Transcription ICANN Singapore
ISPCP
Tuesday 25 March 2014

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

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Man: Welcome to the ISP meeting. I'm going to try and move it along quickly as we couldn't get in a room and prepare beforehand. So there's a few things going on here that will help us later.

But in the meantime, welcome to the Nom-Com, and it would be a great help to all of us to not only to catch up, but to be able to get ourselves sorted whilst we're listing to you bring us up-to-date.

So welcome and I'll hand over to Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I don't mind filibustering. It's better than filling in radio silence, so work and talk amongst yourselves and we'll try and entertain you.

As you probably know, my name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr and I'm the current Chair of the ICANN Nominating Committee for 2014. We have the leadership team and I believe a few others. Maybe not?

No.

(Allen):   (Allen).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Allen)?

Yes, there you are. What are you hiding down there?

A member of the Nominating Committee with us obviously, (unintelligible). The Chair-elect, which is the role I had last year, and is Stephane's role this year. One presumes that the Chair-elect may indeed become Chair, but there is no guarantee, and we'll talk about that as well.

And it really wasn't a guarantee for me anyway. He's probably got a shoe in.

And we have Yrjo somewhere? Where we put my Yrjo? Oh, there we are. Yrjo is the Associate Chair and we - that's actually the selection of Chair. The Chair and the Chair-elect are the selection of the ICANN Board, all right.

Now you know, because you send people to the Nominating Committee, that the rest of the voting, and in a couple of cases, non-voting members come directly from the community, and it's the Nominating Committee's role to seek - to sift and sort, to review, to interview, and indeed to appoint a number of important leadership positions.

Now the important leadership positions that we have this year are two seats on the ICANN Board, the Nominating Committee put eight seats - they fill eight seats in the ICANN Board, so it is a significant contribution to the leadership and governance model. So we have two seats to the ICANN Board. We have a single seat for the GNSO, we have a single seat for the ccNSO, and we have two seats which are geographically limited for the ALAC.

And this year for the ALAC, we are looking for leaders who come from the North American region and the European region.

So there's the leadership positions we will be filling this year. Stephane is going to tell you a little bit about how we're doing this in terms of some innovations and some work we are doing in terms of subcommittees. Yrjo is going to tell you a little bit about the time cost because our timetable - and I'm talking to a room of people who understand project planning and timetabling, and - I hope I am. Our time table has milestone on the 1st of April. 23:59 UTC is the last time that a Statement of Interest or an applicant can begin their process of application.

Now I'm saying begin their process of application because we not only have a new wonderful, shiny, and I hope you all view it as a - visited to have a look at more interactive and useful Web site, including a very important and informative video which just might have the leadership team starring in it, but do have a look. It's also a place where you will find resource materials that gives all the key characteristics and criteria's we are looking for for all of these positions, and they change each year. They are adjusted each year. So the ccNSO has given some in writing, has a (unintelligible) what they gave us last year, and has made some additional comments for this year.

In previous years, for example, the ccNSO said they wanted, if possible, someone with legal drafting skills, so we add that to our criteria. And if we have someone with legal drafting skills, and they are suitable, and we are considering them, that would obviously weight more highly over someone perhaps who does not. So that gives you a little taste of the work we're going to do.

The 1st of April is the cutoff date. It's not the pretend cutoff date. I know it has been traditional, and I trust it's not expected for Nom-Com's to extend.

Let me be clear; we will not be extending past the 1st of April. And, the date is obviously a little ironic, but our - I think I'm now going to ask Yrjo to pick up and to give you a little bit more information on this time course.

Over to you, Yrjo.

Yrjo Lansipuro: Thank you. Yrjo Lansipuro for the transcript record.

Thank you for having us here.

April Fool's Day, yes, it's - this time, it is true actually. After that, the - begins actually the busiest period for - in the Nom-Com lifecycle. Up until now, it's been a little bit slow, but from April 1st, we start - first of all, we start reading - of course, we see these, and the profiles, and the recommendations. The - our aim is to be - in two week's time to be able to select like 15 Board candidates who are going to be scrutinized further and to be interviewed by (Orchars & Bernstrand), which is a headhunting firm that has been helping us for many, many years.

The - while they are doing their thing, we are concentrating on candidates for the ALAC and the GNSO/ccNSO (for assistance). When we get these evaluations from these - from (Orchars & Bernstrand) back, they are in the form of scorecards, and they very much concentrate actually on the personalities because we already know what they have done and so on, and so forth. But, we want from them, their expert view on personalities of these people.

Then for the - before the London meeting, we have to select the - a short list. Less than 10 who are going to be invited to London and they are interviewed there, and finally we have our selection meeting and this famous black box - it's like the Cardinals selecting the Pope. We are completely secluded. And finally, the white smoke comes out.

Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Man: That's a great summary. (Unintelligible) summary...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now, all of this is part of us being far more transparent with our process. We like to think that we're helping with this discussion here for you to understand what used to happen in a totally secluded world. We want the processes to be public. It's the personal information of the candidates that is absolutely kept confidential.

And, I did mention the point of we start on the 1st of April, but it's an application to be fully considered, needed to begin by then. That's because this year, unlike previous years, we have a new Web-based Statement of Interest form. And what happens, and what will need to happen before our drop-dead time, is for an applicant, when they start the process, they very simply go to the Nom-Com place and hit the Apply button. That - there's a page which is their identifiers. Name. Rank. Serial Number. Domicile. All that sort of thing.

And with that, staff then gets a start. This means that this is someone who's expressed an interest in putting in the SOI.

There is an individual Web form which is actually a Wiki place that is dedicated and secure to each individual, and it is in there that they fill out the responses to the questions that we need for our Statements of Interest. This is very different from other years.

Before, people couldn't even save their form. Here, you could've saved when we opened. At the end of January, you could've started an application and you may not push complete until the 1st of April. So people have had plenty of time to consider and complete the process.

Let's assume someone ticks the I am interested in the Board of Director box. There'll be four pages or so that they will need to fill out in response to particular questions, and it's a cut and paste. You can put (unintelligible) material and things in. Then they actually have to say, "I'm finished with this page." And it's only then once they've said they're finished with their Statement of Interest that we take it and we start reading it.

So I needed to make that clear. That process must begin by 1st of April.

Stephane, you've got a few things to tell us. Over to you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Hi everyone. Stephane - is this working?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Stephane Van Gelder: Hi. I can't hear myself, but that's another problem.

My name is Stephane Van Gelder. I'm Chair-elect of the 2014 Nominating Committee. I just wanted to give you a little bit of information on some of the work that the Committee's doing on its procedures and the way it arrives at its determinations at the end of the year, so what's fueling the white smoke that Yrjo spoke of earlier on.

And with that, just as a preamble, I want to say three things. First of all, to thank you as a community for having given us such an excellent Nom-Com member (unintelligible). I'm particularly pleased to see him, because he's French obviously.

And the second thing I wanted to remind you of is that - oh, that's -- told you I couldn't hear myself -- is that each Nominating Committee works in a single year cycle, and each year is free to make up its own processes in order to suit its mandate.

Don't forget that each year the skill sets and -- as Cheryl mentioned earlier on -- the members of the - sorry, the candidates that we're recruiting for the positions that we're recruiting for change. So it does make sense that each year the process is adapted to those specific requirements.

In addition to that, there is a separation between one Nominating Committee and the next, certainly in terms of candidates. That data is completely secret and destroyed at the end of every Nominating Committee cycle. But also, in past times, it's been the case that the expertise built up to do the work has also tended not to be carried over.

So part of the answer for that is the leadership team rotation that Cheryl described earlier on, and I want to go over that. Part of it is also us looking at a committee, and this is under Cheryl's leadership this year. We've initiated a couple of things. One has been to revise the SOI, as mentioned, so the SOI for this year is much more practical for our candidates to use, and that was handled by one subcommittee that Cheryl asked the Committee to drive.

And another one that she asked to drive that I Chaired is one looking at bylaw revisions, specifically -- and this is of importance to the CSG -- with regards to the makeup of the Nominating Committee for constituencies like NPOC, which are part of the same house that you are part of, the NCPH.

So things like that, NPOC do - not having a seat on the Nominating Committee at the moment, although they are part of the NCPH. So things like that, we are looking at. We are also looking at whether current terms - one year terms is the optimal solution, or should those terms be extended? We are looking - so a subcommittee is working on that. It has produced some work that has gone to the Nom-Com, and if the Nom-Com approves that work, it will then go to the Board.

And one last thing I want to mention in that process is that the Board itself has convened a working group on the Nominating Committee that is chaired

by George Sadowsky. This was confirmed and a resolution passed in February this year. And the aim of that working group is also to look at the way the Nom-Com works. Its size, its composition, and the way it carries out its recruitment function.

Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I - just before we ask any questions, and I'm sure I don't need to say this, but when we have a Board Review Committee running, it needs to work on good intel and opinion from community. So should your group have an opinion on the size, the structure, the function, and the remit that it has to look at Nom-Com, it may, for example, come with a model that they believe is worthwhile with a much smaller number of people at the table.

That is as likely as any other outcome.

So should you have an opinion, it is probably wise to formulate that and send it to George and his team's attention, because in the absence of the opinion of the community, they will simply make recommendations and decisions that we then will have to perhaps argue about at the other end of the process.

So we're going to be very busy. This could get lost in the rush. So if you think it's important, you may want to put it on your agenda.

And I guess it's back to you and open for questions.

Man: Okay, thank you, Cheryl.

I have some questions, but before I ask mine, does anybody else want to raise anything?

Okay.

Questions I had were I had assumed, maybe incorrectly, that the Board Review Committee, that would go out for public comment, whatever comes out. Is that an assumption I shouldn't make then?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, I'm sure that any change could only happen after a public comment.

Man: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But the models that are put out for public comment may or may not be influenced by the information coming to the Board/Committee while it's doing its formulation. It is not a committee that is outside of Board. It is only those Board members.

Man: Okay, thanks.

Another question I had. I'm not sure if I should ask this, but I'm going to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) that your very hard stop on the 1st of April, from that we should infer that the response that you've had to date is probably enough to give you a good feeling that you can stop then. Is that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, let me answer you with brutal and absolute honesty. I can't say quantitatively that that is the case, because we have more applications in process and they may or may not complete.

So until they complete or not...

Man: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...I can't give that sort quantitative.

But let me assure you, I'm interested in the quality, not the quantity.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Van Gelder: And I'm - just to let you know - this is Stephane Van Gelder again. Just to let you know, if you go to the Nom-Com Web site, Nom-Com.icann.org, and you follow the links there, you will find one link which is for the 2013 Committee's final report, and at 2014, we'll be producing a final report as well. And in those reports, you will find the breakdown of the - in terms of quantitative this time, not qualitative, of the applications received.

