ICANN MEETING, SINGAPORE

REGISTRIES STAKEHOLDER GROUP

TUESDAY, 21 JUNE 2011

MORNING SESSION

9:00 A.M. TO 11:45 A.M. (Local Time)

NOTE: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Registries Stakeholder Group meeting on Tuesday, 21 June 2011, held in conjunction with the ICANN meeting in Singapore. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

****

Man: I apologize, (David), but I heard him talking about we're removing restrictions. Is he talking about VI?

(David):   Yes.

Man: I'd very much appreciate it if we could put that in the early part of the agenda. We're kind of like, 12 hours behind you guys.

(David):   Okay. Are we getting any progress on putting the agenda up? I'm looking for it myself.

Man: I'm going to try, (David). Craig was working on it as well, but I'm going to see
                         if I can get it up and then I'll let him take it, looks like it's come up right now.

(David):   Okay, yes, thanks. On the agenda review, we've now (added a session) to the
                         stakeholder group meeting itself, any additions to the meeting with ICANN
                         board and staff.

                         As you all know, I hope, we're going to move to a different room, I believe it's
                         (canning) at 1:00 and the way it's going to work is that Keith and I and the
                         counselors will be on the platform with Rod Beckstrom and Peter Dengate
                         Thrush.

                         Apparently, all the rest of the directors and the rest of us will be down in the
                         audience. At least that's the way this is described to me.

Jonathan Robinson: The reason why I thought it might be worthwhile discussing that in the
                         morning session is that as a result of the discussion, we may wish (adding that
                         item) to the agenda session with the board.

(David):   Okay, thanks. Craig, go ahead.

Craig Schwartz: Yes, well, Kurt Pritz and some of our counsel met with us from 10:00 to 11:00
                         this morning talking about gTLD, so that might be a good time to (bring it up)
                         as well with those experts in the room. Is that agreeable?

Jonathan Robinson: Sure.

(David):   Okay, then last on the agenda list, the scheduled June meeting with the
                         registrar stakeholder group starting at 4:00. We have an agenda there. We had
                         a very successful meeting of the executive committees of the two groups on

Sunday morning. Mason Cole was not able to be there, but Statton Hammock took over as Vice Chair of the registrars.

A lot of the discussion involved a question of the election of a Chair and Vice Chair of the GNSO council and then we also got into the question of our respective charters.

Our draft charter provides that no member can vote in more than one stakeholder group. In other words, a member that has a registry and a registrar must choose which stakeholder group to (vote in).

And the registrars seem to be somewhat behind the time - behind us in dealing with this question. The preliminary discussion was that they seem to agree with us, but I was (unintelligible) that they've got to go back to their group and make some decisions about it. Anyone else? Jeff, you have anything to add to that?

Jeff Neuman: No, I think that's good summary.

(David):   Okay, thanks. Okay, the first item on the agenda is to start the demonstration of centralized zone data access pilot program. Is 9:30 - should - do we need to wait for that? Should we jump ahead (unintelligible) or...?

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, are we - we're skipping the (vote on) the charter and (unintelligible) on that?

(David):   I didn't see it on...

Jeff Neuman: No, Item 3.

(David):   The Item 3 I have is the demonstration of (the zone data). This apparently it's an old version that -

Chuck Gomes: The charter is supposed to be...

(David):   Yes, you're right.

Chuck Gomes: ...(unintelligible) but I don't see it either. I...

(David):   I'm looking at an obsolete version of the agenda. So this is a good time to do that - any discussion on the amendments. Unfortunately, I was not available to participate in the deliberations but I have looked it over and it appears to me that the changes look good.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I have just a couple questions, and unfortunately I should have been part of the deliberation but just got caught up in other things. So if can go through that document.

                 I have a question on the - this is actually not a change, but something I've thought about after our registrar meeting. So the part that talks about voting in another stakeholder group, right, what you just said before about if you're - if you vote in another stakeholder group then you can't vote in the registry stakeholder group.

                 Well, I'm not exactly 100% sure how other stakeholder groups work on the non-contracted party side, but I think some of them only vote constituencies and only counselors vote in the stakeholder group.

I don't know exactly how a business - how the commercial business users - sorry, what's the stakeholder group called? Yes, that - yes, the business ISG and IPC.

I don't know if they vote in stakeholder group but they vote constituency-wide and then maybe all the counselors vote stakeholder group-wide. So should that sentence in there say, "(Going out) to the (ratio) older controller buyer or (common) control ownership with or affiliated with any entity of votes in any other stakeholder group in either house is not eligible for voting membership in (RYSG)." Should that say, "That votes in another stakeholder group or constituency?"

Ken Stubbs: (David), it's Ken Stubbs; I can't raise my hand. So can I make a comment?

(David):   Yes, go ahead, Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, first of all, I don't know whether Jon Nevitt is there in the audience but I know he's a member of the business constituency might be able to answer that question.

(David):   He's here.

Ken Stubbs: And secondly, I think that the latter is probably the proper wording, Jeff.

(David):   Yes, in the business constituency they vote at the constituency level now in the stakeholder group level.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Ken.

(Jeff Koons): And it's okay if I comment on that? Yes, I think that probably - just for clarity, it's good to say stakeholder before constituency. By the way, you're in Paragraph Item G, Member Participation? Is that right? On Page 3?

Jeff Neuman: I'm actually on Page 2, right? Where it says "Eligibility." Yes, it's 2A, right above the paragraph - right above the observer status paragraph. Page - I don't know if it's 1 or 2 or...

It's actually right after the red line where we say, "Membership may be terminated if a member agreement with ICANN is terminated." So right after that (headline).

(Jeff Koons): I think it's the top of Page 2, at least on my printed version. So...

(David): Yes.

(Jeff Koons): Okay.

(David): Jeff, what - in that last two sentences in 2A where's your proposal for new wording?

Jeff Neuman: So I guess it would say, "Registry that is owned or controlled by or under common control ownership with, or affiliated with any entity that votes in another stakeholder group or constituency in either house of the GNSO." So you just added the word "constituency"?

(Jeff Koons): This is (Jeff Koons); by the way, I suppose we should be identifying ourselves. So yes, I think that covers it. Good catch.

(David): Then you want to change in 2D on Page 3. I think we caught it.

(Jeff Koons):   I think we've got it there.

(David):   Yes, okay.

(Jeff Koons):   Yes.

(David):   Any other?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so then we - I'm sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. In the observer status we
                  have a paragraph in there that I'm not sure we're consistently - we've been
                  consistent on. So this is where we allow observers in and all it says in there is
                  that we - they have - they demonstrate the intention and means to apply.

                  So we've been asking observers to state their (string) and I'm not sure we need
                  to do that. I know we've been asking for it, but I'm not sure why we need to
                  ask for someone's (string).

                  So if they're our new TLD applicants that want to join, and they've either done
                  a press release that they're in the registry market or they otherwise make their
                  intention known, they probably should be eligible for observer or if they're not
                  then we should make it clear in here that they have to disclose that.

Chuck Gomes: Can I jump in here, (David)? Actually, I recall us having that very discussion.
                  I raised the same issue and I think at the time we decided that they needed - in
                  fact, it might have been related to Krista and when she came in I think we
                  asked them to - we asked -

Yes, so I kind of felt the way you did that may we don't need to do that but I think the agreement then was that we should ask for something. You remember that discussion?

