VP

of Engineering and the CIO. He leads his team on the technical aspect of the open data program and he will explain more later. David Conrad right here, our Senior VP and Chief Technology Officer. As you know, he was in charge of the open data initiative and got that started and [a handover] to operations for implementation. Next slide, please.

So, here are the three questions that we received from you and the team here will share covering those. We also, in this room with us, we have Jennifer Scott who has been very, very supportive from the legal perspective and if you have any questions, she can support as well.

So, here are the three questions submitted. Let's go to the next slide, so we can start answering them. Victoria, please.

VICTORIA YANG: Thank you very much, Susanna. Hi, everyone. Thank you very much for having us. The first question that we received is where are we on the open data program. These slides that are you are looking at should be familiar to you. We shared these slides with the community in Kobe right after we took over from the successful pilot that David Conrad's team leads to operationalize the program within ICANN and we quickly identified here are some of the key deliverables for us to deliver before we can even launch the program which includes we have to customize the platform that we are working on which is the open data soft platform. We need to review the data asset inventory, joining the open data initiative phase. We shared the first version of the data asset inventory. We post for public comment and ask community to provide

us input to aspect one. How would you prioritize the data publication? What data would you like to see?

Secondly, we asked community is there any data that you know that you think is missing from this inventory? And we received good feedback. Thank you very much.

So, we are now reviewing with those feedback in consideration and updating our inventory. Secondly, we're trying to align the inventory with the draft process that we put together which is the last two deliverables which is the platform and the process.

And of course we take the opportunity in Kobe and we want to discuss the high level publication process with the community to get the feedback so we can go ahead and finalize the process and to test it out.

So, in the next slides, we share these next slides as well with the community in Kobe. Who is running the slides? Thank you.

so, this is a very high level overarching process that we intend to use for the open data publication. So, of course, first of all we want to prioritize the proposed data set. As you see that when we post – before public comment include the data asset inventory, there is more than 200 data sets. Of course, it's impossible for us to publish everything all at once, so how do we prioritize it and who should prioritize it?

In the draft process, we think that we need to get community involvement. The idea is to make the data asset inventory available so that community can look at what inventory we have and submit a request for publication.

And one note that I want to make here is once you submit the request, at that time, it's just a data set can be a potential candidate to publish on open data platform. We need to go through some assessment to see whether or not we can make them available through the open data platform and that which is the second step here.

Once we do the assessment, we will communicate the results. If the result is a positive yes, we can have this data available through the open data platform. We will work with our [inaudible] IT team to make that happen. Of course, [inaudible] was the data owner and then push it out. So, this is the overarching process that we identified and that we have been working on it.

In the next slide, you will see that out of this overarching process, I think the major step that we need to test out is the assessment. We understand open data is a great idea and it will help in various ways, but there is more complexity into it.

So, this is the key step that we are testing. Out of this assessment, there are two main aspects. One of course we need to look at the proposed data set from if there's any possible constraints from legal's perspective. And also we need to look at it from the technical aspect whether or not it's possible, the structure, the size of the data. And maybe I can ask Ash to weigh in on the technical perspective.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Sure. Thank you. I think at a high level we have 200 different datasets that have been published as potentially being available. Not all

datasets are alike. If I think of zone file data as an example, the size of the file can be massive and if there are multiple subscribers to that file, then we have processing considerations and data availability considerations on our side. Just to use that as one example.

The readiness of the data sources, some of our systems are pretty old. That's probably true of every one of the businesses here. And the quality of the data can be suspect depending on the age of the systems. So, if there's master data involved, we are concerned that we're sending you the right information, so we have to be sure that when we do the extract, we are extracting information that can be useful to you. So, we want to be sure that we're careful about what we're publishing in that regard.

And the ability to automate often depends on that for us because if we have fields that may be not good, they could be corrupt, they could be old when we do the extract, if they don't convert properly then we'll be sending data streams that maybe containing nulls and other invalid characters that, if you try to use machines, they just suck them up. They may work or they may not work. So, we are being very careful about how we're testing it out and how we're automating the process of making available the [inaudible] capable data. So, those are the considerations that we're going through. Thank you.

VICTORIA YANG: Thank you very much, Ash. So, if we can move to the next slide. Out of the key deliverable that we had on slides 4, here is basically a summary of the status of where we are thanks to the engineer and the [inaudible]

team, we have the piece of the architecture ready. Basically, connect from ICANN to the platform. And of course, depends on the dataset request, we have to build the different pieces for the source to connect with the source data. So, that's a different piece.