So the question you're asking, right now we're not at liberty to answer you, but that will be made public.

Man: So that's been the reason for the extension in the past normally?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, it is, and it's the reason that I've said since I took the Chair there will be no extensions. (And now I'm concerning) there will be no extensions.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Right. Okay.

Man: Are we perfectly clear?

Man: Okay, thanks.

The final question I had was on the Board members, the positions you have for the Board, you obviously get input from the community back on what they would like to see. Do you take into account the fact that there will be holes

appearing in the Board with people who have particular qualities as well who will be stepping down? Is that something you will be (unintelligible)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What do you mean by stepping down?

Man: Well, certain Board members have certain expertise that normally means they end up in certain - with certain responsibilities.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) and risk, et cetera, exactly. Yes. Yes.

Man: And that would be a factor you would look at with replacing...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, that's critical information, and one of the reasons, for example, there's been an election in the At Large Advisory world at the moment with their - they have a Seat 15, which I'm sure you're familiar with. And that election has been running, and is in fact completed now today.

And why that had to be completed today was because we need to know who will be sitting in Seat 15 because we absolutely take that into account. It is critical information.

So, we look at the mix and skill sets, and the needs analysis, and we can of course only appoint from the people who've put in applications, so that still means we need diversity and a good group of people to put in their applications.

And in terms of the quality and quantity, if I just may finish on this, it should be clear, we use (OB) in an interview process to help us with the soft skills analysis, but we are also using a different office of (OB) as a search firm.

Man: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So they will be providing people from their expertise and (unintelligible). Okay?

Man: Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Always a pleasure.

Man: Okay, and thank you very much. We do take this seriously, as you will gather from the (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good.

Man: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks a lot.

Man: Okay, so apologies (once going) that we couldn't get into the room quickly and set up, and we are recovering time, so I'm not going to go around and do the round of introductions that we normally do because we have a formal agenda.

                                 But for those around the table and those behind, I would ask that you could complete the sign-on sheets. If they haven't gone to the rest, could they be passed back, please?

                                 So Mikey, if we can show the agenda?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, here's how you do it.

                                 You use the little arrow and just click that, that way you can drive. I know (unintelligible)...

Man: And we're through the first item, which was the update from the Nominating Committee.

And the next thing, and something that's getting a lot of prominence here is the Internet governance issue.

(Unintelligible). Yes. Does it (unintelligible)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay.

Now various people in the constituency have been involved in the debates - (unintelligible)?

Okay, thanks.

Have been involved in the debates so far, so I think the first thing to do here would be just to position this in terms of there's a lot coming up. There's certainly the activities within ICANN itself which are taking place currently, and this constituency has a number of people involved those, including the community-wide working group.

And, I would ask Olivier and (Alain) to bring us up-to-date with some of the issues coming out of there, and the fact that we're now at a stage where there's an output document.

And that will be fed into the meeting - NETmundial meeting in Brazil that's coming up shortly, and again people from this constituency will be involved in that session.

I'll ask (Tony) to maybe pick up on that point, who's very close to the organization of that meeting.

And then, we should have some discussion about the recent announcement for the transition of the IANA function and what that means for out constituency, how we're going to engage within that.

And finally, just to make people aware that this is a whole series of activities, and I don't think anyone's under any illusions about the importance of that and how it fits together over the next year.

So maybe we can start if I could turn to - Olivier if you could say a few words about where we are currently with the working group?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, happy to do so. Thank you.

Well, the start of the cross-constituency working group on Internet Governance was basically when the Brazil Conference on Internet Governance was announced, and there, the group decided to file a contribution to that conference, and that was the main work that has been undertaken in the last weeks.

The paper has been filed. It has already been discussed in the open sessions that we had on Monday, and the cross-constituency working group was now asking the community for further input and further contributions on that paper that by the way can be - it's published on the Web site of the NETmundial Conference, so you can find it there.

And so in the public session on Monday, we collected the further input of the community and mainly there were two questions in the room. The first one was should this working group end with the NETmundial conference? The permission be completed then, or should the work go on?

And I understood the comment of the community very clear, like there is a need for an ongoing process and that this working group should exist even after the Brazil conference and go ahead with this work.

The second important point was that there was requested a public comment period for the paper, and I think that is a very good idea. I think it's very important to get further input from the community and to give even those guys that did not attend a session on Monday the opportunity to comment on the paper. So, I think there will be a further comment period that might end after the Sao Paulo conference so that we will not have all the input and the comments and the new version of this paper ready when the conference starts.

But anyway, I think this is a very important process, as we of course - in particular in this group have to show that we are working in a multistakeholder bottom-up model.

Yes, that's on the paper and the activity so far.

I think one thing is very important to make here, and we have to make a little distinction, but we'll discussion about this - so a discussion of the IANA function, which is of course also part of the Internet governance discussion and Internet governance in general. And then that was also a (unintelligible) on the session on Monday as well as agreed within the working group.

The working group is addressing Internet governance, let me say, as a whole. It is - there has been a front against the background of the Sao Paulo conference, which is, as you well know, addressing the general question how Internet governance principles should be involved, and what the further roadmap for the development of Internet governance on a global level should be.

And this is what the working group is addressing. And of course, it's overlapping with discussions about the transition of the IANA function, so there is an overlap and so I think this discussion will also be part of the discussion within the working group.

And - but I think it's important to point out that this is not the only and not the main focus of the terms of Internet governance that we're dealing with.

The last point in the working group is discussing to get a charter, which I also think is very important, and you know that one of the main themes that are discussed in terms of Internet governance is the question of accountability and legitimacy, and that makes it very important from my perspective that this working group will have a charter in order to guarantee processes that everybody agreed on to become legitimate and accountable.

Yes, that's the current status, and (Alain), is there something you'd like to add?

(Alain): Yes. I would like to add a few things. The first thing that is that it is a very, very real cross-committee working group. All constituencies (unintelligible) have been engaged in that working group. (Unintelligible) has been engaged also, so that is a good sign to see that all form of organization is so - ASAC have been really engaged in that work. It's really, really representative of the ICANN community is the first thing.

The second thing I want to add is as ISPCP, we have been really engaged in that work. I think we are one of the few constituencies that where it were to be attending I think all of the meetings. We have been represented to all of the meetings. Myself, I've been attending the - there were 12 meetings. I have been at nine. And Olivier has been at as well nine or ten meetings. I think (unintelligible) one of the meetings, or two maybe. So we represent at all the meeting and engaging, and that's really important.

The third thing I want to add is that there was a deadline, so the (unintelligible) was approved by the members of the working group and met by the (unintelligible) by the constituencies, and that's clear that the deadline which was the 8th of March (unintelligible) from our endorsement from the constituencies. But I think it's important to - that this was sent to the NETmundial as an input from ICANN community, and we should consider an endorsement of these documents, even if we say there is some recommend - this document - is it a perfect one, in terms of best one over time that we - ICANN was able to draft?

But there was some important (decisions) in that document, as well as messages for people attending ICANN, participating in ICANN for long time could be self-evident supporting the multistakeholder model and what is a multistakeholder model? Support for a single (unintelligible) - support for the single Internet?

But if you (unintelligible) to the contribution can be too granular, is (most evident) and not so evident for some of the people that will be attending the meeting in Brazil.

So I think this - the fact that this document exist is very important and I think it would be very, very good to endorse the document and (unintelligible) endorsed or validated by the participants of the working group.

Man: Thanks, (Alain).

I'd like to come back to the issue of endorsement in a moment. But before that, are there any questions from anybody?

Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Hats off to the both of you for all of that scramble and work and stuff like that.

I wrote down before you started talking about it, the charter thing. I think - I just want to sign on that that's something that's really on my mind too.

Is there any thought being given as to how that charter would get approved? Is it going to go back to the AC's and SO's to be approved by - you know, so come back to the Council and come back to the ALAC?

You know, is there any process laid out? Any kind of a plan as to how to get that done?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm not aware of - (that there's) a process being discussed, but I would absolutely support that this has to be - come back into the constituencies and to - and not only to be drafted on the community working group level. I would support that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

I think that it's fine to have it drafted there, but it would be nice I think to have it get endorsed because there's a kind of momentum that gets picked up.

I mean one of the things that happened really late - really late, like the day before deadline on the Council list, was there was a sudden flurry of interest in this thing, and some hesitancy, and you know it would be nice to have it - you know, a charter that's endorsed. You know, "Look. They did what they said they were going to do." You know, "What's this thing?"

You know, that was a vulnerability I thought for the document, because there wasn't a charter. It was easy for a person to sort of say, you know, "This is isn't legitimate. It's just an ad-hoc group." You know this whole thing.

So I think the charter would be a really helpful deal.

The only other question I had is really a question for the room. Could we get a show of hands of who is going to Brazil, if anybody?

Wow. Holy mackerel.

Man: Impressive.

Mikey O'Connor: That's fabulous. Way to go ISPC.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Outstanding.

Well, that's it for me.

Man: Okay. Thanks, Mikey.

With the issue of the charter, that's going to bring a few things to a head I think, because the interaction of this group and any other group that's maybe looking at the IANA transition, there's likely to be some other (app) potentially there. So having a charter should clarify some of that hopefully.

And, I assume, Mikey, from previous experience, that approval would probably be done at the SO/AC level. Is that correct (unintelligible)?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm thinking back to the DSSA Charter, and that was approved by the respective counsels.

Man: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: And so presumably in our chunk of the world, it would go all the way down to the constituencies and the Counselors with (cherry back).

Man: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: And to the extent that something needed to be changed, it would seem to me that it would be pushed back to the working group for revision. You know, we'd just echo back and forth until we got to one we liked.

Man: Okay, thanks.

Man: (Unintelligible). Happy to do that.

Well, we all know that this meeting is happening in the City of Sao Paulo on April the 23 and 24. There are some entities, at least the association I represent, (Capasa), did present the ten principles which were - there was a request on the Web site when you sign up for this event if you want to submit any proposals. And, we did submit our ten principles.

I believe Abranet was at the table here, Eduardo Parajo sitting over here. I think I saw something from your association too, right?

Eduardo Parajo: Yes. We did in the same way. We submit the ten principles that (unintelligible) to the meeting.

Man: Thank you.

So basically, as you've seen from the show of hands, there will be quite a good representation of our industry there. There are people from Argentina that aren't here that were going also, and I would imagine from some other countries, too, who are not here in Singapore today.

Basically, I would ask a question. Is there any issue - anybody here on - here would like us to raise in this forum - I mean, that is of interest to us, something we want to preserve or suggest in the event? We'd be happy to take it to the mic.

Man: So on that basis, (Alain), your suggestion I think was that as a constituency, we just endorse the one statement, and that's - sorry, what...