(David): That's my recollection that the discussion to the group was to the effect that we should ask for the name of the particular new domain that was (related) for application.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, that was the case, (David). Chuck, by the way, I have your redline proposals that I can throw up on the screen if you would like me to. I do not have the draft (unintelligible) but I do have Chuck's proposals if it would be helpful, (David).

Chuck Gomes: That would work, Ken. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: So at that point - and I kind of agree with Chuck that I think (they) should have to disclose the (string) but we should probably see how the group feels. But either way we need to - if we are going to require a (string) we should (put) that in there so we have some backup for it.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again, and my concern there is that, I mean, many of us are going to be involved in an application in one way or another and it's almost competitive information and it becomes a little bit sensitive. But I'd like to hear what other people think.

Ken Stubbs: Well, you know we can do, Chuck - this is Ken Stubbs. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: No.

(David): Go ahead, Ken.

Ken Stubbs: I'm sorry, (David), and again, I apologize, I can't raise my hand. What we
could do would be to appoint - I'm just talking off the top of my head, we
could appoint an independent third-party as kind of a - some sort of a
credibility type of a check, and that information could be provided on a
confidential basis to an independent third-party.

It could either be an ICANN staffer or somebody, but it would be an ICANN
staffer who makes a commitment to the constituency not to provide the
information to anyone, but only to determine whether or not the information
that he's given, in effect, qualifies a person for eligibility within the
constituency.

I think that would take care of the confidentiality issue. The other option
would be to appoint somebody in the constituency that we knew had the
ability to keep the information confidential. But I think we're all better off
using a third-party. Just food for thought.

(David):   Go ahead, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I just - look, if there's a company like - well, I'll use Jon Nevitt's. So is Jon
Nevitt's is the room. So (donuts) came out, they made a public announcement
that they're in business to do this kind of stuff. I just think if they do that then
we don't need the (strings).

I agree we need some sort of check to make sure that they're legitimate, or
even (off the registry) for that matter, if Krista is here. We certainly know that
they're in the (news) business. So I think - I don't think we should be ask - I
think if there's competition concerns I don't even think they should disclose it
to ICANN. I think - I'm not in favor of having anyone disclose their (strings).

Jonathan Robinson: Mine's a small company, I don't know about how one did - it's Jonathan Robinson, I don't know how one deals with the other issues, but certainly it strikes me that the disclosure of the (string) itself is - it's actually a commercial (and compact) competition because some - it's quite clear that some disclosures with a commercial intent and some would rather not disclose with a commercial intent.

So for us to try and flush that out doesn't seem reasonable. I'm not sure what other tests we can put in to determine legitimacy but the (string) test doesn't seem like one we should...

Krista Papac: It's Krista. The other thing about disclosing a (string) or the idea of disclosing it to ICANN, nobody wants to do that in the application process until the last minute. I don't know why they would want it that much in advance. You know, everyone's concerned about the confidentiality of giving it to ICANN anyway, they certainly don't want to do it that much, you know, 10 months (in advance).

Ken Stubbs: Well, Krista, I wasn't really referring to ICANN, I was trying to use somebody as an example of the independent third-party. I'm inclined to agree with your logic and Jeff's as well. I think the information is competitive information, it should be held confidential.

I just think that we have to have some way of vetting legitimacy. And I'll be honest with you, if someone lawyer walked in who I had met at an INTA meeting and said he wanted to join the constituency and I had never seen his name anywhere before, I might be somewhat reluctant to just allow them carte blanche in terms of the constituency memberships.

And that's the only concern that I have. And I'm sorry; I'm only using INTA as an example. But I think we all get the gist there.

(David): This is (David), I think that the original idea of asking for the (string) to be identified is we were concerned about a flood of applications from every registrar and every potential back end provider, and we wanted to get the more specific idea of who wanted to join the group as an observer.

I think at this point it doesn't make that much difference in light of the title line that has been publicly announced. The - at this point the people who are really interested and are serious, we have not had a flood of applications. I don't feel strongly about it any longer. If the sense of the group is that we need identification of the (string).

Chuck Gomes: I prefer to just provide an alternative in cases where they wanted to keep it confidential and just a self-certification that they do intend to apply and that they would rather not do that. If they want to give us the (string) they can, if they don't that's okay, but they do some sort of self-certification.

It's not perfect, it's simple and we don't want to be too closed because it's going to be important. We're going to be working with these people down the road. So would something like that work?

(David): Sounds good to me. We can just amend the application form to take care of that.

Jonathan Robinson: (David), I'll second that. It's a very pragmatic suggestion.

(David): Okay, unless there's some objection to that, I'll take that as a consensus of the group.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck, (David), who's capturing these changes?

(David):   It's the transcript.

Chuck Gomes: So it'll be in the transcript? Okay, so we'll be okay. We don't need anybody
                  to...

(David):   No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. And where was that again, Jeff, that we needed to do that?

Jeff Neuman: I don't think we actually need to make a change in there. I think it's - I think,
                  as you said, I think it might be just - or as (David) said, it might be just a
                  change to the application form.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Because the paragraph is fine the way it is.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(David):   I agree.

Jeff Neuman: My next comment is on G, Member Participation, the added sentence in there
                  in the first paragraph which says - I'm just waiting for it to scroll up. Yes, it
                  says, "No member that has transferred voting rights to or from the RYSG in
                  the past -" sorry, "in the previous 12 months shall be entitled to vote in any
                  RYSG proceeding."

And I just didn't understand what the concern was that we were trying to address. So...

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again if it's okay, (David). We had quite a lot of discussion here and by the way, we need to talk about this paragraph anyway, because you can see that our little small group wasn't in - didn't have consensus on this.

But the idea - one of the problems, and somebody help me out here, I don't know if (Carolyn)'s on, Keith's here, and the - and (Ray), is (Ray) - I think (Ray) had a conflicting meeting today. So is (Ray) on?

Any of those people can help. They were in the small group, but as I recall the concern was we didn't want people jumping around for particular issues, you know? There's an issue - a hot issue, "Oh, I'm going to influence the registry's vote. So I'm going to switch my voting membership over to that. And then when that's done, move it back."

Now whether or not the numbers we have here are right, I am kind of inclined to go shorter numbers in terms of months or something. Some people thought six months was fine in that previous sentence, and the one you have is a little bit different issue, but related to the same gist as that.

That was the gist of that. I think the people that brought this up had a legitimate point. You don't want people bouncing around back and forth between stakeholder groups because a hot vote is coming up and they want to influence it.

Jeff Neuman: So this is Jeff again. So I understand that but I didn't - so - and I agree with that. So if we kept that sentence either three or six months, or whatever we

decide, I didn't understand what that last sentence added to the sentence before, like I didn't know what it means to transfer your voting rights.

The sentence previously says, "No member that is entitled to vote, or has voted, within the preceding three months in any other stakeholder group or constituency shall be entitled to vote in any RYSG proceedings." So I understand that and I'm fine with three months there. But then this next sentence I didn't understand what that meant.

Chuck Gomes: Keith, can you help us out on this? Do you remember what we - what the purpose of that sentence was? Unfortunately, (Ray) and (Carolyn) aren't on, I guess.

(David):   (Carolyn) is on, actually.

Man: Chuck, (Ray) is here.

Chuck Gomes: Help me out, (Ray).