The rest of the delivery, you will see that there is a lot of testing going on. So, we have the framework and the publication process. The open data platform, the portal, we are done with the UX design and the UX design implementation is done as well. Now we are just doing QA and here I want to add a note that we had an issue design and then as ITI evolved and it is a decision made that is good to align with ITI so that when ITI launch, the [inaudible] will be familiar and they will be looking alike. So, one is for content. The other one is for data.

So, we realigned the UX design with ITI and we have already finished the implementation aspect of it and we are just doing QA now. We are also developing the portal privacy policy and terms of use. The inventory, as I mentioned, we are updating and reviewing. It's in process. Next slide.

What's next? As I mentioned earlier, just in the previous slides, you see a lot of testing. So, indeed we are taking a couple of pilot datasets to test out the process and vent through the assessment step where we valued whether the data can be published as open data.

Here are some of the dataset that we currently use, which is all mentioned in the feedback during the publication. As I mentioned earlier, when we put the inventory out for public comment, this is the

least of data that community provides us feedback, say, "These are our prioritization."

The orange highlights the data that we're currently taking as pilots to test out all these deliverables that we worked on. ITHI is one of the datasets and I will ask [inaudible] later to weigh in on that.

So, the contractual compliance data and zone file data, although these two data are mentioned by the community, we are taking subset of those data. The reason is we are working with the business owner of the domain name marketplace place indicator which is the indicator out of a working group currently published with Excel on ICANN website. I know that everyone has the desire of having this dataset on the open data platform. We are working with the business owner on that dataset. There are 23 indicators and some of the indicators are extraction from the contractual compliance data and the zone file data. So, we are working collaboratively on that.

The DAAR data, at the time of publication, was not mentioned as a prioritization but was increased interest and David Conrad has mentioned that it's going to be a good data set to pilot test. David, do you want to talk more about these two data sets?

DAVID CONRAD: Sure. With ITHI, there is actually a website right now that publishes the health indicator data. It's ithi.research.icann.org. If you go to that website, you'll notice it's sort of maybe the best of 1990s web style. We made a decision early on that we would try to minimize the amount of

development that went into the display of that data, and instead dump it into the open data. So, as a result of that, all the various metrics that we have in ITHI, which some are actually quite interesting if you're into that sort of thing, will be one of the primary targets for the soft launch pilot of the open data program.

With regards to DAAR, as you're probably aware, we're dumping a monthly report of DAAR into a PDF and making that available. The intent there is to take the statistics or generate it in these monthly reports and put them into the open data platform as well.

We're looking at also seeing what other aspects of DAAR that we'd be able to pull in automatically. But at least at the initial phase, we'll be looking at the aggregate statistics that are brought in, that are published via the monthly reports.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you for this great insight. We have already a question to ask, so Steve, I would leave the floor to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks. The domain abuse activity reporting, the DAAR. We've reviewed your September report and are really anxious to be able to get at the data underneath that. If you can explain the granularity that would be available in the soft launch for that. The granularity down to the TLD level, for instance, or is it still under just legacy versus new at a categorial level?

DAVID CONRAD: So, we're discussing right now ways of improving DAAR the way … Actually, bucketization is one of the big topics of discussion. We're still constrained by our licensing agreements to basically provided – publish – aggregates. That's another thing that we're trying to address but it's a separate issue from the open data aspect of it.

So, the initial soft launch will have bucketization. We probably will not be doing legacy versus new g bucketization but probably more along the lines of the categorizations that we're using sort of operationally, things like brand or IDN, that sort of stuff.

Basically, the same information that you get with the monthly reports are going to be what are going to be available initially in the open data release.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, there would not be the underlying data by TLD.