(Alain):   Yes. I think - I can - the ISP's and telecom operators community sent to the Brazil (unintelligible). I'm aware we as a (unintelligible) submitted a contribution. I'm aware of a - we were involved (unintelligible) contribution coming from (unintelligible), which is a member of this constituency. There was - we were also involved in a contribution coming from (unintelligible).

                        I'm aware of a contribution coming from Telefonica and there's one coming from (unintelligible), so all committee being member of ISPC or not, submitted a contribution to the NETmundial, but something very significant.

Man: So on that basis, what would you say was the rational for a constituency endorsement of the cross-community statement?

(Alain):   Simply because it is - it is coming from (unintelligible) coming from overall ICANN community. That's perfectly a very good signal for - as a participant in Brazil and as a world that ICANN was involved as a (unintelligible) organization to agree on a (recommended) input to Brazil.

Man: Okay, thanks.

                        Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: (Alain), are there any significant conflicts between our (ccWTE) product and the other ones? I mean, is there anything that would be a block?

(Alain):   I would confess that I haven't read - have read all contribution coming from all industry for the (unintelligible) in Sao Paulo, but I don't see any conflict with the one we were involved in directly. The (Aetna) one, the (unintelligible) one,

the (arranged) one, as well as the (unintelligible) one on Telefonica. I'm not a member of it (unintelligible).

I don't think - see any conflict here.

Man: Okay, thanks.

Sorry. (Chris)?

(Chris):   Can you clarify one thing? (Tony), I think on the list we had been talking about potentially this group signing on to a couple of different submissions. One was one that CCIA had drafted, another was one that ISOC had drafted just talking about basic principles of multistakeholderism. Did we - we did not officially sign on to either one of those. Is that correct?

(Tony):   Well, that I'm not sure of because Wolf was left running with that, and he isn't on - able to join us online. So, I'm not sure how that resolved.

(Chris):   I don't - having just looked online, I don't believe that we did send it into things. NETmundial actually has a nice little Web site where they can check that sort of thing. I don't believe that we did. I just wanted to clarify...

(Alain):   We haven't signed at this stage to any contribution. We haven't signed to any of this. That's clear.

On the - one reason for that it was in my view difficult to sign without knowing which contribution were coming in from ICANN and from whole community or members of (unintelligible).

Maybe it was a bit premature to sign the (unintelligible) to one contribution not knowing what (unintelligible) where exactly.

(Chris):   Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Eduardo's in the queue.

Man: Yes. Sorry.

Eduardo Parajo: I just would like to make a point here because I know that ISPC here is composed by ICP's, content providers, and telcos also. Is really clear for me that in Brazil we have a different position between the telcos and the ISP's in one point, (unintelligible). So basically, our contribution to NETmundial is based on the (CGIDR) ten principles, and most of the point is about the (unintelligible).

So if you see all the contributions, basically all the telco companies are asking to have a different way to handle the (unintelligible). And our contribution is based on the principle to keep the (unintelligible). So, I don't know if the ISPC, we will have some statement on that, but this is very important for the content and the - for the ISP's, and the hosting (unintelligible), all these guys.

So basically, I believe this is only the issue, or only the points that we need to discuss a little bit about.

Man: Well, thank you for raising that, but even within Europe there are different views on that. You've tried (unintelligible) - the ISP constituency, I think we need to stay right out of that debate, because it's not going to go anywhere here for sure.

So (Alain)'s proposal was that - I think you were proposing that we would offer endorsement for the ICANN statement. And we're going to have to be very careful if we were to endorse anything else, particularly some of them

are going to mention that net neutrality somewhat. Clearly the ones that do, we would have to bypass those.

So it seems the easiest and straightforward way would be to offer support for the ICANN statement, which (Alain) was suggesting.

And maybe, I think the members here are well aware where we have a common view on all of the issues, and we would rely on you people who are on the ground in Brazil to basically look after that perspective there, if that's an acceptable way.

Man: I think basically defending the multistakeholder model would be the base.

Man: Absolutely.

Man: And we would probably be called on to support that. And nobody has a problem with that I guess, right?

Man: Oh, I got a big problem. Working groups. I hate them.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Alain):   (Unintelligible). I think - yes, I think it's a very useful document. It's a very good document, and I think it's also good for the visibility of our constituency to have our constituency (unintelligible).

Man: Okay.

(Alain):   (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you.

Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm not sure about how the conference in Brazil would be organized in terms of open mics and things like that, that we know from ICANN. And - but I don't think that all of the ISP representatives will have the chance to contribute with something.

Maybe we could agree on if one of us has the chance, that he - as we agree on the general statements anyway, that we can also speak in the name of the other associations that are at the conference in order to give the ISP voice more weight. I mean, if (Tony) has the chance, I would be happy if you could mention that in the European ISP's are there as well and that you are representing the ISPC with ICANN, that you represent your own association.

I think the more we mention who is there, the better it is for the weight of our voice.

Just a suggestion. I would agree (unintelligible).

Man: I think that's a good proposal. We would have - those of you there would have to take care on the fact that if there's any particular association on an issue like net-neutrality, then we need to tread very carefully on that if we talk about the ISPCP.

Eduardo?

Eduardo Parajo: I think that this is a good idea. I don't - the model that I heard how the meetings were going probably is not a lot opportunity to - some people to talk about. But I agree that we need to keep the multistakeholder model, and I also will defend this in our proposal. This is important.

And also one of the things that we did this statement through Abranet is that the government of course can participate, but not in majority. So basically, we're talking about the multistakeholder model with the civil society and the government that is the different levels of that, okay.

Man: Okay. Thank you. It seems so we do have a way forward on that.

So everyone's okay with that.

We should move on I think on the agenda.

So the next item we have is the issue that some of you would've heard about over the past few days. The issue of the reports from the strategic panels and the documents that they published. There's a link here that refers to the announcements. And from there, you can pick up the various reports.

Now the - yesterday, there was a session that focused in on that saying one of them was of a particular interest to us, as ISP's, and it was ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem. And (Alain) had initially raised - I think alerted a number of us to the point that within that document there were some diagrams in particular that were of concern to ISP's.

The - some of you may be able to get it up as I'm speaking. But the drawing that showed the ecosystem itself clearly had ISP's recognized within that, but the links it showed linked us to the European Union and to the ITU, which seemed a rather crazy thing to do, because we had no links with ICANN and we had no links with the RIR's either.

So I don't know whether that was code for the fact that the ITU has ambitions about being a distributor of IP addresses, and that's where we're heading, but it was a crazy situation. And, we did raise concerns about that during those discussions.

We need to follow that up and we need to get some comments back on that document in particular.

The public comment period is open to the 30th of April, and I think it's beholden on us to actually provide that input back, particularly as they're going - it was an issue that was raised during the cross-constituency meeting today.

There was a lot of confusion yesterday over the reports, whether they were even going to be updated and have a public comment period, but one question was asked, "What are you going to do with that input? Are you going to publish an updated version?" There seemed to be some confusion. That was clarified by Bruce Tonkin this morning, and certainly I made a note to the fact that he stated there would be a later iteration of the documents.

So with that in mind I would suggest that we should work towards providing some input back. And I just wanted to make a note of anybody willing to contribute to that to help review the documents and to provide any comments.

So I've identified one in particular, the role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem. The others, the responsibility framework for multistate holder, the one on innovation, and the identifier one.

The identifier one has a lot of relevance for ISPs. I would suggest that what we do with the other three is to ask people to look at those and use the ISP mailing list to flag any concerns, whether we go back on those.

But in terms of the first one, the role in the Ecosystem to form a definitive team here with people to work on that reviewing and get some comments from the constituency.

So with that in mind I will raise my hand to be part of that, but would certainly welcome some support from others to join that work.

(Alain): I would be able to contribute here.

Man: Thanks (Alain). Does anybody else want to work on the initial draft with (Alain) and myself? I don't know if you've had a chance to look at that (unintelligible), or whether you would want to join.

Man: Yes, by the way, I (unintelligible). Sorry to be late. Yes, that's some ideas to contribute, but my current problem is it's really difficult to find the time for this. I'm really (unintelligible). Sorry about that.

Man: Okay. Well let's run with an initial draft from (Alain) and I which we'll circulate and try and push that through as a response back from the ISPCP. Does anybody else want to raise any issues at this stage over that report or any of the other three reports?

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry. Yes, please.

(Izumi): Yes, so this is (Izumi) from J.P. Nick, not for this particular strategy panel or the previous topic on - across community working groups, I feel like the ISPCP has - can have input and a perspective that's a little bit different from a lot of the other stakeholder groups in the way that we can see things on how some of the decisions affect operations.

So in terms of going back to the previous agenda on the IONA transition, I think there's a lot of discussions over the accountability. That's also

important. But in addition to that, maybe we can also think about how can we give input in terms of okay, how would this affect the stability of the Internet.

So maybe if a SSAC Report comes out, maybe we can know, take a look and review that from ISP's perspective.

And another thing that I think might be helpful is there was a lot of discussions on doing more outreach to the communities outside of the ICANN. And I think a lot of us have, you know, communication channels and people that you know outside of the ICANN community. So I think that might be one of the areas that we can help. That's just my thoughts.

Man: No, that's a very useful comment. I never raised as an issue our input into the IONA transition discussion because at this stage it's really difficult to see how that's going to be progressed, both within ICANN and outside of ICANN as well.

Clearly we have to get involved in that. But until we see how some of these processes start to evolve, it's quite difficult to make a first stab at that. So I would suggest that that's going to pick up pace pretty quickly.

And probably as our time passes and we have our constituency calls, that's going to become more and more an issue for us. But at this stage it's really hard to see how it fits.

And even the remarks from (Bolivar) on the continuation of the cross-community working group, I don't fully understand how that's going to get involved in that issue and how it's going to relate to some of the other discussions in the GNSO and other parts of ICANN.

(Izumi): May I make a comment on that?

Man: Yes, please

(Izumi): So I agree with the thought - (Izumi) from J.P. Nick again. I agree with Tony that at this stage we don't really, you know, know what's happening so it's a little bit difficult to make a concrete move.

But what we plan to do within J.P. Nick is think of ways on how we communicate the topic that's relevant to the ISPs, and how we can communicate the message. Because if we just explain everything the way that's discussed here, people are going to think okay, maybe nothing to do with us so much from the ISP perspective.

So once we come up with something good, hopefully we can come up with a good idea, we're happy to share it with the rest of you. And hopefully we can, you know, share our perspective. Or maybe this would be an effective way of communicating with our communities.

Man: That would be very welcome. I think that's great. A great idea. Thank you very much.

Okay, the last bullet on this particular agenda item is an update on the GNSO review. So if I can just turn to either one of our Counselors to just bring us up-to-date; where that situation is poised currently.