(David):   And (Carolyn) is on as well, I think.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, and (Carolyn), if you guys can help me out on that, I'm blind.

(Ray):   Well, looks to me like an inconsistency. It's either got to be 3 months or 12 months. There's no reason to have them both. It's a redundancy that conflicts.

Chuck Gomes: We're in the first paragraph under G on Page 3. "Member Participation." It's that last sentence that we added, and frankly I don't have an answer why we added that.

(Ray):   Is it on the screen, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Can we make it a little larger?

Ken Stubbs: I'll do the best I can. You're really talking about - there we go.

Chuck Gomes: You're doing well, Ken. That's great. (Ray), and (Carolyn), you guys know where we're at?

(Carolyn):   No, I got disconnected. I'm using a landline and it's a little bit difficult to use for this type of thing (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let me set the stage for you, (Carolyn) and (Ray) because the...

(Ray):   Hey, Chuck? Chuck, I see where we're at and I'm not recalling what transfer of voting rights. I don't recall us talking about transfer of voting rights.

(Carolyn):   Well, I think when we were talking about this we were talking about - sorry, this is (Carolyn) (Hoover), we were talking about the fact that we were trying to prevent someone from coming in to the stakeholder group and participating for a short period of time to be able to vote on an issue that was critical to their particular interest and then going back and voting in a different group, or joining a different group, leaving our stakeholder group and going to a different group, voting there, and then coming back in sort of switching their votes back and forth.

                    And that's the transferring, I think - the idea was, you know, using that term to sort of be able to address, you know, the - what we might determine another way, the flipping of the voting rights.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, (Carolyn). So should that then say - we've got a to or from, and I'm wondering if it should just be from, somebody transferred out of our group, that would make more sense to me than, they can't transfer back in 12 months - within a 12 month period, but it says, "to or from" and there's where the contradiction would be, right?

(Carolyn):   Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Did that make sense? Let me read the sentence, (Carolyn), since you can't see it. It says, "No member that has transferred..."

(Carolyn):   No, I can see it, I just, - I can see it, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good, thanks. So should it just say, "from"? "No member that has transferred..."

(David):   I just am editing on the fly, Chuck, if it gets confusing, let me know.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So (Carolyn) and (Ray), should it just say, "No member that has transferred his voting rights from the RYSG in the previous 12 months shall be entitled to vote in any RYSG proceeding"? In other words, they have to wait 12 months if they want to come back.

(Carolyn):   Yes, I...

(Ray):   This is (Ray)...

(Carolyn):   ...think that would agree with what we were discussing in the group meeting.

(Ray): Right, this is (Ray). I don't disagree with that; it's just that I'm confused with the last sentence now with the sentence right before it.

Jeff Neuman: Well, I think on that, I think the difference is that the first sentence or the preceding sentence has that if you voted in any other stakeholder group (within) the past three months, you can't vote in a registry stakeholder group.

The last sentence says, basically, if you left the registry stakeholder group in the past 12 months, you can't come back and vote until the 12 months is up, I should say.

Keith Drazek: That's right. And this is Keith. And I think the intention there, what we were concerned about on the call is the possibility or the potential of flip flopping and the goal was to try to basically say, "Look, we understand that there may be times when an entity wants to switch its voting rights from one group to another, but that we don't want that to happen on a very frequent basis or to have this flip flopping back and forth."

They may be able to vote on a particular issue in a couple of different groups in a short period of time. So I think that the language, Chuck, as you've just clarified, makes sense to me. But (just want to) open it up to others.

Mike Palage: So this is Palage. Give that we (as a) constituency or stakeholder group have (in short) tried to deemphasize the importance of voting, right? We've always focused on documenting, I mean, at the Council level, one of the things we've always been critical of is the idea of voting.

I don't understand this - I understand the concern about people flip flopping, but trying to put up exclusionary mechanisms, particularly in light of the

European - the EU letter on competition where they were talking about the representation of contracting parties registered.

I understand that you're trying to do; I just personally think that this is really dangerous. So I'll just leave it at that and I'm not going to belabor it, but I just don't understand it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank, Mike, let's separate though, this is Chuck - let's separate policy development voting and what's happening in our stakeholder group a little bit, because the non-voting emphasis was the idea of trying to avoid that in a PDP, for example.

And in this case there are times when we have elections, where we vote, and one of the things that the RYSG does, and a few other groups I think do, too, is we try (get) levels - measure levels of support for a particular statement on every statement we submit, and that's a vote, so to speak.

So, and, you know, we don't want flip flopping around on that, for that, so that it becomes a game. So I think there are two different applications of voting that we're talking about here. Does that make any sense?

Mike Palage: Yes. But, so let's just - again, I'm playing devil's advocate here. So let's just suppose, and as someone who's participated in multiple constituencies, I think I could put on multiple hats, easy.

So let's just suppose I am in the constituency that is trying to oppose what the registries are trying to do. I would just document the fact that there were certain registries, right, in trying to represent this to the ICANN Board, I would say, "Oh, these are people that have a registry, but their voices are being silenced."

I just think this is, when you look at how this is going to play out in silencing people, I see it just then coming back to bite one - I see it undermining the registry...

I just think this is, if you look at how this is going to play out in silencing people, I see just it coming back to bite one - I see it undermining the registry constituency if you try to enforce it, I.

Man: Well yes, but understand the basic issue here. It's from the board that nobody can vote in two different (unintelligible). That's the basic issue we're dealing with. Is that silencing certain voices? Now that's really the underlying issue that leads to this.

Man: So, I mean what was funny is I just came from the board alumni had our breakfast. One of the things we were discussing the evolution from (V)NSO to GNSO1 to GNSO 2.

And what was interesting was it was basically a broad recognition that one of the problems that ICANN is going to be struggling with when you have 500 new contracting parties.

Particularly a large percentage of them most likely being corporates or brands. That is going to change the underlying dynamics of how policy development worked within the GNSO.

So again, I'm not going to belabor this anymore. I just see, I see this as something that will, you know, it will probably work in the short-term. But I see people later on challenging this and somebody wants to address. So that's it.

Man: Well, and go ahead (David). I'll jump in (unintelligible).

(David):   I understand (Michael)'s concern. I think it's overstated. And I do think the short-term danger here is what we're trying to get at. And I think it's, I wouldn't suggest changing the draft language that now stands.

Chuck Gomes: And one more we could mitigate, this is Chuck again, (Mike)'s concerns is making sure our time periods aren't too long. So we can talk about that as a separate issue.

                But I'd be curious, (John) if you don't mind me picking on you here because you've been in another constituency. And you've been in the registrars and so forth. And it's probably registrars and registries that we're talking about here. I'd like to hear (John)'s opinion, if nobody objects to that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. I have the unenviable position of sharing a mic with Jeff Neuman. Yes. I thought that the year was too long when I first read this.

                Then I read it again so that, you know, you're limited to three months. So three months - a three month position sounds reasonable to me from the perspective of if you're at a specific meeting you're not going to switch voting in a day.

                Vote on one constituency and then on another day vote on another constituency. So three months is inter meeting the length of time. So that made sense to me.

The year as far as transferring its vote from one to the other seems a bit long. So then for example if there's a brand TLD that is a member of the business constituency and also is a member of the registry.