DAVID CONRAD: No. As mentioned, for licensing reasons, we're not able to publish that data right now. With that said, you can obtain similar data from other sites, the data sources that we actually use. You can obtain – yeah.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Any other questions from members? Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYTE:	Thank you so much for the presentation. Good update. Normally, in a program, needs to have some timeline, basically. What timeline are you looking at for this to not become business as usual [inaudible] system?
	Then, secondly, [inaudible] mention that because of the quality of hardware, that will affect the data generated. Are we depending on ICANN systems or is it cloud-based activity?
VICTORIA YANG:	Okay. So, regarding the timeline, we actually have two more slides which Susanna may cover to answer your question of the timeline. Ash, do you want to address that?
ASHWIN RANGAN:	Yeah. So, as far as the quality is concerned, we have sufficient hardware to go through the data sources and make sure that we are sorting it through, but typically in programs like this, we go through three phases. There is a phase of extracting data. There is a phase of transforming data when it's not clean and clear. And the third is to load the data. So, it's typically called the ETL process in IT. So, we're going through that with every data source that's being targeted as a data set that needs to be published.
	Depending on what we are sourcing as a target data set, the quality varies depending on the source systems that it's coming from, which is the reason the technical side of this takes quite a bit of time.

So, if you identify a data set, for us to become ready with it, is oftentimes a month-long process. Physically, it's easy. But the first extract usually tells us all the problems that are with the data set. And then we have to go through this cleansing routine to be sure that what we're displaying is actually useful.

So, that process of cleansing quality assurance, cleansing, it's an iterative process that we go through. So, it's just the nature of this kind of a beast.

SUSANNA BARRETT: So, regarding timeline, let's move to the next slide, please. This is related to the second question and the third question we have, the indication of what's next. Here, you asked a question. Can we satisfy what the program [inaudible] so far?

We collectively thing that it is definitely taking longer than anticipated, but we have been learning a lot. There's a lot of complexity we're getting through and it's really a collaborative effort with the whole organization, although our operations program managing this, as you see in IT and OCTO's team and Legal are very involved. And the data – the owner or the people who manage the data of these functions are very involved in this. We need to get all their expertise on this to help us to do this right.

So, you all know that this is a very important program for ICANN and we have a steering committee overseeing it and Goran is on the committee. This is a very important program for him, personally, he always said.

And of course, Ashwin, David, and John Jeffrey are our general council on the steering committee as well. And myself. So, this is an important program. We'll drive it forward. We want to do it right. Next slide, please.

So, the third question you have from the [inaudible] perspective – I know that Jamie is going to go through from the other perspectives, but from the [inaudible] perspective the g data we're publishing, as you see earlier, the discussion that a lot of complexity we're getting through, and of course [inaudible] normal time is the time it takes to get these all through. However, also, we have to balance the prioritization, the resource constraints around it. Then we have to ensure the proper evaluation about these data sets and get through the possible constraints.

Then, timeline wise, what we're anticipating right now, looking at these four important – as Steve, you mentioned – important data sets, we are looking at a soft launch in Cancun. So, a soft launch, Ash, you probably can describe better than I do. Thanks.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you. Historically, when we've made available data, we've seen that when there is a machine interface at the other end, there are internal processes that you may have that want to take up this data. Of course, there are [inaudible] licenses and other such things, depending on the kind of data that gets published. You may have internal processes and you may want time to go through those processes and reevaluate them before something is declared as being in production.

So, we think of it as a soft launch where you have the ability to test them out and make sure that your internal processes are aligned with the availability of new data sets in a machine-to-machine capable format. So, we are thinking of the Cancun time approximately as the soft launch opportunity. We can then declare it being available to everybody at some future time, when once there has been an opportunity to test it out and for you to confirm that it's working as you desired it to be working. So, that's the thought process that we currently have. Thank you, Susanna.

SUSANNA BARRETT: Thank you, Ash. We'll learn from this and get the input and feedback from the community to help us build the rest of it more properly and better serve the community. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much. Is there any other last questions? Please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: At the time, will there be APIs available so that people who want to collect and pull the data on data sources?

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you. Yes. To answer your question, the open data soft platform that we chose makes available open APIs as a part of the platform, so once we feed the data, it is available to you in machine-to-machine ready format. But you will have to write your interface to suck the data

out using that API, so there will be some lead time there. So, that's yet another reason why we think of this as a soft launch as opposed to a hard launch. It will give you the opportunity to learn that interface and then get comfortable with it. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. It's more of a comment. I would say that the anxiety that part of the community that deals with data has had with the program is an ability to interface with this for such a long time in between the pilot and the current moment. So, I would urge you to make use of us as soon as it's actually ready to be tested in some way, mailing list, a small working group, something. There are many of us very willing across different constituencies. We actually have our own little email thread trying to keep track of this project. I don't know if you know that. We are very keen on starting to work on this project. So, make use of us. Thank you.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you. I appreciate the offer and we will take you up on it. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Yes. Absolutely.