Mikey O'Connor: We got a briefing from a Board member that is running it whose name just flew out of my head.

Man: Is it (Ray)?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, (Ray)...

Man: (Ray Patterson)?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, (Ray Patterson), and the GNSO Counselor (Jim Wolff) who's the liaison with that, and there was big news there.

(Fadi) has been taking a lot of stuff off the table to sort of make room for the IONA transition work. And one of the things that's changed is that GNSO review is now not going to take a look at restructuring the GNSO, it's only going to look at improvements like the ones that were in Appendix to the ATRT 2 Report that Mark had something to do with and knows more about than me.

So if you have questions about that, I'm just putting you on notice, and they'll point at you.

And so the sort of panicky, you know, will we have a constituency in the morning kind of very disruptive possibility seems to be gone for this round of the review.

And I think a soon as (Ray) said that which was right at the beginning, everybody just tuned out and said oh fine; whatever, and didn't pay any attention.

And so, you know, I'll turn to ask (Faldo) you know, that was the big news for me. And then I proceeded not to pay much attention after that. You know it's kind of a mechanical improvement sort of thing.

Undoubtedly a lot of good ideas that will come forward, but the profound change that might have resulted I think, is now off the table for this event. So that's sort of the brief summary, and we can make up stuff if you want more detail.

Man: Well no. I mean don't know whether you have anything to add (unintelligible).

For me personally, I'm somewhat disappointed in that because the last reviewer at the GNSO didn't leave the commercial stakeholder groups. And the ISPs in particular which is our concern, in a particularly good place.

And I actually viewed the ability to have some structural change as something that would have been advantageous to this constituency. And earlier when we'd had some discussion within the constituency about the possible review, we had some thoughts about how we would like to make some proposals and some changes.

Obviously we can't do that now. That's off the table and we're going to be left functioning the way that we are. I don't think it's a particular good result for us.

Out of all the constituencies I think, you know, ISPs are probably going to be more disappointed than a lot of the others with our announcement. But hey, if it's a decision that's been taken at the very top of ICANN, we're not going to be able to change it.

What we will need to do as it proceeds forward -- and my final question Mike is if we're going down the route of making tweaks and improving some of the things that came out of the ATRT to adhere, was there any indication of time scales that's going to be expected?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. There was an indication of time scales. I can't remember, but my recollection was on the order of pretty long - two to three year kind of thing.

And the point come up either during that discussion or afterwards, if the review happen every five years, and the process takes three years then we're basically constantly in review.

But, you know, it's long. You know there were phases - there's a whole slide deck which I'm sure I can rummage out of the GNSO working sessions and circulate to the group, which I will take an action to do.

Man: Okay, thanks Mikey. What it does mean is it's off the table for us now, and we've got a pretty full agenda so I'm going to move us along on that one.

And it's your favorite subject Mikey, domain name collisions. Just to provide a little bit of background on this again, a number of us in the constituency who've been involved with it still have concerns over collisions.

The disappointment for me, this morning at the meeting with the Board -- the CSG meeting -- was when we raised this. And we raised this because there appears to be a feeling within the Board in certain places that everything is fine on domain name collisions. It's not a big issue and everything is looking good going ahead.

And it (unintelligible) responsible for us as ISPs to actually subscribe to that when the truth is we really do not know. We don't know the scour of the problem and we're not sure of the measures; how effective they would be in dealing with that.

That was the focus of our message this morning, just to get it on the Board's agenda to say that part of your community who are actively involved in the issues around (unintelligible), still have real concerns.

It was disappointing to hear a response back which well, you know, we don't want to talk about it in an inflammatory way. Just take the heat out of it and just sit back and watch which was really the message I heard, and I think the message that Mikey and I heard again after the meeting.

But Mikey, do you want to say a few words of where we are on this? And maybe a few as to where we go from here, if anywhere with this?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey and I'm going to sort of clump some things together. Tony Harris and several others of us were visiting before the meeting about the issue of universal acceptance. And then there's IDN variance, and then there's name collisions.

And I'm sort of gluing that together with (Izumi)'s comment a minute ago. It seems like we have an opportunity to mount and spearhead sort of an authoritative campaign to inform our respective communities about all these issues.

And Tony was saying, "Give me a piece of paper. I can read a speech and I'll get a lot of people's attention about universal acceptance."

And you know we've got this name collision thing. So I just want to plant the seed that that's - and then, you know, if you tie that into outreach, I don't know exactly where all those things fit together, but it does seem like there was a possibility to do something really interesting there.

So let me kind of back up to name collision. The status of name collisions right now is that the report is out. It's out for public comment. I think the public comment period will end on April 7. And the difficulty is the fact that half of the report has been held back because of a security issue that happens in dot com. It doesn't have anything to do with the new gTLD program but it's a very severe problem that will apparently be revealed in this part of the report is published.

So from a policy perspective there's this puzzle. It's like wait a minute, half the report isn't published and we're supposed to do public comments on this report, but we don't know what's in it.

So I raise that on Saturday or Sunday or something in the weekend session. And (Mike Filber) was there and he did the same thing then that he did today

was he sort of launched off on this chicken little, you know, thing about threat to human life and, you know, how that's overblown and so on.

So I have yet to figure out a way to present this to make it clear that I don't know what's going on. I mean the underlying issue is that we do not know.

And so I'll take another run at it in the Board meeting because this name collision issue is on the Board agenda and it's essentially going to be JAS giving the same update that they gave yesterday.

The interesting thing is that one of my domain names was used to conduct those tests. Cork.com is a domain name that I registered long before the Web and long before anybody realized that the Internet was cool.

And it gets a lot of air traffic. If you put Cork.com on the list of name collision names, out of the 1900 or 1400 names, Cork.com would be 20th on that list, so it gets a lot of air traffic. It gets on the order of two million queries a day with fairly light TTL.

And the recommendation that JAS is making -- and this is important for us to tell our communities -- is they're essentially going to put a signal. Their recommendation is that as a name gets delegated, the first 120 days after delegation they will wildcard the whole domain to an internal loop back address.

You know that a loop back address in a PC is 127 dot zero, dot zero, dot one usually. But that 127 series is actually a full...

Man: Slash 8.

Mikey O'Connor: ...slash 8, right. Thank you for helping me out with that because I was cranking.

And so they've picked 127 dot zero, dot 53, dot 53 as the wildcard address. And the reason they picked that is because 53 is the port for DNS. And so they though well this might be a clue for a really clever administrator which I think is true, but it would be a cleverer administrator than me.

But they also picked it because it's unusual enough that it's likely to get picked up by the search engines which it has. If you do a search on 127 dot zero, dot 53, dot 53, you do wind up at the ICANN Web page that explains this problem that there are a lot of pretty good resources that float right to the top of search. So that's pretty neat.

The other things that's very appealing about it is that -- and they debated; there was a list that went with this and I participated in that debate -- there was a debate about whether to use an internal loopback address or whether to use an internal network address; a local net address like a 10 dot or a 192 dot where the traffic would leave the machine but could go to a defined machine on the internal Net which could then be set up to receive that traffic and respond. You know it could come back with an error message or something like that.

And then the third option that they looked at was that the signal would be to an ICANN housed honeypot site like that.

They elected not to let the traffic leave the local machine for a whole bunch of really good reasons, and I won't go into those, but I agree with those reasons. And we tested it in Cork.com because it gets so much traffic.

And so as you may recall, I've been pretty nervous about what happens if something changes with these domain collision requests. And so I spent a fairly sleepless night the night before we did this test because, you know, one of the biggest traffic sources on Cork.com is U.S. Renal Care which is distributed kidney dialysis services provider. It's an international company.

And I could just imagine my little 127 address hitting a kidney dialysis machine and killing grandma. And you know I probably wouldn't be able to buy clothing, never mind come to ICANN meetings after they sued me into the Stone Age.

So I had a fairly sleepless night and some conversations with lawyers before that night. And then we ran the tests on the first day for an hour, the second day for six hours, and the third day for 12 hours to see what would happen.

And the answer was nothing happened. We got no email from anybody. You know we had all this stuff embedded in the DNS records. We had text records in the DNS that said, and this is where the phrase imminent possibility of harm to human life, just the thing that (Silber) has launched on.

And it's like (unintelligible) man, it's in your report. But I'll figure out a way to present this.

And I was astounded. You know I have 150 million IP addresses or sources of traffic to Cork.com in the inventory. And I thought for sure one out of 150 million addresses would ring me up and say what's going on.

So we ran that test. That was before the report was issued. And then they gave me - they were hosting the DNS for that. They gave me back DNS and I just put that same zone into the DNS server that's running there now.

So if you want to try it, if you go to any, you know, any third level name, dot Cork dot com you'll see what happens, it's nothing you know. It just doesn't resolve.

And it's been running for six weeks and I still haven't gotten any calls, any reports; nothing. And so I'm kind of conflicted at this point because there is no underlying data. I mean this is just anecdotal. You know there's no analysis,

there's no data under this. But this one anecdotal result is pretty much a non-event.

So that's kind of the status of things. We've got this sort of puzzler. And Jeff has gone on. He's now working with vendors, especially the browser vendors where they're going to burn that 127 dot zero, dot 53, dot 53 address into the browser code so that if you go to that at some point in the future in a browser in a Web browser, it will come up with an error message that's local to the machine.

So again, we're always keeping the traffic local to the machine to make sure that we don't let confidential stuff go away that will say something like, you know, please forward this screen to your network administrator, you have serious problems with your DNS. I don't know what the language will be.

They're also talking to, you know, other vendors with the same sort of goal in mind which is to actually use that string as a flag to indicate that there's something you ought to do. And it's partly because of the lack of response at Cork.com.

So that's kind of a long story but it's an interesting story for us as ISPs. And that's kind of what I've got.

Man: I have a question Mikey. There are more than 300,000 new top level domains registered. And as far as I know, the 120 days period where you can't allocate the names on the domain name collision list starts when the contract is signed with ICANN.

So that would mean that meanwhile some of the name collision list domains should have been resisted. Is there any experience about if there's trouble with them?

Mikey O'Connor: I will turn this over to the proud owner of a new dot (unintelligible), right.

Man: Yes, things I could say about this. So I've actually gone ahead and tried this out and registered in some of the active domains and not seen any collision effects, where I actually have the same name locally as I do in the public domain.

One of the things - so that's my answer. I have - I've just tried to experiment with some names, so that's not a broad experiment. But I've not had a problem.

One of the things that I've done with a co-author is deal with one of the JAS recommendations and write an Internet draft that actually reserves the name - the strings that are at the topmost of the list of Interaisle's report of collisions.