And they decide to vote in one and then switch back for whatever reason, because people switch back and forth from the business constituency to the IPC all the time. It's not uncommon.

So a year seemed long to me. But otherwise the concept seems find and (unintelligible).

Ken Stubbs: (David) it's Ken Stubbs. Can I make a comment?

(David):   Go ahead Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, all right, here is my concern. My concern in the day to day business of the constituency I don't see any issues here. You know, if we're going to vote on dues and changing meeting rounds, normal operations.

Where the issues could come in a situation like that and where you could have an issue that could be gamed would be in significant election, either to the council or elections for board members.

And I think it's extremely important for us to have some sort of a protection against that kind of gaming. My guess is Krista, if (AJ) was here or people in the registry constituency, they would probably have the same concerns.

You get into a situation where we're talking about strategies for dealing with representation on the council and so forth. And it gets - it does get a bit dicey there.

And I think from a practical standpoint we need to have enough flexibility to ensure the constituency has not only consistency but credibility in voting processes for both the council and the board. So that's where my principal concerns would be.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, this is Chuck again. Thanks (David) and thanks Ken. So let me, first of all let me remind people that in the last sentence, I think we kind of have consensus to lead the two ore in the middle.

So it would say no member that has transference voting rights from the registry stakeholder group in the past - in the previous 12 months shall be entitled to vote.

So now somebody has left us, the voting member, they're going to have to wait a while before they come back. Now whether it's 12 months or not, I'd probably be okay with six months.

And I tend to prefer the three months in the previous sentence. In other words, if somebody wants to transfer into it, they have to wait three months before they can become a voting member.

But someone in our small group that I took over because (David) was on vacation was like the six months. So let's talk about the months.

Man: Can I make a suggestion? We could do a little mini polling. It doesn't even have to be done here at the meeting unless this has to be acted on.

That is we could have a couple of options. We could do a 12 months and Option B would be six months. And if somebody can come up with an Option C if they feel it's necessary.

And we just agree at the meeting here to be bound by whatever the poll indicates. (Sherry) could open the poll up after the meeting if it's not necessary give us a week for something like this. And lock it up before the end of the month if it makes sense.

(David): It sounds like a reasonable suggestion to me.

Man: Yes, I think it would be good if we could wrap this charter up today. So we can do a live poll in Adobe right now. I don't know if I've got any yet. But, yes, I guess I am.

Man: I don't know who's going to do it. Don't look for me here. Frank has better control than I do over this because I can't even get my hand to come up.

Chuck Gomes: Well to get this moving, (David) do you want me to do a quick poll right now? I mean we can do it verbally. We could do it - you can hit the (unintelligible) where you raise your hand, you can agree.

How many - let's take the first sentence. And we'll make this really fast. It's not the first sentence of the paragraph. But it says no member, and by the way let me make everybody clear, members are organizations in our charter. They're not individuals, individual delegates.

Okay, that's really important and that's a change we made. No member that is entitled to vote or has voted within the preceding three months, let's go there

right now. And any other GNSO stakeholder group or constituency shall be entitled to vote in any RYSG proceeding.

If you agree with that, click agree. Now is there anybody that's not in? Okay, some aren't connected. Well you can just click agree. And I don't know, whenever - how many in the room, members, just one obviously per member, agree with that?

So we got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Anybody on the phone agree?

Ken Stubbs: Yes, I'm sorry. I don't have the ability to manage this and vote at the same time. So but I do agree.

Chuck Gomes: I think Jonathan already voted.

Ken Stubbs: Okay that's fine then.

Chuck Gomes: You guys can't have two votes Ken, I'm sorry. Well I, yes okay. So and is there anybody that opposes the three-month instead of the six-month? Speak up or disagree.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You had three months there Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Three months sound okay (Amit)? I think we got good support for that.

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And then it's the last sentence. We've got 12 months in there right now with the edit that I already called attention too. How many support the 12 months as it is? Anybody on the phone support 12 months?

Ken Stubbs: No, I'd rather go to six.

Chuck Gomes: So is anybody opposed to us going to six months in that last sentence then? Okay, (David) I think we got that part resolved. Now do we need to switch over to Craig or can we keep going?

(David): I think there are people on the phone who want to hear the centralized zone file presentation. So shall we go ahead and then we can come back to the charter.

Craig Schwartz: Yes certainly. I mean certainly are people on the phone and in the room waiting to do that. I'm actually a little bit more concerned about Kurt and (Dan) and (John) who were supposed to be here at 10 for your new GTLD section.

I mean I could probably get through mine pretty quickly if you're going to stop the charter conversation. But I kind of deferred to...

(David): Why don't you go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes Craig, this is Ken Stubbs. Because of the nature of the who has the documents, I'm going to let you control what's presented on the screen through the next few presentations okay?

Craig Schwartz: Thanks Ken. So thanks everyone for giving me an opportunity to update this group. And those both in the room and on the phone on the work being done

on the centralized zone data access program. This, what's called the pilot project.

And I'm going to go through a set of slides really quickly. And then flip to a browser to actually run through some examples and display.

I do want to make a couple of real quick comments before starting though. And that is that to thank Vladimir Shadrunov and Rod Rasmussen, who is in the back of the room. Who were co-chairs of the zone pilot access (project) group for their leadership and hard work on getting to a solution in a pretty short period of time that seemed to appeal to the vast majority of the participants.

Also I'd like to remind folks that we're right now just in the pilot stage. So what you're seeing may not look really pretty. But I think all the functionalities are almost there. And what we'll continue on after this pilot phase is moving this into a production version.

I also wanted to acknowledge Ken Shiu who is sitting to my right who is part of ICANN's legal team who's based on our Sydney office. Ken and I have been working really closely together on this project, and specifically the click through license agreement that will function very similarly to the Appendix 3 and most of your registry units now.

So instead of their being a paper document going back and forth between registries and consumers, everything will be electronic.

I also wanted to point out that most folks know that my last day with ICANN is next Thursday, which is the 30th of June. And that Karla Valente will be

taking on responsibility for seeing this project through. So you have a familiarity with Karla and her association with the project.

And then in closing before moving to the PowerPoint, the centralized process or program obviously applies to new GTLD registries. But to the extent that we can get some early adopters from you folks, (unintelligible) registries to get on board with this, I think it's a good thing.

I think it will be good for the zone via consumers. And will obviously give us a lot more experience using the - using this new system. If any existing registry was move to this, we certainly would need to talk about how to contractually make that happen since you are obligated to provide (so file) access right now under a different process.

So those GTLDs can sorted later. But let me move to the PowerPoint really quickly. I'm sorry. My Adobe skills still leaves a little bit to be desired so.

Ken Stubbs: It's loading now Craig.

Craig Schwartz: All right, well it doesn't look pretty right now. But you get the sense. There we go.

So three short slides. Where did this centralized zone data access program come from? And early on in the development of the new GTLD program a number of overarching issues were identified.

The need to consider measures to mitigate malicious conduct was one of those overarching issues. And in a paper published in October of 2009, an exploratory memorandum on this issue, a centralized access or centralized

approach to zone data access was one of the nine measures that were identified.

Shortly after that paper was published the zone file access advisor group was constituted. And worked really diligently for the next six months until May of 2010 when it published the zone file access advisory strategy proposal.

And that proposal was ultimately adopted or accepted by ICANN as a new GTLD implementation detail. And what this program is is a lightweight solution to accessing zone file data, as well as standardizing the format.