DAVID CONRAD: Thanks. That's a good segue to what I was hoping to say for compliance. As many of you know, we already publish a lot of data. We've been starting to publish more granular data in part in response to the CCT recommendations – or in anticipation of them, actually – showing more granularity about the types of abuse complaints that we're getting.

We're also moving, thanks to Ash, to a new ticketing platform, Salesforce-based platform, that registries and registrars use which will allow us to capture even more data in both when parties submit complaints and as we process them.

So, we have on our page a lot of reports that we publish on a monthly basis, annual basis covering all types of complaints and broken down into complaint types and regions and all kinds of things, which is great if you're a data junkie but what we're finding is they're not getting a lot of hits. The analytics don't show that many people actually access those reports. So, this is not a complaint that we'd rather not publish the data. We want to publish the data. We will continue to publish the data, but we are eager to get input from folks like Business Constituency on the types of data that you would like to see published that we would publish on our own in the form of reports but also feed into ODP. So, as you think about that, I'd be grateful for your input. Thanks.

ASHWIN RANGAN: If I could add to that comment one of the other patterns that we also see when we publish data in any format, there is an initial spike of interest which is very high and it quickly dies down but it leaves us with the cost of producing and making available the information so it would be helpful if we have further interactions about persistent usage of data so that we can shut off things that we're producing. No matter what it is, there is a cost attached to producing things and making them available. So, as long as we're responding to true demands, we're happy to do what needs to be done but we would appreciate feedback when the usefulness of some data sets starts to taper down, and if we are able to shut it off, it will be helpful for us. Thank you.

DAVID CONRAD: The way I would interpret that myself is that people want access to the data sets and they find that the data sets that you're publishing do not align with their needs in terms of data granularity. So, there's a misalignment of what the community is expecting the data to have and what you guys are actually publishing. And I understand in certain cases there's limitations around licensing agreements and stuff like that. But I do think it would be a good idea if there was some dialogue around we did this and initially there was interest but now there isn't. Because if it can be improved, that would be excellent. That would be better for everybody. I know it's very frustrating to do work on a project, spend thousands of hours, millions of dollars and be like, "Well, 17 people are actually using this," or something.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much for your great insight and for being with us today. Certainly we'll continue dialogue and come back with a suggestion as you proposed. Thank you.

DAVID CONRAD: Thank you. Thank you for having us.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay. In fact, the question to you is if you're fine in staying 15 more minutes, we can basically skip the break and then save more time because this morning in our closed meeting we covered a bunch of topics that were foreseen in this agenda. So, if you agree to stay on, we will adjourn the meeting before the time. So, since we covered all the policy discussion this morning, Steve, maybe what would be useful to cover now is the discussion that we just had with the Board if you want to summarize that as maybe some members did not participate.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. How many members were in the CSG Board interaction prior to this? Okay. Most. That's fantastic. So, we don't have to summarize as much crystalize what it means moving forward, not just for what Mason has to do tomorrow in DNA but how our interaction with ICANN compliance.

Jamie, you were in the room I think for the beginning of the discussion. We confirmed with Becky that the bylaws were written explicitly to grandfather and protect the public interest commitments and the RAA,

the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And so I'll probe a little bit more about the public interest commitments and what you said at the mic and then Mason will ask about RAA-specific provision.

DNS abuse is a significant concern of the BC, the GAC, and others, and we were absolutely in support of what PIR and the other ten put forth. We questioned why PIR's framework suggest that ICANN has no role at all, other than to convene. And I think we clarified today that because of the piece of the bylaws right below what they quoted, ICANN does have a role. Okay, and you're agreeing. And Becky clarified that all of the 2013 agreements are completely in bounds and further refinements to the public interest commitments.

But after that, we went into this discussion of what is in that public interest committee, and for all of you in the BC, it's a page and a half long, specification 11. It has a couple of obligations in there. And the obligation, Jamie, that I was probing the Board about was 3A, not 3B. You went to the mic and addressed 3B, completely confusing us all. Under 3A is this notion that the BC championed this. It started in the Toronto meeting when Fadi had first started and we said, "Wait a minute, we have this new registrar accreditation agreement but not all of them have signed up to it." This was back in 2013. He said, "What a great way to incentivize them to sign up, by saying that if registries want to sell names [inaudible] new TLDs, then all their registrars had to sign the new RAA."