And so it reserves names like dot host, dot mail, dot and so on. It actually - the current Internet draft actually reserves eight names - eight strings. What's been sort of surprising about that is that both the ISG and ICANN had pushed back against that draft.

And in the case of ICANN one of the reasons that they pushed back is that two of the strings are currently in contract negotiations.

So to actually get an Internet draft from the IAD or the ISG that says these strings are reserved, while ICANN goes ahead and puts them in the root is a real problem.

So one of the things that's a problem with the JAS report, and I'm going to move up a level here - one of the things about the JAS report is that I'm not that surprised about (Silber)'s response and the Board's response because the JAS report effectively says, except for three strings, it's good to go. Just go ahead and do it.

So I'm sure that's the takeaway message from the Board. And I'm sure the Board hasn't heard the ISP community, I think. There's a real disconnect between what the ISPs are saying and what they're hearing from their own commission report.

The other thing I'll say is there is clearly, right now, a disconnect between the ISG and ICANN. And the ISG is clearly moving - one of the problems is frankly, is that it's not good enough to go talk to the browser vendors and say okay, for a particular IP address we want you to show a particular message.

What needs to happen is resolvers actually have to have a mechanism by which when they are asked to go resolve a particular string, that they have a mechanical way to find out what reserve strings there are, and they currently don't have a way to do that.

The reserve strings could cut down on the population of name collisions right, because you could cut out the top eight, top ten; pick whatever number you want; top 20 if you wanted to get down to dot corp.

And one of the things that we see happening this week is that there's a move of afoot to write a standard for resolvers that would actually go out and look at a list of reserve names.

Of course that requires the standards process to crank away. And while there is some commitment on the ISG's part to do that quickly, ICANN is also hearing from registries and registrars who would like to make money at this to go get those names allocated to the root.

And the process of the ISG doing some work, and ICANN doing this work is an interesting conflict here.

So in answer to the base question yes, I've gone and done some experiments here I've not had. With the very small set of experiments I've done, I've not had significant problems with collisions.

But the other news here is that there's work afoot to try to implement some of the other recommendations that are in the JAS report. And then the other thing I would say, and it's an observation of my point being here this week, is that I'm not at all surprised that the Board doesn't think this is a problem.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, there's clearly a - there's a lot of wind behind moving forward. And one of the rationales that Jeff has shared with me is - because what I was asking for over the week was that we extend the comment period until the report is complete.

And Jeff is saying, well we - you know the longer we wait to put these in the root and give those signals, the less effective the signal will be, so we need to do this quickly.

And I heard him say that and it took me a while to process it. And I'm going to try you on this because I, for the life of me, can't figure out why waiting makes the signal less effective. But it kind of caught me - rationale kind of caught me by surprise.

Has anybody got any reason - anyway, so what the Board is now looking for is a way to maybe reopen the comment period once the report is completed. Meanwhile they can proceed.

And then you get to the question of when's the report going to be complete? And the answer is when the security issue that has been identified is resolved.

Well the security issue sounds really big and complicated and nasty and it may take a long time to resolve it. And I think that's part of the reason that

they're struggling. You know it's like if it's a tank, I see a land here now and (unintelligible).

Man: I'm not sure I understand (unintelligible) because I've read your reports of course. My understanding that there is a security issue and is that documented in the report because it has to be fixed before briefing issues are common (unintelligible) rule with ICANN to use it already?

But my understanding is that it is not really related to the name collisions. So in that situation where it is not related to the name collision, why should we extend the comment period.

Mikey O'Connor: This is a really weird situation. The - I will confirm that is not related to name collision in any in new gTLDs. It has nothing to do with new gTLDs.

The problem is apparently, according to Jeff, I mean this is - I've been studiously avoiding understanding that the real problem is. But apparently once they reveal the data and analysis it will become clear with the security vulnerability is.

You know a security vulnerability in dot com, it's not in a new TLD, but they have to fix it because if they don't fix it and they release their data, bad guys will figure out how to exploit it. So it's like kind of a puzzle palace deal.

Man: I understand that. Again, how useful would it be to extend the comment period in that situation, given the fact that the proposal is a just proposal. It's all related to name collisions.

Mikey O'Connor: Well from the policy standpoint the problem is that we need to be able to see the methodology that used to come to their conclusion so that we can evaluate whether it's right or not.

Basically the report right now says well we did a bunch of research and here are our conclusions. Trust us, we did our research well. You know we can't tell you our methods, we can't tell you the data sources, we can't tell you the findings, we can't give you any graphs; we can't give you anything.

And so basically where we're at right now as policy makers is we basically have to trust the contractor. Well that's a pretty unusual circumstance for a fact based policy making organization to be in, and it makes me really uncomfortable.

Man: One of the things that surprised me Mikey was the discussion this morning was suggesting that it was quite easy just to say oh, we're going to go ahead and we'll have another comment period when we get the data because - and it was my understanding, because that's going to be in June, it's no time at all.

What you just said is totally different. You were saying this is quite a big security glitch and there's no telling when the data will be published, which seems to be at odds with the way some Board members were positioning that before lunch.

Mikey O'Connor: Well the security problem is big enough that I don't think anybody really knows when it's going to get resolved. I think people are sort of smoking those (unintelligible) cigarettes and making up a date that pleases people.

The date moved a month between Saturday and today. In Saturday's session with (Cyrus) at the GNSO Council, I asked that question and it was May, and in three days it slipped to June.

So at that rate of slippage it could be December. You know that's the problem with this.

Man: Right. Hello?

Man: If I understand well Mikey, you think the new proposal coming from JAS which is (unintelligible) is revisiting the decision coming from the Board, in a way?

You think that this probably is much better than the previous one, if I understand well?

If this is the case, asking to defer the approval of the proposal, deferring the comment period would not be, mind you, a good solution. As soon as we implement what is already - what is the current proposal in the report, it could be basically (unintelligible) sooner or later.

Because as you (unintelligible) is not satisfactory? The current situation is that there is a blocking list which means nothing. TLD (unintelligible) there could be collision because the blocking list means nothing. The blocking list is only based on that (unintelligible) some years over a very short period of time.

So I think the proposal coming from JAS is a much better one than what it is today. And deferring the comment period until the (unintelligible) is sold, it means deferring it for a very long time would be very negating in that sense.

Mikey O'Connor: So let me just respond to the land and then (Kristin) and anybody else. All those studies that we've done so far have provided varying and improving quality of data about the source of the traffic.

The question that was asked to JAS was what are the effects of that traffic and what are the mechanisms to mitigate those effects?

It's not clear that they've fulfilled the first half of that equation until we see the rest of the report. And if we go in as policy makers and say, well we know where the data is coming from but we don't know what it does, and we like

this proposal better because it gets us to the root faster, I'm not sure where were doing our job as policy makers very well.

So I'm reluctant to subscribe to the theory that this is better because we don't know.

You know, so Verisign ran a seminar in London three weeks ago in which they brought real smart people out, and I participated in that remotely and many of us did I think.

And I took notes; my standard compulsive note taking that you guys see on the list. And the last page of notes is basically all of the researchers saying we still don't know the impact of these transactions. So with that I'll...

Man: so getting down to brass tacks, what we're trying to figure out is whether we are going to respond to half the report, whether we should. And it seems to me like this is an important enough issue that we should put something out from our community.

And part of it should be that we should see more. But do we think this is a clever solution that may solve some problems; we don't know.

What I'm most interested and what I've always been most interested in is getting information out there. And what I do like about this proposal is that it's very Googleable - 127 point zero point 53 point 53. Really, really Googleable.

And so being able to create documentation and get it out there into the world seemed easier under this kind of clever idea.

Again, we need to see the rest of the report to see if we have the right methodology or whether it all works or not. And I think it's okay to say that, and say we still need to know more in a response.

Man: Could I guess that there are recommendations in the report that the ISP community to stand behind right now without seeing any more data. Like there - I mean there are ten recommendations in the report. Some of them are we needed better data.

Well excuse my language, but hell yes, that...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Right, right we certainly need to do that. And there is some recommendations in here that are already being acted upon like reserve some names.

Okay, some of the recommendations that simply don't have enough justification. The Ebero stuff makes no sense to me, and it doesn't seem to be backed up by any -- I think -- any lucid argument.

And there's a recommendation that says you should not do due delegation from the root without any explanation at all about why that's enough.

Now I understand some of the reasons why gTLD is a mess, but I don't see that the Ebero is a better solution, right. I think that's a mess too.

And if the ISPs could very usefully stand behind some of the recommendations and then point out that some of the recommendations simply don't have the data or the justification to - for the community to stand behind. And until that data is available, the ISP community can't support them.

And that the Board - and that it's a real danger here that for operational recommendations like these that the Board doesn't take into consideration the ISP's community guidance, I think that's a real disconnect.

Mikey O'Connor: Please put that in memory storage and stand at the microphone on Thursday and say that to the Board. Are you here Thursday, please god?

Man: Have you got the asbestos suit. I'm certainly - I mean I'm certainly happy, as an individual member of the community to stand up and say there are some things in that report that are important and should be moved on immediately.

But without seeing the data there are some things that the community should not support.

Mikey O'Connor: I mean I think the community is tired of hearing Mikey on this, that's what I'm saying. Most of the concern at this point is that we need some other faces; some other ways of articulating it, etcetera, etcetera.

And so I would encourage people to be ready to stand up at the microphone during that part of the meeting and speaking just as individuals.

Man: And sorry to interrupt. I'm happy - I'm happy to stand up at open mic and do the Mikey impersonation.

I feel - one of the things though, to be honest, is I feel a little differently about it than you do. Yes, but I think - and I'm willing to do this is to bring to the Board's attention that there is no consensus behind some of the recommendations in the report.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes Christian, go ahead.

(Christian): From my perspective I've got a little bit of a different perspective than I think a lot of people. I care less about data than I do about documentation and outreach.

I come from the world of software updates where we're doing massive software updates for a whole bunch of people. I expect stuff to break. I expect

to have to fix it. And as long as things are well documented and people can figure out what the issues are and move past, I don't need to see all the data and figure out what the scope of the problem is. I really want to focus on how do people find solutions to this problem and solve them.

Mikey O'Connor: And I think that gets us back to the point that (Izumi) was making and the point that I led off...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sorry, go ahead.

(Izumi): Actually you must have been reading my mind, so this is a (unintelligible). I really agree with (Christian). And of course we can't fully, you know grasp, you know, the scale of the problem and what impact. Even the experts don't know for sure.

But what we can do at the moment is I think a lot of the people don't even know that the number of gTLDs being delegated. And then, you know, some of these - and sharing these lists of names and asking our customers okay, you know, do any of the names is within your organization, please check.

And if there's any collisions and we can just like show the link to the URL or what you can do as the mitigating within your network that ICANN has already posted, those are the things that we can already do.