And all of these details are presented in the applicant guidebook that was approved by the board yesterday.

So how does it work? Primarily there are a series of interfaces. A zone data client interface is how consumers, not registries, request access, how they log into the system. How they can see what their user name is, their password is and their URL to the XP server for each registry.

The second interface is the registry data manager interface, which is how registries approve requests, revoke requests, reject requests, all the functionalities that you will need to have to manage access to your zone data.

The third interface is the administration interface. And that is currently being provided by ICANN, Simon who is in our applications department. And administration is adding new TLDs to the system.

And also adding what are called super registry data managers which is the, kind of the key contact at each registry that would then assign permission to other registry personnel to access and use the system.

There is also a logging and reporting engine, which is intended to provide a series of reports that registries would like to have with regard to, you know, who has access, when did they request it and when were they approved.

We're currently doing a consultation with VeriSign, New Star Affiliates and (Punket) on what these reports might look like. And this will be an evolving process as we use the system more frequently.

And then lastly this email notifications, the way that zone data client is advised that their request has been approved, or the way that a registry data manager is notified that a particular consumer has requested access is through a series of emails. And we'll do a little bit of a demonstration of that in a moment.

Quickly, some of the benefits, reduce administrative burden primarily from the consumer side. So rather than them having to contract with 50 or 100 or 200 GTLDs, depending on how many we have, they will go to this centralized provider.

And fill out a request form once. That form will stored. And other than having to agree to terms and conditions of the registry, they will only have to go through this process essentially once.

It also makes it easier for the registries too because they'll be able to approve and make modifications to access online and very quickly.

The system was designed to provide control for the registries over access. And what that means is the registry still has the ability to shut someone off or turn someone on at their, you know, at their discretion.

I had already mentioned that one of the benefits of this approach is the standardization of the data file and the format. And again, the formatting and the filing labels are filled out in specification (unintelligible) procedure...

((Crosstalk))

Craig Schwartz: Specification to the registry agreement and what number to call. Okay, specification to the four, but registry agreement for new TLDs spells all this out.

And then lastly it's a cost and time effective implementation. The programming has been pretty simple, ease of use for both consumers and registries I think is very straightforward. And it shouldn't be very expensive to run on an ongoing basis.

The last thing, if you're interested in information about what the zone file access advisory group did through its course of work over six or seven months, there's a link provided here.

There's an email address since - for those who are testing the system to provide feedback. And anybody who generally has questions about what this is can send an email to that same address.

You can certainly contact myself or Karla Valente with additional questions. And also I provided Simon's email address because he's the administrator and he's also monitoring this TDDAP test at ICANN.org email address.

So that - those are all the slides, and what I'd like to do now after entertaining questions that you might have up until this point is to move over to a display

of, or the demonstration of this (unintelligible). So any questions before we move on?

Seeing none. So what I'm displaying right now is the registry manager interface. And basically what this will be used is by the registries to look at information related to zone data requests that they've gotten.

So what I'm going to do is log on to what's - to a TLD that we've created called ICANN dash test. And so what I'm able to do in this display is I can see what pending requests there are.

So it looks like Rod Rasmussen has requested access to, access credentials for the TLD. I can also look at what registry data managers I've assigned as the super registry data manager to respond to request that we get. So Karla Valente in this fictitional (sic) CS555 are also registry data managers.

I'm also able to see what zone data clients have already been approved for access to my TLD. And I've obviously got lots of relatives listed here. But I assure they're not interested in this information.

And that's (happened phrase). It's a deep, dark secret. So moving on, you can see that all of the users that are listed here and that has a registry data manager or a super registry data manager that I can revoke access at any time.

I can also change my password information and update basic information about my profile. So I'm not going to display all that. But you get the idea.

So really simple to use from the registry perspective, primarily what you're going to be doing is responding to registry, excuse me, zone and client requests.

And you'll either approve them, reject them or for access that's already been granted, revoke it, super simple. Any questions about? Yes Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: It not so much a question. I know Barbara is on and at 13 in our company that really probably will be managing this. So Barbara are you watching this?

Barbara Steele: This is Barbara. And yes I am. So it's...

Chuck Gomes: And any questions? I think you've been involved in this anyway right?

Barbara Steele: Yes I have. And I found that the system, at least from the registry perspective, was very easy to use. One of the questions that I would have is for the list of users because, you know, VeriSign manages multiple TLDs.

And I'm assuming that, you know, other registry operators are also managing multiple TLDs. Is it possible to have displayed by each of the users which TLDs that you're managing they have access too kind of on that main screen? I think that would be helpful from our perspective.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Barbara.

Barbara Steele: Sure.

Craig Schwartz: Barbara thanks for all the support that you provided to me and all the feedback that you've given in the testing.

Right now we're kind of working on basic functionality. But also empowering of the stuff, upgrades that we'd like to make for the production version. So I think that that's something that we could build into the next phase of work.

Would you mind, since I'm kind of juggling a few things here, will you just send that suggestion to that CZPAP-test@ICANN.org email address?

Barbara Steele: Yes I'm happy to do that. Thanks.

Craig Schwartz: Thanks. So the other, I guess the final kind of piece of this, and I (had) gone through this before is on the prop screen you can see that Rod Rasmussen was listed as a pending or approval for this ICANN.test TLD.

So what I'm doing is I'm going to go ahead and just approve it. The user name is here, the access password is here and the registry access to URL should actually be form fed in there. It's not right now and that's a bug that we need to fix.

And when I hit continue, it will just say that the success, the request was approved successfully. Rod will then get an email saying you've been approved.

And then he can log on and see what his user name and password is, which are going to be necessary. Did you get - yes, good job, thanks.

So that is the, that's the quick run through from the registry data manager side. What I want to do now is flip to the zone data client side, which is...

((Crosstalk))

Man: So once the registry sees that the request came in, do they only see the name of the user that requested access? Can I click through and see further details like the address or email address?

Craig Schwartz: One of the pieces of information that we realized a couple of days ago is missing is the ability for the registry data managers to view the entire zone data client information form, which will give you all of what you just asked for.

So we need to add that piece in. But that was a good catch. Any other questions on that registry data manager side? If not I'm going to move on to the zone data access side.

And I've already created a number of kind of fictitious user IDs and passwords. So let me access one of those.

So what I can - once I have created a user ID and password to access the system, which (acted) before this morning. I can then log on and I can look at the list of registries, ICANN.text, .biz and (SGB) is also a test TLD.

And I can request access to any of those TLDs. I can also look at the registries that I've already received approval to access. And I can also look at the registries where I requested access, but the registry hasn't responded yet.

For those that I've already been approved to access, I can view information which is how I find out what my password and the FTP server address is. I can also deactivate my account if I'd like too.

And so what I'm going to do next is to take literally 30 seconds and run through requesting access to ICANN.test. Just click request access button.

Now I've already completed a zone data client information request from before. I don't need to do it again. But what I do need to do is read through

these terms and conditions. And I do actually have to scroll all the way through them before I can click that I accept them, which is actually kind of pretty handy. I've not seen that before.

And I - what's that (unintelligible)? What's that?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Craig Schwartz: Sorry, yes if I try and click on that button before I scroll through the whole thing it won't work. So then I click and I enter my name, I give a reason why I'm requesting access, and I hit continue.