There was a couple of other things in there, 3A. It also said that any registrar selling names for the new gTLD space had to have a policy on

its website prohibiting seven different specific types of DNS abuse, eliminating the need for this conversation to come up with a definition of DNS abuse because it lists them in specific terms. Distributing malware, botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark/copyright infringement, fraudulent deceptive practices, counterfeiting, etc. So, given that those all had to be there and that every registrar had to not only have a policy against them, it had to have a way of imposing consequences including suspension of the domain name.

It sounded like this morning that we heard that ICANN doesn't feel that it has compliance, doesn't have any role in enforcing that provision and we would benefit from a discussion here about whether that's the case. If it is, we have a lot of work in front of us, but if it is, that's a terrible surprise to a lot of us who believe there was at least a compliance hook there. Help us out.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, first of all, apologies for confusing anyone. When I came in, I thought the discussion was about spec 11 generally and that we weren't enforcing it and I tried to go from there to go over the audit that we just did.

But backing up a step even further before even getting into 3ZA, contractual compliance, our role is to enforce the contracts and the agreements and the language that's in the agreements. That means that … As a practical matter, one of the things that that means is that between 60 and 70% of the complaints that we get, we throw out or we can't address either because they're about cc's or there's no evidence

or they're about content not contemplated in 11 or the complainant just disappears.

So, with the complaints that we've gotten on DNS abuse, when we get them, we look at there are specifically provisions in the RAA about the obligations of registrars to investigate and respond and there's no definition of abuse.

In spec 11.3a, I think our reading of that is a little different. If we could use 3A to after registrars who are not enforcing what's required to be in their RAA, no question that would move the abuse discussion. But what that provision actually requires and where we have enforcement authority is it requires the registry to include in its agreement with the registrar that language. It does not give us authority to enforce against registrars their agreements with registrants, if that makes sense. So, it's a derivative thing.

If there's a claim that a registry is [inaudible] and whenever there's a transaction and other times we make sure that they have included this but there's no way under 3A for us to go after a registrar.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, one of my favorite expressions – "For the avoidance of doubt" – we want to clarify that if we showed you evidence that a registrar has a policy against operating a botnet because they had to and on their website they told registrants that if you registrar a name through us in this new gTLD, you may not operate an abusive botnet and that we have the authority – we being the registrar – to suspend the domain name.

And then if we showed you evidence that a registrant was operating a botnet in that new gTLD and we could tell you the registrar that they got the name through, what can you do?

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, under 3A, nothing. Again, we can go after the registry for not including the thing in its agreement with the registrar. We do not enforce registrars … We don't authority to enforce registrar agreements with registrants.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, ICANN can do nothing. And we went to some lengths to protect in the grandfather clause what is turning out to be a somewhat meaningless set of – sorry, unenforceable set of protections.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, what I'm not saying, I am not saying that if such a provision existed that it would not be covered by the grandfather. What I am saying is that I am not aware of any specific provision in the RAA or in the RA that would allow us to go after—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Then, so tell us what we can do with respect to a public interest committee dispute resolution process. That's PICDRP. For the newcomers, we call it a PIC DRP. There's only been two so far. But how would you guide the BC if we wanted to do a PIC DRP associated with 3A?

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, I would be [inaudible] to give you advice on how to do your work but my understanding is that the way the PIC DRP is supposed to work is, first, we get a complaint and we decide whether or not we can handle it or we turn it over to a DRP to resolve.

But after that, what the panel is supposed to do is consider the complaint against the agreement. So, they don't have new authority. And this has become an issue in one of the recommendations for DNS abuse that did not get consensus. But that by setting up a review panel, you don't create new obligations that you can enforce.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you for that because we informed Cyrus before you came in that on the fast-track timeline to the next round there's probably going to be a time out now that everyone – GAC – everyone has this realization that agreements that we thought were helpful, worth protecting and enforceable are not, with respect to DNS abuse. The most obvious illegality. And that would say that we're really not ready for another round until we fix that. And if that requires new policy … Becky was advising us to do it through a PDP within the picket fence. That's what she was suggesting. That's a challenge, especially for a business community and a PDP has to get through a contract party ability to block it.

So, we had thought we had black-and-white letters that we could use and if we cannot, it's going to raise a significant concern about the next round. You aware of that?