And so we can't, you know, fully judge how - you know what percentage of the, you know, collisions in the world is. I think it's impossible for anybody. So yes, sort of try with what we - with what's available. And yes, I really support (Christian)'s approach.

Man: So there are two key questions for us we need to determine here. One is still the issue of whether we put a response back now, and I'm getting the sense that we should. We should work on putting something back.

And the second issue there, and I think it picks up on (Izumi)'s remark is that Mikey does a great job for the constituency every week posting the list of delegated new top level domains.

I wonder if we can also use that at the moment, to try and get some more information out for people who look at that side.

Mikey O'Connor: The weekly post is really complicated. It takes me about five minutes to put it together. And all I do is copy last week's post and stick in the new list, and periodically I find some cool link and I stick it at the bottom.

But this is just like - I'm swinging around to the Web site conversation that (Christian) and I had earlier today which is there is plenty of upward room for improvement in that.

And, you know, maybe (Christian), you and I could sort of - and anybody. You know (Izumi), you could join this too, you know, maybe we put together sort of a Web or an email redesign gang...

(Christian): Not a problem.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and maybe hatch that thing up. Because, you know, it's a breeze to do it. It's an email.

(Christian): We're working an overhaul together.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, done. I'm writing an action for myself and at least (Christian) to overhaul that.

(Izumi): I'll (unintelligible) too.

Mikey O'Connor: And (Izumi). I heard that. I heard that. Okay I think that's kind of it on name collisions. You know Mark, I really like your idea of breaking apart and responding to the recommendations individually rather than in a clump.

Man: But (unintelligible) haven't covered (unintelligible). If we're going to put something back, who's going to work on the draft or put in a response back in, along those lines? Along the lines of these ones we're fine with, but we really struggle with these which I think includes (unintelligible) to me. Could you help with that (Christian), Mikey, and (Izumi); the same people?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Any cries of outreach?

(Christian): I'd be happy to help put something together. It's going to be along - like I said, I'm very interested in pushing outreach and documentation. If that's something that people are comfortable with; happy to help draft it.

Man: Can someone remind me of what the date was for that?

Mikey O'Connor: It's pretty soon. It's like April 7...

Man: Yes, that was the date I had in mind, the 7th of April.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, somewhere in there. So I'm going to do - (Izumi), you want to help with...

(Izumi): Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Anything else on name collision.

Man: I don't think we can do more than that at this stage. (Alain) did you want to join in on that?

(Alain): Yes.

Man: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, so I'll put the four of us together an email after the meeting and (unintelligible).

Man: That would be great.

Mikey O'Connor: Do you want to - well you probably can't contribute.

Man: I don't think we can do more at this point than that. I don't know what other parts of the community are doing. We share concerns over this with the some of the registries as well, but I don't know whether it's on their agenda and I don't know whether - how they're doing it.

But maybe we could make them aware Mikey, just in the corridors (unintelligible) what we're planning to do.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, those (unintelligible) okay.

Man: Like find out if they're also doing anything.

Mikey O'Connor: Well they're - there are a bunch of registries and I'm sure Verizon is in and, you know, there are going to be a lot of comments.

(Tony): Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

(Tony):   Okay thanks. Let's move down. Oh...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony):   Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: That was a smooth segue.

(Tony):   Yeah, it is. And we have some news on that which I'll turn over to (Tony) for - we had a meeting with Chris Mondini earlier in the week here but, (Tony), do you want to walk us through what's potentially on the cards there after the conversation with Chris?

(Tony):   Be happy to do that. (Unintelligible). I'd be happy to do that. We had a conversation, (Tony) and I, with Chris Mondini on - I think it was Sunday. And what's happening is we had proposed a meeting of CEOs from large ISPs and connectivity providers for Latin America. It was an idea I had put forward to coincide with the LatNic meeting in Cancun which is May 4 though May 9.

                And Chris Mondini told us that unfortunately Fadi would not be available and in fact he is no longer interested in setting these meetings up as far as he personally would be involved.

                But there was interest on the part of ICANN to assist in our outreach efforts and build particularly on what's happening in the Lat strategy group where I am working with the ICANN VP for Latin America, with Rodrigo de la Parra.

                And my specific assignment in the steering committee of the Lat strategy group is to come up with events that we can do outreach at during this here. And I was asked to put a - to come up with a calendar of four events which would cover four parts of the Latin American region where ICANN could conduct outreach activities.

And Chris Mondini specifically would help factor in specific ISPCP outreach activities into what is being done in general in these events. I don't know if I've made that very complicated.

But there are events that ICANN is going to support with outreach activities. And the ISPSCP would have, let's say, a preferential treatment. We would have resources and the opportunity to reach out to, you know, whatever community we want to at these events in Latin America. This would be sort of a pilot project for this year. If it works well next year it could be - tried in other areas of the world.

I don't know if we got that right, Tony.

(Tony):   Yes, certainly the pilot approach was what was being promoted. And it's been left to (Tony) and I to pull together a FAQ sheet really that will say these are the aims of what we want to do, this is what we want to achieve, this is how we're going to do it and these are the items that we're going to cover when we hold that sort of event. We have to go back to Chris with that submission which we'll obviously circulate on the list.

And the plan is if all goes well ICANN will stand up certainly to the first couple of attempts to do this. If all goes well then we're likely to push it out in conjunction with the ICANN meeting program so we push it out in areas such as Africa and other places where it's viewed by ICANN as fertile ground and they really need more engagement.

(Tony):   I think one thing that might be of interest, I'll read out the calendar for this year for the outreach events in Latin America which would include an ISP specific outreach activity.

There's an event in Trinidad which is being programmed - they have Saturday the 25th of April. I'm going to try and change that because this is being done with the Caribbean Telecommunications Union who have an

anniversary and they want to do this event with ICANN in Trinidad but that's the week of NETmundial so it doesn't seem like a good idea. I'm going to try and move that forward a bit so we can actually have time to organize something for the ISPs.

The second event is in Cartagena Columbia, that's called (AndiComm) from September 3 to September 5. The third even it is in Guadalajara in Mexico. It's the WITSA annual event which is a huge industry event for hardware and software industry particularly. And that's September 29 to October 2. That would be actually an idea place, Mikey, to, you know, present something very solid about name collisions and universal acceptance because you've got the industry at this event.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

(Tony):   And the fourth event which we have on this slate is in Sao Paulo and it's FutureCom which is October 13 through October 16. I'm sure, (Eduardo), you're familiar with this event, you have it every year, right?

(Eduardo):   Yes (unintelligible) has a booth there. And also I invited the ISPCP to make outreach there.

(Tony):   Thank you.

(Eduardo):   We can arrange something there. We have a very good relationship with (unintelligible) the organizer of the FutureCom and maybe we can have a space to do some meeting there.

(Tony):   That would be excellent. And maybe even come to the meeting when...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony):   ...meeting is over there's a Latin American meeting.

(Eduardo):   I will be there.

(Tony):   And then this will be something that we can...

((Crosstalk))

(Eduardo):   We can talk with...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony):   Right, thank you.

(Tony):   Okay, thanks both of you. And we'll work on the outline and draft which we'll
                    be give Chris with that additional information about dates and possible
                    venues. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to go to the (Eran) meeting in Chicago April 15 and if we could get a
                    rough cut of that outline draft I don't think I've got myself on the agenda but if
                    I could load up an iPad with a little walk-around the room deck, you know,
                    that's - it doesn't have to be in any way fancy-schmancy but...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...just, you know, a few talking points and...

(Tony):   Talking points about ISPCP and what it does and...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah and maybe...

(Tony):   This is your in.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I've actually - I believe that if I recall correctly (unintelligible) actually has a - you have a slide deck with a couple of slides on this particular subject, don't you?

Man: Yeah, I have something when we had (unintelligible) and another point is the recent Webinar. It is quite in general information.

Woman: Sorry, I seem to be coming up every time anything related to the outreach. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: So it's me again. Yes, so I think (Aren) meeting was exactly the meeting that I presented (Aki Nori)'s slide. And the impression I got was given just a general update about the IPSCP itself doesn't attract that much attention so we got to share specific topics. An, this is the topic that we're discussing and that's why it's important for you to get involved. So we might want to think about what would be the topics that would be interesting to share.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony):   Well that fits very well because that's part of the brief that (Tony) and I have got to prepare.

((Crosstalk))

(Chris):   I did, I wanted to steal the floor for a little bit to talk a little bit materials. And I do think that we can put together a slide deck, something that's going to be compelling. I think that what we ought to do - there's a small - there's a subgroup of this, the outreach committee, I think we ought to steal the next call to do a brainstorming session.

Because in (unintelligible) slide deck and some materials that we can use for future outreach we also need to start the process of performing the Website. And I want to do that with this community's input, start that process. So I would like to request that the next time we do an outreach call we let the community know that we're going to do it and we can steal most of the time to brainstorm about materials and Website.

One more thing about materials, I have, in my hot little hands here, a stack of ISPCP business cards without somebody's name in them but information about the ISPCP. They're not the greatest looking cards in the world, they've got some issues, but it's a first round.

And as we further brand ourselves with the new Website in the coming months and new materials we can go at this again. But I'd like people that are interested in doing outreach that are going to events to get stacks of these. I will have them up here and actually if you want to raise your hand right now I'll walk around and hand some to people if you have interest in taking some of these things fantastic. I will...

((Crosstalk))

(Chris):   I'll make sure I get you some right now.

(Tony):   Okay.

(Chris):   I continue to...

(Tony):   Thank you very much for that.

(Chris):   Sure. Keep working on it.

(Tony):   Thank you. Yeah, that's an excellent addition. (Alain).

(Alain)::   Yes, just to support what (unintelligible) saying. I had exactly the same feeling when we tried to do outreach during (right) meeting so...

(Tony):   Right.

(Alain)::   ...we have to think about that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

(Tony):   Yeah. Very much and make sure the agenda is right. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: One of the best sources of topics for us, I think, is the SSAC reports. It's just unbelievable how many things are coming out in SSAC reports that have a whole lot to do with the network operator and ISP community. So there's root key rollover, there's...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...search list processing, thank you. I mean, basically the last four or five SSAC reports are just loaded with stuff that we could just dump into this container of topics. And, you know, I would think that if in a couple of years people said, oh, the ISPs are coming, great. Well, we got to go to that because they're always bringing us cool new stuff to think about.

(Tony):   Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: And then we use the SSAC report...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...as the source.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony):   ...the other source of our input as well because we've still got to update the
                   material, the brochure as well and that fits in really nicely with that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Now the other thing I want to do an advertisement on just - we're
                   talking SSAC - is I started a GNSO-SSR email list that is just an informal list.
                   And I will take an action to send the link out.