And so what will happen in my ICANN email address now is I'm going to get a - I'll get an email saying that this user ID has requested access and then as I'll have to log onto the - as a registry data manager into the other module and go ahead and approve this particular request. So again, super easy I think really straightforward. (Unintelligible).

As we move into the development, the production version of this it will look and feel a little bit different and we're certainly open to any feedback that you may have on that. And that really kind of takes us through the whole demo; pretty simple.

I guess what I also would like to add is that it's not really been determined yet who's going to administer this program. Certainly during the course of the advisory group's work there were strong suggestions that ICANN should just take this on as an administrative function and that's something that we can explore. We're also looking at the possibility of outsourcing this. I mean we have worked with the developer and ICANN owns all the code and our own software application folks can make enhancements to this.

But it's something that we can easily outsource probably pretty inexpensively on a monthly basis. So it's something that we'll be engaging on a little bit further down the road as whether this should be an ICANN managed function by someone on the registry liaison team or whether it's something that should be outsourced.

So we'll obviously seek feedback from the community on this, specifically the function from (unintelligible) access group and the registry (unintelligible) group.

Okay I think that actually kind of wraps up what I want to share with you this morning. Happy to answer any questions, I know that was really, really fast, but I'm trying to be conscious of the fact that you guys have a full schedule and that you're expecting guests on another important topic shortly.

I'm happy to show this to anybody outside of this session, I'm here through Friday afternoon and I'm happy to walk through this a little more slowly with you.

Man: Thanks Craig.

Craig Schwartz: You're welcome.

Man: Any questions?

Jonathan Robinson: Hi it's Jonathan, Craig I hope this isn't slightly apprehensive of this question but this is a - you've described something that functions well and looks great and seems to do the job. What happens if somebody didn't - if a registry operator or someone didn't comply, because it strikes me that there's

sort of compliance overlay to all of this. I mean somebody could just for example, repeatedly deny requests and give me if you dealt that - all that.

Craig Schwartz: Right so, just as it is now with your Appendix 3, your registry of England, and you pretty much are required to give access to anyone who requests it unless it's, you know, you had some bad experience with them and you later revoke access. And the same situation will occur with this new system for new gTLD registries.

There are - there's language in that specification that kind of outlines what registry operators obligations are. There are no SLAs right now, with regard to how quickly you need to respond. I actually don't know that there's anything related to compliance, you know, compliance measures. But what we'll need to do is develop a set of implementation notes for how this will work.

Those notes will be developed in collaboration with the community. Much like when we did the AGP limits policy. I mean, the council recommended the policy and the board approved it, but then there was this ongoing dialog between staff and the community on how it should be implemented. And I think the same process will need to happen with this (unintelligible) access tool.

And I think that's where we would address the SLA-type issues, some of the compliance-related items that, you know, are sure to pop up. That's a good (unintelligible) Jon. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Craig, this is Chuck again. And Barbara may have already covered this. I know that we, I don't know, about every 6 months or so kind of clean-up the zone file access rights for people that aren't - haven't used it in a long time. And Barbara correct me if I'm misstating in this - any of this please. Is

that still going to be a possibility for the registry to do? Because we get people that sign up and, you know, don't use it so.

Craig Schwartz: It's truly it's the registries discretion to do periodic clean-ups. And I know that VeriSign has done that. I think there's even been a suggestion that, and it may have come from Barbara that zone data clients that have requested access but haven't exercised that access within a certain amount of time would lose that access. Again, those are - I think that's implementation detail that we can all work out together. But I don't see any reason why VeriSign or any other register for that matter couldn't periodically do these clean-up projects and eliminate all these user IDs and passwords that are not being used.

Barbara Steele: Hi this is Barbara, I actually had raised my hand here, but I'm not sure - there's not - you can't always see all the attendees and their hands raised.

So anyway I just wanted to jump in to say that Craig that is exactly what I was referring to when I made that suggestion, is the effort that we go through as Chuck mentioned every 6 months to just make sure that the user access that we do have out there is active users and doing that clean-up.

Craig Schwartz: Vladimir I know Ken wanted to make a comment also.

Ken: I've got one suggestion and one question.

The suggestion is that some registries of - those registry gives access - grants access to every user, may work for some registers but for others they may - it may be worthwhile just adding an optional automatically preapproval in the access for every user that requests it. I don't know if this is something for your info for those registers that are helping you to consider just the one idea.

And the question it wasn't just clear to me at what stage does the access password get generated and how it gets into the registry systems?

Craig Schwartz: Sure so, on your first question about automatically approving every request. I think that's something that we can look at when we do that next phase of development. And if you could send that recommendation into that email address that would be terrific. I just want to make sure we capture all the good feedback.

With regard to the second question: As it is right now, when a registry data manager approves an access request the system actually assigns the user name and the password. And then that's communicated - and that's stored in the system so the registry can see it. A zone data client will have to log on and retrieve their user name, password.

The feedback that we've heard from some of the registries is that they would rather assign their own user name and password, rather than having to use that provided or generated by the system.

And the system now and (unintelligible) the registry to override what the system provides in terms of user name and password. And once the registry overrides that and hits continue to finish a final approval of that client, again that information is stored in the centralized system and again the zone data client will have to log on to view their access credentials.

So did that answer the question?

Ken: Yes Craig thanks.

Craig Schwartz: Great.

And Francisco's saying that there is a question in the Adobe Chat rooms I can't see because I've got (unintelligible). Yes why don't you do that?

John: It's a gentleman McCormick is asking if the login for the client will be ID-based - will be picked so one ID will be open.

Craig Schwartz: So on the zone data access agreement now, there's a requirement for requesters to identify, I think it's the host server name and the host server IP address. And that's information that we're also going to collect in the system. I think our developer who's David Conrad, who many of you may know used to work at ICANN, he's identified too that we might need to include a range of IP addresses versus just a specific IP address.

So, John if you could send that question off to the CCDIP at ICANN-test at ICANN.org address we'll make sure that the developer's follow-up on that.

John: I believe the question was about the client and the web page. We probably don't - we probably just haven't decided on that but I guess we (unintelligible). We don't need to have a (unintelligible) different web page, I would think.

Craig Schwartz: I'm sorry John, I didn't understand the question and I've just been saying we probably won't need to have a fixed IP address for access to the web page. But we can follow-up on that as well.

Man: Okay thanks.

Ching Chiao: Hi it's Ching Chiao here, I just - I think there was a question just about compliance or - but I just want to make clear that the implementation of the

access license it's fundamentally the same as a con-link, just under page 3. And in its current graph form all we've done really is to convert that into a electronic click-form process; so all the limits of use obligations and the rights of registry operator in relation to access have been retained.

So procedurally and administratively, I mean, we shouldn't see any change. Hopefully it'll be more efficient to manage and that's the goal of the project.

Craig Schwartz: So unless we have any more questions why don't we close out now I see that Kurt Pritz and Dan Halloran have joined us for your next section on the agenda and again I'm happy to follow-up with anybody on the centralized system during the course of the week, or by email after the fact. So thanks for your time.

Man: Thank you Craig, you're going to stay with us for the remainder of the afternoon?

Craig Schwartz: Forever and ever almost, yes for the rest of the afternoon, yes thanks.

Man: Thank you; Kurt and Dan?