JAMIE HEDLUND:
I was not aware of your discussion with Cyrus. I understand where you're coming from. I will say our role is limited to enforcing the agreements as they're written and that includes the policies incorporated therein.

I will also say that one of the purposes of doing the registry audit that we just did which was on a different provision, on 3B, was to clarify for those in the community who weren't aware of certain things what is the scope of 3B itself? Who does it apply to? New g's, not legacies. And what are the requirements under it?

So, we're all in favor of transparency around what the obligations are and allowing the community to do what it can. I think Becky was saying there are two ways, either through PDP or through contractual negotiations.

STEVE DELBIANCO:
Thank you, Jamie. I want to turn it over to Mason a little bit to probe you on what he brought up after I did in that session. I have it up on the screen to make it a little easier for you. This small piece of the registrar accreditation agreement. It's RAA, not RRA, sorry. It is one of the grandfathered agreements that you can enforce. Let's talk about

whether that is another productive element. Mason, you want to take over from here?

MASON COLE: Sure. Thank you, Steve. Jamie, forgive me. As you know, I'm not an attorney but I will try to read this as though I were an attorney. But the question I believe that we had in the session prior was that, to set context, ICANN has got the capability to seek declaratory judgment in a registrar's home jurisdiction if it knows that the registrar is harboring abuse of some kind.

I think what you said – correct me if I'm wrong. But I think what you said is you're not aware of anybody bringing those judgments against a registrar, nor is ICANN planning to do so in the event that a registrar is harboring abuse.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes on the first. On the second, it's something that we're looking at, that we're considering. I don't have anything more. I have to obviously work with Legal on that. Brian [Symbolic] I think was originally brought this up in a meeting ago and it's interesting there are some concerns I have about ICANN, the optics around ICANN going into a court and asking for this when we're supposed to be convening a multi-stakeholder process and then we're going through a governmental process. With the transition over, I suppose that's less of a sensitive—

STEVE DELBIANCO:	The optics might be quite good if we want to show that we're trying to combat abuse.
JAMIE HEDLUND:	Right. I'm just saying it's a consideration. I don't know that we've certainly don't anything like that in a US court. It's not off the table. It's something we're looking at.
MASON COLE:	Okay, thank you. So, what if the jurisdiction was other than the US? Would that dissuade you from pursuing the—
JAMIE HEDLUND:	No. I just said US initially because a lot of the big registrars are in the US and there's always been [inaudible] around the US. I think the analysis about whether or not to go to a court anywhere would be basically the same.
MASON COLE:	Okay. All right. That's good. Thank you.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Facebook, one of our members, has brought an action. It happens to be in a US court. Against a registrar, proxy provider. And if they obtained a judgment, it would fit into this one?

[MASON COLE]: I don't know all the facts, but yeah. If there is an order from a court, declaratory ruling from a court of a competent jurisdiction, we would in fact enforce it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Follow-up if I can. Would ICANN go so far as termination in that regard or would you seek interim steps before termination?

[MASON COLE]: It would depend on the facts. If it were a registrar whose business model was based on [CSAM], I can't imagine we ….

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. I'm thinking back to [out names] when that was an ugly situation. I wonder if that could have been handled more quickly when the community became aware of the level of abuse that was going on inside that registrar.

[MASON COLE]: It's a fair question. But you're suggesting you need a court of competent jurisdiction to do a ruling for this provision to work.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We're going to go to Margie next in the queue but please be as open as you can with us today. If you have ideas … Because we've listed two for you, this PIC spec and obtaining judgments. But if there's others that