                   Glen sent out an invite a while ago but you probably missed it. It's now
                   actually perking along pretty well and it's an open list so you can join,
                   anybody can join, it's not closed. One of the interesting things, and you sort of
                   heard (Patrick) talking about it this morning, is that the conversation on it is
                   sparse right now because it's just getting going but it's very good.

                   And so that's another way for people to keep their finger on the pulse
                   because what I usually do is when an SSAC report comes out I extract it,
                   post it to the list and then ask leading questions. And the goal of the list is to
                   see what the GNSO Council and the policy stream interest is. But it's also a
                   really good place to sort of keep up with it and so I just do a plug for joining
                   that.

(Tony):   (Christian).

(Christian):   Your comments (unintelligible) saying before about our role being unique and
                   special in that we are operating networks and we are not contracted parties.
                   To (Aren) we've got this - sort of unique voice. Would it make sense to
                   actually have a little sort of taskforce of people that are actually responsible
                   for digesting the SSAC reports and contextualizing them for ISPs within this
                   group?

Man: That's a good idea.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a great idea. And, you know, I've been doing it kind of on my own. And I'm getting a little overloaded so I could sure give that one away just like I gave - I just gave the Website away to (Christian), just for those of you who are curious the Website's going to get a whole lot better really soon.

Man: Give him name collision also.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, no, you remember that...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...I don't think he wants that (unintelligible).

(Tony): Excellent. Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay?

(Tony): That's good. Yeah, thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...the arrow. I'm going to let you do it so you learn how.

(Tony): What we're going to do is to - won't let me control - or it's not your PC.

Mikey O'Connor: No.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): What we're going to also do at the end is to set the date for that outreach calls. And (unintelligible). So...

Man: No.

Mikey O'Connor: I can't believe it. (Tony), you are - there you go.

(Tony):   Okay. And guess who's on now?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Hey, Osvaldo.

(Tony):   GNSO issues and working groups so this comes down to our councilors to provide an update of the things that are very live within Council that impact us.

Mikey O'Connor: I think Osvaldo got off really light (unintelligible) all three of those are working groups that I chair so I'll do the first three and then...

(Tony):   Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...Osvaldo will do the last one. Just giving you a heads up, Osvaldo. Oh no, policy and implementation, are you on that one, Osvaldo?

Osvaldo Novoa: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Okay well I'll give the update on that. Policy and implementation is the musical question that sort of arose out of a bunch of missteps the TMCH clearinghouse debacle when Fadi first came on board, sort of the adventureism of the ICANN negotiating staff when it came to renegotiating the RAA, whole bunch of stuff.

And the question came up - it came up very - it came up first in my recollecting in the TMCH clearinghouse discussion in LA. And there's a fuzzy boundary between the end of policy and the beginning of implementation and

how much the community ought to be involved especially during the implementation of policy if policy issues come up.

So Chuck Gomes is chairing that. And it's off to a reasonably good start. They've got a series of definitions that came out which I think I sent to the list he said, memory fails me.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Did I?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. That's what they're working on now. They're getting ready to go to work on the actual consensus stuff.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I've commented on the definitions and I'm planning to - they have a session later in the week, I think it's early Thursday morning, that I'm planning to attend and surely everybody is welcome. So that's kind of an update on that.

IRTP-D is one that I'm chairing. And it's the last of the IRTP working groups. And thus marks 82 years straight of doing IRTP working groups. We started in the 1800s I think.

But there are some interesting recommendations in there. One that surprised me is the answer to the question, "Should registrants be given direct access to the transfer dispute resolution policy?"

And when I went into this process I thought, yeah, absolutely. And I have been convinced that the answer is no. Because this is something that's leftover out of IRTP-C. In IRTP-C we split the notion of inter-registrar transfer

from inter-registrant transfer. And that is out for implementation. And it turns out that the disputes that registrants want to get resolved aren't disputes between registrars, they're disputes between registrants.

So what we've said in IRTP-D - and this one's out for public comment - so I'm highlighting that because people who are interested in this topic should go read it and do a public comment because we are asking for special comment there.

Is first some background. The TDRP - the transfer dispute resolution policy, which is a part of IRTP-D, has been used since the inception of the policy almost 10 years ago exactly 70 times total. It's never used. These disputes are almost always resolved, registrar to registrar and if they can't get resolved registrar to registrar they go to compliance. The TDRP is a big heavy expensive slow process.

And the issues that are trying to be resolved here are usually issues where the harm is measured in hour and the TDRP is measured in months. And so it's not a real robust solution. It's certainly not robust for a registrant whose site is down or whose domain has been hijacked to seek redress.

And so the previous IRTP, IRTP-C, took that one on head on and we're waiting for the implementation of that. And if the implementation includes a sufficient dispute resolution process we're good; if it doesn't we'll bring that back to the Council for another PDP to get that fixed. So it's not like we're leaving that alone, it's just the TDRP isn't the right place to do it.

There is some other stuff that's in there but it's pretty inside baseball; it's mostly aimed at the Contracted Parties and we're expecting comments from them. I, as a Non Contracted Party, don't think I care about those and I don't think we do either. So that's a quick one on IRTP.

The next one is data and metrics for policymaking. This is just getting started. We are literally only one or two meetings in. I'm the chair of that as well. This is the one that came out of the Registration Abuse Policy's omnibus work and is one of the last ones.

It's basically saying, look, if we have fact-based policymaking as our goal we need more facts, we need more data. And how do we get that data? How do we get it from the Contracted Parties? How do we get it from other places? How do we get it from Compliance?

And, you know, sometimes we're going to need the data in advance to decide whether to launch a PDP. Sometimes we're going to need the data as a result of launching a PDP. And so this is a real process-oriented look at how the PDP works. It's pretty good, pretty interesting group. Three co chairs, partridge in a pear tree, the whole...

(Tony):   Are you going to take into account on that the issues that were raised in the recent ATRT 2?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. In terms of data for policymaking? Yeah, I mean, that's one of the big - that's one of the big things that I used to sell, you know, this is one that had not been for me this one has died a death of 1000 cuts several times and this is back. Better than ever. And by God, we're going to do it.

Man: Originally this working group didn't have many people in it; has that been fixed?

Mikey O'Connor: In spades.

Man: In spades. Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, the only thing that is a little bit of a concern is that we're a bit light from the Contracted Parties. We've got a couple registrars and a couple registries. But I think we're up around 35 members.

Man: Wow, okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And what happened was - if you want to get more members for a working group Berry Cobb is the staff support for that. He posted it to the main ICANN news feed and holy mackerel we've got people from all over the world, you know, it's just - I mean, now the problem is really managing the other problem which is too many people somewhat inexperienced and we've got them coming up a learning curve, that kind of thing. But, yeah, plenty of participants.

Man: That's a good problem to have.

Mikey O'Connor: A great problem to have. And as long as I'm talking about people coming up a learning curve if any of you ever want to learn about the PDP process I run a webinar once a month alternating early in the morning and late at night for me to cover the regions of the world that's an introduction to the PDP for newcomers. And it's not a bad introduction for everybody. And so - and it's open to all. I think I've been circulating them to the list but don't be shy. I mean, we have plenty of room on those.

Osvaldo, you want to do meetings and...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, go for it.

Osvaldo Novoa: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Good for you, you go.

Osvaldo Novoa: We have the recommendations (unintelligible) the Meeting Strategy Working Group has put out a report with recommendations for public comment. Basically what they said is that right now with the three meetings per year and the amount of people and the working sessions they have it's a bit unmanageable.

They have in the last - in ICANN 47 there were 1800 persons present and 238 sessions in the five and something days. So they have I think three recommendations.

One is to continue with the three meetings schedule annually but dedicate the first meeting - basically it's the middle meeting, the one in the middle of the year, to focus it on the support and organization and the advisory committees.

The last one would include the annual general meeting and would be focused on showcasing ICANN's work and the first one would be similar to the ones. They also - well they were talking about the regional rotation of the meetings.

They propose to continue the regional rotation but to (unintelligible) the rotation strategy to take advantage of the smaller (media) meeting so that the one - the smaller one would rotate much more than the first and the last one meeting of the year and that would be the principally geographical rotation of the meetings.

And finally - well they would - the public forum is one of the points that was very much discussed to continue with the public forum. And I know they said to keep it on the first and the last one, not in the middle one. And in the middle one allocate much more time for support of organizations and advisory committees work.

Basically those are the recommendations. They have open for public comment.

(Tony): Thanks, Osvaldo. There was a presentation about this earlier in the week. And I do think it's appropriate for us to go - in fact I think it's important for us to go back and comment on that. I'm quite happy to take that on to produce an initial draft.

Having said that I've only heard a limited number of comments, some from (Tony) on this particular matter. And what I heard - and what I'd like to just raise here and see if there's anyone who doesn't agree with is to offer support for continuation of the three meetings per year, to offer support for continuing the rotation.

The big issue is that middle meeting and (Tony) had some points on that. One of the points (Tony) raised was that it should actually have a public forum as well. And that's something which I tend to agree with as well. I think it's great to focus on the policy work and have a real meeting that basically gets people together who want to work.

But if that's going to be part of the rotation of the three meetings it didn't seem appropriate. I think I'm summarizing your thoughts, (Tony), appropriately. It didn't seem appropriate that ICANN could go to somewhere in the world on a rotation basis and just say, oh, there's going to be no public forum case that's the place where people get a chance to pick up on anything they want to and voice their concerns. So there are the things I heard that we were going to go back on.

Osvaldo.

Osvaldo Novoa: Yes, that's one of my main concerns. I'm afraid that the geographical rotation will be limited to the middle meeting that's going to be the smallest; it won't

have any public forum, it will be just dedicated to the support organizations and the advisory committees.

And at least for us I think that the geographical rotation is the opportunity lost. A lot of our members have to assist to ICANN meetings because sometime in one year they would be near their home location.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): Please.

Man: Yeah, we have to take into account that when people travel on their own budget they're coming from a company - particularly from organizations associations and government entities or whatever - if they come to a meeting they want to read out the statement so they can go back and report that they have presented their comments at the meeting, they have to justify their presence in some way. If there's no public forum they can't do that.

(Tony): Okay so there are the things I've heard and I'll produce a draft and circulate it of those points before it's submitted. Any other points anybody want to add anything else? (Alain).

(Alain):: On this issue of meetings I think - I agree with your concerns, both of you, but I think it's not a bad proposal. It's a good proposal in that report, much better than I was expecting when - early in the process we were told that it wasn't possible to have geographical rotation anymore, that we should have only two meetings per year and that this meeting could only be organized in hub cities.

(Tony): Yeah.

(Alain):: I think the proposal it's much, much better than I was expecting. And we should mention that.