Craig Schwartz: Ken do you want to go ahead and redisplay the agenda since I - you have control of that, thanks.

Ken: Yes it will take me minute to pull it back up again.

Man: Welcome Kurt and Dan, the floor is yours.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks for having me. I think the purpose of our visit was to answer specific questions about new gTLDs and so, you know, with this, you know, pretty

savvy group I would just, you know, open the floor to questions I think is what we intended to do.

Man: That's fine, I start the ball rolling. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Sure I'll be glad to start it. Not that I've ever asked a question about new gTLDs in the last 6 years. But one of the things, you know, in our GNSO session on new gTLDs with you guys on Sunday, you're very aware of this, I you know, the regis - I asked some questions on behalf of the registries and we have submitted those to the question line.

How are those kind of things going to be handled? I know that there's possibility for some tweaking of the guidebook and so forth going forward. And I know that the board motion says that any changes have to be publicly posted to all makes sense and everything. I'm just curious, I'm sure we'll get a response on the questions we submitted.

If you guys could tell us your view of how those kind of things will be handled, that would be great.

Kurt Pritz: So we don't have a process posted, you know, clearly there's some principles though - after this meeting and with the board approval - subject to change we plan to, you know, re-tweak the guidebook in accordance with the latest board changes. Read it really well to see that English is correct. And publish a version control of the guidebook so 1.0 or something like that.

So then the guidebook then going forward would be under version control and then as changes are made along the way certainly there's some that would be classified as purely administrative or form and not substance.

Then there would be another set where there'd be a formal, you know, approval by the board and that would cause a rev. change. And I think it would depend upon the significance of the change and the effect on potential applicants or others.

So it's very similar to the process we go through now with registry agreements where - when registry agreement is changed we have a flowchart to determine, you know, if board approval is required or, you know, can staff handle this one. And we have a set of tests, you know, for that. Does it materially affect others? Does it affect the ICANN budget?

Those sorts of tests and applying those sorts of tests to this, you know, it would determine if the staff could just authorize the change or we need to go to the board. And then we have another set of tests to see if it needs to be posted for public honor.

Man: Thank you, anyone else?

Dan Halloran: This is Dan Halloran for Mikey and (Steph) I can talk a little bit more about that one. I mean we still don't have a formal answer we got your - the letter from the registries with the proposed changes to the section on renewal pricing. And we'll look at that and, you know, come up with a response.

And I think that would fall under the category of things, you know. When I first read through it, it looks very promising and I definitely agree, you know, you have the goals that we seek to advance, I think we're all on the same page. Those are the goals we're trying to hit. You guys have it that well.

So we're really into like tweaking the wording and I think, you know, this one to me would be in the category of things, it's not really going to substantially

impact third parties, it's not going to materially change, you know, registries decisions or business plans or something.

So I think this is probably one of the lower categories Kurt mentioned of things that probably would right below of being border use so it's just something that the staff could look at it. We'll go back with our lawyers and legal language and maybe we can even get it into that first 1.0 Version that Kurt's talking about. But if not it'll be in the works as possible clarification and refining of that part of the agreement.

Man: All right, while other people are thinking up questions if you have anything, there may not be any but this is an area where it's probably good to be redundant and repeat myself. But I think it's probably fair to say on behalf of the registry stakeholder group that thanks to you guys for all you've done and all of these meetings we've had and we've had with the whole community and your teams.

It's been a lot of work and we certainly thank you for putting up with us and being responsive, because you've been quite responsive. And we really, really appreciate that and look forward to the next step.

Man: You know I think Karen Lentz said it best yesterday when she said she actually found the comments and the commenters to be intelligent and the comments to be intellectually stimulating. And actually got to the point where she would look forward to the comments each time so she could respond to them.

So I really - it really, you know, when you're in the middle of it, it's painful, but as soon as its over - it must be just like childbirth - as soon as it's over - well, I'm not going to, never mind.

When you look back on the file and say, you know, it's really a good exercise to go through that.

Keith Drazek: Hey, this is Keith Drazek congratulations again and, you know, to echo Chuck's comments thanks. I do have one question or maybe I should - I'm actually going to pose a question and let some other chime in.

We had some discussion, brief discussion earlier today about the questions of vertical integration and cross-ownership. And I think we would all benefit from maybe your views on sort of the state of play, or the state of vertical integration, removal of cross-ownership restrictions for existing registries.

How that impacts, you know, an existing registry going after a new top-level domain, whether the recommendations, the resolutions cover removal of cross-ownership for existing TLDs. I think it would just help us all to better understand where that stands now. And then maybe we'll have some follow-up questions from some of the rest of the group.

Dan Halloran: Thanks Keith. So this was sort of late breaking news. You guys all saw about a month ago we posted the proposed process that we had for (Ian) with requests from existing registries and you're all familiar with the resolution going back to Palo Alto saying that, you know, for TLDs, you know, vertical integration will generally be allowed. And that this could, you know, move over to existing registries too. So what in development is processing to minimal it's difficult to get where we are.

We posted either today or yesterday and we've been trying to get this up quick. We know there's a lot of interest and apologies for the speed itself has been a little - few hiccups and I think there's web teams working on making

sure the red line showing the process that we posted back in May as opposed to the process that the core finding used direction's post and the differences there.

Hopefully we've got now a clean good version of the process. It's now called the process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership restrictions from existing gTLDs.

And I don't know if you guys have seen this yet. I'll just walk you to it. I'm going to - if you go in the ICANN homepage and find the registry information.

Over on the left we've got, you know, agreements, consensus, (unintelligible), policies, one of the things there is ICANN internal procedure for handling conflicts of privacy law. So we stuck that on that page with the link to this process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership with the current new process as proposed by the board and someone think something would help to bring up? Thanks Craig.

Craig Schwartz: Where was that? You go to registry...

Dan Halloran: If you go registry - actually a shortcut to it if you want is icann.org/tlds. It will drop you right to that page for future reference. You guys want to...no that page...And ESO you have probably seen this page before, and I don't know if you guys knew you could get to it by doing /tlds it's got all this background information, you know, STLDs and generic TLDs and then all these agreements and processes and archives.

Yes, and there's the process. Yes so it looks like it still - and again, apologies it's a little rough, it's got the headline repeated twice there I see which I'll get cleaned up.

So, it's very similar to what was posted in May with one change it was that it's restricted to - it's not a general removal of the cross-ownership restrictions but just a removal for the restrictions in TLDs other than the registry TLD.

So, you know, the months and years of the big (unintelligible) it's a little, you know, tricky to sort out all the implications of that, and this is a new thing we posted so it might take some time to think through all the implications.

We've already gotten questions here and, you know, that first question is well what about existing TLDs and existing, you know existing registries, existing TLDs. And if you look at the text that's posted here, which is based on what was posted back in May, the implication is that it just applies to registries owning - not being able to own registrar - in the registry TLD. It doesn't say anything about new or existing.

So that's what's posted here, now caveat, that doesn't mean that it's open season any under this process any requests we get will go through competition review and that might be a factor and I can't like pre-judge that. What factors will be relevant in the competition review so I think that's enough of a monologue about that.