we're not aware of that we can be helpful on, we want you to suggest those as well. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. Thank you, Jamie, for coming. I did want to follow up on what Steve mentioned. In the case that we filed, it's actually a registrar that has already been involved in a breach with ICANN compliance in the past. So, this actually happens to be a registrar that has had issues in the past and we're certainly pursuing the litigation but it's unfortunate that that's what we have to do in order to deal with actors that have been in breach of the RAA in the past.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jamie, any other guidance for us? Hints about where else we can go in the agreements that it is your job to enforce?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Unfortunately, I don't have any … I do think it's important that this dialogue continues. I think a lot of people [inaudible] cautiously optimistic that it's not a one-and-done thing and there are follow-on steps. So, we're obviously supportive of that but I just leave you with this sort of obvious point that we enforce the agreements as they are and not as people would hope them to be. So, anything you can do to … Wherever forum you have to articulate your concerns, I think that's helpful.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	How long have you known that the public interest commitments and the registry agreement could not be enforced against the abuse in 3A?
JAMIE HEDLUND:	It's not that they can't be enforced. They just can't be enforced the way that you were reading them. From the beginning, we've known how the provision is written.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Susan?
[SUSAN PAYNE]:	I had a quick question on B of the spec 11. ICANN can request the reports that the registry has put together and I was wondering how often you do that and if those are … If that's possible for others to request what you have requested – to see what you have requested?
JAMIE HEDLUND:	Sure. So, we just did an audit and we took a different approach to the audit than we had taken in the past – we as a risk-based approach where we focused on DNS abuse related obligations and rather than auditing just a sample of registries against the entire agreement, we essentially audited all gTLDs against the provisions, and for new g's that was 11.3b.

As part of that audit, we requested the security threat report for a particular period of time. This is all public. I can send a link later if it's helpful.

[SUSAN PAYNE]: That would be helpful.

JAMIE HEDLUND: We published a report I think back in September providing aggregate overview of the audit. But basically what we did was we took their security threat report and compared the names on that list with our own compilation of security threat reports from our publicly available RBLs and tried to do – compare the two. And where there were many more listed in our RBLs than there were on their own, we asked them why and some of them, in fact, responded by changing the way they're doing their threat report.

There were some who took the view that they didn't have to give us that detail and we've come back to them and, as part of the report, we said we want to sit down with you and understand their view and our view and try to get to a common understanding. In our view, it's not enough just to show that you've ticked the box. We want to see how you've done your work and that in fact … And if we don't [inaudible] we'd have no way of judging whether this is just a piece of paper with a couple of scribbled names on it or its an effective, in compliance with the provision.

EN

So, we just did that and we would do that again in another audit, I suppose. Depending on the type of complaint we got about a registry, we might do it again for that as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'd like to bring that screen up and then Susan and Mason.

[SUSAN PAYNE]: I just want to follow-up. So, those reports, though, you said you could provide a link. That wouldn't be a link to those individual reports.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, that's part of the … The individual audits are confidential and we would not provide the reports that they provided us but we provide the aggregate data on all the participants in the audit.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Have you ever imposed a breach notice on anything in specification 11?

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, in this audit, 5% of the TLD operators were found not to be in compliance and some of them were brands who just didn't realize that they had to do it. So, all of them remediated. Had they not remediated as part of the audit, then we would have issued a breach notice.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Has ICANN ever issued a breach notice on anything on specification 11?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Well, we had the PIC DRP and that came out where we came out with things that they had to do.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, in one instance so far with data breach notice under specification 11.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I'm looking at my … I can get back to you on that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It would be so helpful to understand the degree to which compliance has been active on specification 11. We're understanding more and more the limitations on what can be done. So, it's therefore important to know what is being done. That would be so good.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sure enough.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think we'll go to Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you. Let's say the contracts were open for negotiation right now between ICANN and the contracted parties. Would there be specific

provisions that compliance would seek on behalf of ICANN Org to strengthen its ability to enforce?

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, I think as part of the SubPro, as Becky mentioned, there will be likely an opportunity to negotiate those agreements. We participate in the negotiation. We help internally in making clear what it is that we think we want or would need or what wouldn't work that they're proposing. But it's part of Org's negotiation. It's not a separate compliance negotiation.

MASON COLE: Yeah, I know. I was on the other side of the table in 2013, so I remember well. But I'm just wondering. I've heard compliance say on occasion "I wish we had stronger contract language." And if you would make that known to Org, I just wondered what that might look like in a negotiation.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Well, like any part of Org that had skin in the game in the negotiation, we would share that information with the leads negotiating the agreement which is typically GDD and Legal. In the past, anyway, we had not publicized what it is that we were seeking.

STEVE DELBIANCO: A couple of years ago, when Akram ran GDD, we had a long discussion with the BC because I said that Org represents the interests of the global

community when it sits at the table across from registrars and registries in that process. And Akram said, "Well, yes, and after negotiations are done in secret, we'll let the community comment on it." But we convinced Akram that what was necessary ahead of that was for Org to ask the community for what are our priorities as you enter any negotiations on the agreements.