(Tony):   Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Alain)::   ...concern to be so positive.

(Tony):   Yeah, you're quite right, (Alain) because I'm aware also there was a really strong push, even at Board level, to move it to two meetings in two hubs and we have got away from that.

Man: I think it's a good report, good concerns just in the group I think...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...the point about the B meeting is that you can get in small cities around the world.

(Tony):   Okay.

Man: Good point, yeah.

(Tony):   I'll pick that up, thank you. So (Asarda).

(Asarda):   No, I think it's a good proposal. And I agree, it's much better than what I expected. But I'm afraid that the B meeting that's going to be shorter and is the one that has more of the geographical rotation is going to lose importance in front of the other two. And if people don't go to that meeting then it loses the reason to be. So...

(Tony):   I've heard you. And I will pick that up and make that point and say draft to be there for everyone to do that. It is a valid concern. And what we wouldn't want

to do is to be seen to disenfranchise certain parts of the world so it's an important issue.

Okay technical liaison group I believe, (Daniel), this is your opportunity to bring us up to date. And thank you very much for coming along to do that.

(Daniel): Okay, hi everyone. So thank you for inviting me to present the technical liaison group. We're two persons presenting the (unintelligible) and IETF which are (unintelligible).

So I don't know if you're much aware about the TLG Working Group so let's go back with a little bit of history. So it has been created in 2002. And the idea was to connect the ICANN Board with some technical guys. So it was specifically formed by some major institutions like ITU, (unintelligible) and IAB. Click.

Man: I'm sorry to interrupt.

(Daniel): Yeah.

Man: Could you break out what TLG stands for? I know a lot of acronyms but I don't know that one.

(Daniel): Technical Liaison Group.

Man: Okay. (Unintelligible) sorry.

(Daniel): The next slide. So I'm here as being - not representing but assigned by the AIB and the IETF so that's the main standardization body I'm representing and - or making the liaison to with ICANN. So it's not a new thing but - and well there are some kind of relationships with the ICANN and the IETF.

So the first one is that we have a specific person assigned to the Board which is currently (John Sirinan). And we have this TLG stuff. So at least, I mean, well the AIB withdrew from the TLG because they said they was not much activity. So - but it has been restarted and reconsider this year. So this is actually the first time the TLG AIB is being at the ICANN since 2005. And we're going to have the next meeting - the first meeting tomorrow.

So how do we work? How do we - we're expected to work? As there are two ways. The first one is we can respond to questions so either from the Board or I guess anyway. And the other way is that we might bring some technical clarifications on some issues. So it's like (unintelligible) so it's really a dialogue.

Next slide. So there are also some things we're not. So we're not an identified body; we don't have committee, we are not represented at the Board. So - and anything we express is more - we express the things not under the name of the TLG but under our personal names.

So well it means that we're free to answer to all questions; we don't have political strategy and we can all be (focused) to the technical stuff. So I think that's a great thing.

Next slide. So what do we do? Actually what is the - now that we have defined how we can work what are the different targets we're going to be focused on. So these are some bullets, some points, that came down from discussions we had at the IETF in London. We had a internal lunch with - I think there was one - Sebastien Bachollet, Steve Crocker, Thomas Narten, John Kane.

And we came to some different areas. One of them is TLD collision. And I've heard quite a lot of questions and quite a lot of things so I think that's going to be the big topic for - we have to answer before the next ICANN meeting.

There's also IP addresses so (unintelligible) validations and things like that, open resolve issues, the different packet size involved that's more for the administration of the root servers.

But, well, you see it's open so I think the most important thing is that you have to understand that if you have any technical questions feel free just to address them to the TLGs or to these members and we will be happy to try to answer to them or at least to give a response. Thank you.

(Tony):   Thank you very much.

Mikey O'Connor: This is fabulous. I'm so glad you're doing this. And this will be the first meeting - this is a public - this is a normal public meeting with a microphone and people can come and talk and all that. Great. I'm there. Thank you.

Woman: (Unintelligible) with Mikey about this initiative. I think it's great and I also thought it was great that it wasn't just about the domain names that you've listed and you've added IP validation and also open (resolver) issue which is like really having quite wide attention and interest which is something that's DNS related so there's some links with what ICANN does.

And I don't think this is getting that much attention in, you know, currently at our constituency or I don't hear too much about it but so I think it's great that you also picked this topic as well. Just my feedback.

(Daniel):   Yes. The other thing is that well - I'm only being assigned for one year so we won't - probably won't have time to solve all the problems. So a good thing is...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Daniel): I'm used to disappoint people.

Man: When's the meeting?

(Daniel): Tomorrow at - I think it's 3:30. It's in Bras Basah room. And the other thing I remember that especially Steve Crocker mentioned that he wants feedback from the ISP so I think I'm in the right group.

Mikey O'Connor: I hate to put you on the spot like this but it's not on the schedule. Does anybody got the schedule in front of them and I'm just...

Man: It's not on the schedule.

Mikey O'Connor: It's not on the schedule.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: So is there a - so you gave us the room number and I wasn't listening because I was trying to get to the schedule.

(Daniel): It's Bras Basah.

Mikey O'Connor: Bras Basah.

(Daniel): And I have the invitation yesterday - I mean, well it was supposed to be on Sunday then it has been rescheduled so we had to find a schedule on yesterday I guess .

(Tony): It would be advantageous to get that added to this one.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And what I'm concerned about is that Mikey (unintelligible) GNSO Council is going to be booked up.

(Tony): Oh Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Because there's the - oh...

(Tony): It's the Council.

Mikey O'Connor: No, it's not the Council, it's a direct clash with something I promised Chuck - I think I'm just going to beg off Chuck. Never mind, I'll be there.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): Thanks once again.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Speaking about clashing of agendas, I have a last point I have to leave early unfortunately, last point regarding the cross constituency working group there is another working session tomorrow at 10:30. And I am leaving tonight so I can't attend and (Alain) can't attend as well, right? So I think it would be very good if...

(Alain):: I have an (unintelligible) committee meeting I cannot escape.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): What time is that?

Man: The cross constituency is at 10:30.

Man: So my suggestion would be I write an email to the CCWG list informing them about the point that we discussed today, endorsement of the constituency and what was the other one? I have it in my notes anyway. And would be great if someone could attend just to show that the ISPs are...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): I will do my best to attend. It's on the schedule is it? Okay. Okay I'll do my best to look into that one. Should be able to do that. Shouldn't be a problem.

Okay with that we're final point of the agenda which is is there any other business before we (unintelligible) discuss.

Mikey O'Connor: Want to do this?

(Tony): Oh, yes, budget thank you.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: Just call me Radar.

(Tony): Basically all I wanted to mention, and it's more a matter of thanks than anything, is that I think Wolf-Ulrich, who isn't with us, did the hard lifting on the budget submissions this year. We have put in a similar budget request to last year.

A number of things that we've requested in terms of secretariat support, the running of the constituency, maps quite easily onto the requests from the other pats of our stakeholder group from both the BC and the IPC.

There is a budget meeting scheduled again for tomorrow - that's wrong, it's scheduled for Thursday is the one that I will be attending. And, (Alain), I assume you'll be ruled out of that session again because of the NomCom.

So I will attend the budget meeting. And I'll be in a position to report back on what's happened in terms of the broader requests going in at our next call. So this was really just an update to make people aware that the budget submissions have gone on - gone in. They were circulated to the list. And they'll be discussed at this session on Thursday. It's an open session; anyone is open to attend.

That was all I wanted to mention on that particular issue. So we're running very close to time now. I'm also aware that most people rush straight from here into the GAC meeting with the Board for the fun there. And if you don't get in there you don't get a seat so I'm going to try and finish on time.

Is there anything else under any other business that we...

Mikey O'Connor: We can say we covered this one but this was in your deck too.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): We have covered that. We have covered that and the planning for London is something which will be the focus of our next call as much as anything. Very keen that the IDN variants is going to be a big part of the London program for the ISPs. It should have been this time but it got overwhelmed by other issues. So certainly that will be (unintelligible).

So does anyone else want to raise anything while we're together as a group? If not can I propose then - and I'm very keen to have both the outreach call and the ISP calls before Easter. And I'd like to see if we can get away with scheduling them both on the same day which is - I was going to suggest Thursday 17th of April. It's right before Easter. Is that fitting with people's diaries?

(Christian): I'm okay with that.

Mikey O'Connor: I think I'm at the meeting in Chicago but...

(Christian): That's the day before Easter Friday?

(Tony): It is. That's why I was hoping people would be free.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): You're in California.

(Christian): We're going to have some interesting (unintelligible) going on.

(Tony): Right, so is there a time...

Mikey O'Connor: You and (Izumi) can...

(Tony): Is there between you and (Izumi) that comes together?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...we're going to have between California...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Well what's...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Oh anything that works.

(Tony): I'm quite...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): ...quite open to suggestions what is the best time. It doesn't...

(Christian): Sixteen hour time difference.

(Tony): Sixteen hours?

(Christian): Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: There's no wonder you guys are never on the call.

(Tony): Yeah. Wow.

Mikey O'Connor: What was the date? The 17th?

(Tony): The only other...

Woman: So we should have a meeting - the regular meeting time is okay for us but perhaps it doesn't work for you, (Christian)?

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): It's normally in the afternoon and we can flex it a little bit in the afternoon around 3:00-4:00 in the afternoon.

Mikey O'Connor: GMT.

(Christian): GMT.

(Tony): Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You're minus 7.

(Tony): Yeah, so it's...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...did it at 3:00 pm...

(Tony): Would be minus 8.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): What if we do it an hour later?

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Then I think we get (Izumi) and (Naikomora) up in the middle...

(Tony): Oh, we don't want that.

(Christian): Three pm.

Mikey O'Connor: What if we did 6:00 California time?

((Crosstalk))

(Christian): The last time I was in California the call was at 4:00 am.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, you were sharp on that.

(Tony): Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony):   Six am so that's 1400 UTC.

Mikey O'Connor: No, 6 plus 5 is...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: It's 11:00. Is 11:00...

(Tony):   It's not plus 5.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony):   It's plus 8.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: So 6:00 am LA time...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...oh plus 7 - 6 plus 7 is...

(Tony):   The date is Thursday 17th of April and we're just sorting the time.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, so it's 6 plus 7 so it's 1300 UTC so it's 1:00 pm in London.

(Tony):   Yeah, 1300. Is that okay (Izumi)? Okay so 1400 time - 1400 European time.
                    And with that if we could do an hour on the constituency call and an hour on
                    outreach.

(Christian):   Back to back?

(Tony):   Brilliant. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony):   So with that I'd just like to thank everybody. And we can close the meeting just five minutes over time so thank you very much for the input.

END