And Akram at the time had said, "I see the wisdom in that. We should be doing it that way." And it's process change you can make. It's in your power. And then he left. But you're here.

So, Jamie, before entering any negotiations on the agreement, ask the community, please, through formal process to suggest priorities for the negotiations in the agreement. I think in the light of how toothless spec 11 is today, you will get some comments that would guide your ability to do that. If there's conflicts, you'll have to figure out a way to sort those out.

But I hope that the contract parties, and certainly the 11 who signed the framework, they get it, that if they don't do something, we are going to see imposition of intermediary liability. And that is far worse than finding contract provisions to weed out the bad actors, the ones who aren't going to sign the framework.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, two things. One is I think that's a great thing to raise tomorrow's DNS abuse …Even though it's [inaudible] what you just said about

getting input from the community. There are vehicles to get input from the community, but if you're not satisfied with those, then—

STEVE DELBIANCO: What vehicle is there for us to tell you what to negotiate in your next contract?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Well, there's public comment. In the past, there's been public comment on the contracts.

STEVE DELBIANCO: But wait, that was after the negotiations had resulted in a preliminary agreement. I'm talking before you sit down to negotiate.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay. So, I understand your frustration and I understand that … So, what I'm trying to say is that, to the extent that you're not happy with it, that you should definitely surface that in the community dialogue, starting tomorrow.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So we're clear, we've told you we are not satisfied with only commenting after the agreements have been negotiated.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Right. But I'm only compliance. I can enforce the agreements after they've been executed. And I will take your comments internally, absolutely.

The other thing I wanted to say is, as you and many others have pointed out, a lot of the information that's in the framework, those are great. And what we found in the registry audit was that 95% of the contracted parties do not just what's in there. They might even agree with you that spec 11 has really not the motivating factor for them and they … But the real challenge is how do you get the rest of them? All the best practices in the world will not … So, that's …

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, that comes down to you, frankly. The only party in this whole ecosystem that could make a difference is somebody who can de-accredit a registrar. That's you. So, honestly, all eyes are turning on you and if you don't have the teeth in the current agreements to go after the bad registrars. It's incumbent on you to tell that to your colleagues at Org before they sit at the table across from the registrars and registries.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I couldn't agree more and it's also helpful that it's public knowledge. It's nothing secret about the fact that the best practices are honored by those who show up here and …. My understanding is a lot more would have signed it. But the real challenge is how do you get the 5%, 10%, that are responsible for 90% of the abuse?

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you very much, Jamie, for staying over with us and thank you for the great insight and conversation. We'll certainly continue that.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes. Thank you. Thank you very much.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jamie. I don't have anything else I want to take your afternoon with on policy. It's been a busy day, a busy week. If the BC members have anything more they'd like us to do, me to do, as your policy coordinator, tell me now or otherwise I'll pass it over to Barbara.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think we covered the CSG this morning, right, Barbara? Okay. I don't know, Jimson, if there's anything that you need to cover more than we covered this morning on outreach.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Well, no. But just to use this opportunity to invite our friends to join us tomorrow at our in-reach. I can see maybe put interested in business, being part of us that are not yet part of us. So, you're all welcome. Please, join us tomorrow, 7:00 PM. Tim, you want to describe it, please? Mention it, please?

TIM SMITH: So, the in-reach tomorrow is at [inaudible] Steakhouse at 39 [inaudible] East at 7:00. We hope everyone can make it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a walk from here. It's not far from the science museum, if people were there. So, it's an easy walk from here. For those of you who have sent us your submissions, they are great and many of them are very funny and revealing in a lot of good ways. We encourage you to come on time because it's a short window and to enjoy as much as you can.

Is there a chance to get food there?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have ordered some food. So, there will … It's actually a restaurant, so you can actually stay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Only if you answer the questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What about alcohol?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Only if you answer the questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, that's right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No answers to the questions, no food, no alcohol.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hot hors d'oeuvres for those who contributed. That's right. For those who are engaged in the process. But it is a restaurant and if anybody wanted to stay afterwards, I think there might be availability for people who wanted to stick around and have dinner.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Great. Thank you very much also for organizing that. Is there any other—

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Also to mention again that we have newsletter up there, so pleas feel free to pick as many copy as you want and you can visit the website. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Is there any other business that you want to bring up? If not, we will adjourn the meeting. The record can stop and we will see each other tomorrow.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]