And, you know, if there are questions about it it could be that, you know, it's already been brought to my attention, a couple things, we need to fix this, or the red line wasn't quite right there. We're happy to clarify things and get this hatched up right. But this hopefully is the road map for handling that kind of request.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again, on that, we - VeriSign submitted some questions and
                 comments related to the time frame when it's sent out for competition review.
                 And I suspect based on the board motion that this may all be tied up in terms
                 of your work with the competition authorities in the next few months. But any
                 thoughts on that, how that - because it could just be a black hole that these
                 things go into.

Dan Halloran: So we did make - in addition to the changes that the board talked about, you
                 know, restricting it to just, you know, (unintelligible) up with respect to the
                 registry TLD we also made a couple other tweaks in response to comments
                 and one of them was to put some timelines in there.

                 We put similar to the Rcep process we put in a 15-day time frame on our
                 initial preliminary determination about competition reviews, so trying mirror
                 that process. And we also put in again to try to avoid the black hole. Although
                 there - I won't call it black hole I guess - but we did put at the very bottom of
                 the process there, you can see the 15 days - if you could highlight that - please
                 Craig.

                 The 15 days is at the beginning of that process and then at the end if we
                 decide that we do need to send a referral to the competition authority there's a
                 clock that starts and we have 90 days.

                 If we haven't heard back within 90 days then we can either - depending on the
                 circumstances - and what the competition review said; we can either take it up
                 anyway even with all the evidence in competition panel, or we can proceed -
                 or we can say, you know, on this one let's wait until we hear back from
                 competition authorities.

And so it could be, you know, in some cases, it could be indefinitely. It says, you know, depending on if it's reasonable under the circumstances it - consideration could be deferred.

Man: Okay thanks, sorry. Thanks Dan. We had a couple of additional questions, Vladimir and Jeff I think I saw a hand down there.

Vladimir Shadrunov: This is Vladimir Shadrunov for DotTel. Thank you again for the presentation. But the change is actually quite revolutionary especially for the smaller TLDs. I can understand why this change was made because we all saw the letter from the US Department of Justice raising certain concerns with regards to market power, possible raising of the prices, and so on.

But that letter only mentioned five, Top Level Domains where they had those concerns and specifically mentioned that in other situations they do not feel there are any negative - there may be negative consequences.

So basically this group represents 16 gTLDs and I do not see why the smaller TLDs like ours cannot become a registrar and sell their own TLDs. That's basically the only thing we are interested in with regards to vertical integration. And we feel quite disadvantaged here and I don't think this decision is fair for us.

Dan Halloran: Thank you Vladimir for that and, you know, I think what you're saying is in line with what the board had decided and what was in the proposed process. But you guys saw the same as we did the letter that came in the last minutes of maneuvering and the boards, you know; I think everybody was in agreement. We didn't want this issue to hold up the new TDL launch so I think, you know, I think the board made the call at the end to, you know, make the move that they had to do to where they were comfortable.

Respond to letters and listen to GAC advice and to these letters from the European Commission and the point of Commerce Department of Justice that came in. And you know, the important thing to note is this is not - the boards been saying they were deciding it, they've changed their mind, they're saying that they're going differ, the session toward the full process that we talked about earlier so that these discussions can continue.

We literally got, I think, that one of the letters came in like over the weekend as we were applying here and, you know, and the meeting (unintelligible) was Monday at the beginning of the week before any of these discussions could happen. So it was just a decision to, you know, we thought it was - the board thought it was important to include at least this much with the resolution that as new gTLDs which knew that wasn't a sure thing either so.

So this is what the board approved now, the board did not say no, did not say no to what you're asking. Well further they said, let's continue conversations on that. Hopefully that can proceed quickly because, you know, I'm sure you can see from past resolutions the board is sympathetic to that and I think...

Ken Stubbs: Dan?

Dan Halloran: Go.

Ken Stubbs: Dan it's Ken Stubbs can I ask a question?

Dan Halloran: Yes Stubbs, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, I have some concerns about definitions in terms of what constitutes market power, what's constitutes the universe for determining market power for instance, what's big and what's small.

And I think at some point in time we need some help in terms of guidelines, you know. I'm not really certain because I haven't looked at the numbers recently.

Chuck, you probably have them from the VeriSign deal but I'm quite sure that the - they're in excess of 200 million domain names out there at this point in time.

So I think it would be helpful to develop some sort of a meaningful benchmark. I'm speaking purely for myself, not for affiliates now but I'm somewhat uncomfortable about examples necessarily because, you know, what's big and what's small I think is very nebulous here, and especially when you look at trends over the last five to seven years in terms of growth in domain names.

So I think at some point in time I'm hoping that you guys can work on developing some specificity if it makes any sense, otherwise I think we've got some issues that may be very difficult to solve here. Thanks.

Dan Halloran: Okay. Ken thanks. This is Dan. Thanks for those - for that point. So I'm by no means Ken's best expert on competition. Now we have Amy Stathos, you know, is an expert anti-trust lawyer and she's on our Staff, and we also have retained Joe Simms and we have some of the best anti-trust lawyers in the world and I'm for that.

But that point is well taken. In essence that's going to I'm sure come into play in these discussions we're going to have to carry on to try to get, you know, further resolution of these issues including with the competition authorities.

And I'm sure you guys will be involved in those discussions too. One thing that pops in my head just in terms of another resource on this same ICANN.org page, if you go to the Registry Services Policy and I don't know if you guys already know this by heart or if this is new stuff I'm showing you, but if you go to the, yes, the RSEP page - so this idea of having a competition review is not new.

This is borrowed from the RSEP and we've posted there earlier. If you go to the bottom of that - the - on the left side there - no not that far the bottom of the navbar on the left, preliminary determination of competition issues.

So there's a page that kind of gives some guidance about how we go about doing that, that competition review. And again it doesn't go into - I don't think in any detail about, you know, trying to analyze what is the market.

I know that's a whole science and art of trying to figure out what's the relevant market and how do you measure market share and how you determine what market power is.

But there's some of that kind of back information on this page, and then our experts on that would know more about it. Thanks Ken. Jeff, did you have a question?

Jeff Neuman: My question wasn't on cross-ownership but on another aspect, so if anyone wants Staff...

Frederick Feldman: Cross-ownership now Dan...

Dan Halloran: Yes.

Frederick Feldman: ...is the topic? Dan, assuming that we are involved in some old project and can cite others with project and it's - it also the new gTLD applicants important if they are looking for going into bed with one of the market power players or shape the cross-ownership thing with especially small markets, niche TLDs which have a very local market or local or let's say a special branch direction.

This is not easy to plan for us either what's going on, who might be shareholder in the company and so on but another topic coming up there.

Dan Halloran: Thanks Fred. So it is important to highlight that it's not just existing gTLDs that this is an issue for. You know, the Board has decided that cross-ownership will be allowed for new gTLD operators just purely in new gTLDs.

But there is a competition review also in that process. Any applicant - you can come in with zero market share. You may have never been in this space before with a brand new TLD and you're still required to disclose any plans, cross-ownership, Registry, Registrar and that could also be referred to competition authorities.

That's been in the guidebook for a while now, so it's not just - it's an issue for brand new players too and for - and so the kind of question that Ken was asking about are relevant and you see this - things about that in the two letters we got from the government.

You know, there's - they still have concerns about that decision the Board made just on purely new gTLDs and they, you know, they're - they were kind of urging a more conservative approach like only allow integration if it's - you're sure there's no harm where the Board was coming at it the other way, allowing integration unless somehow it could be determined there would be an issue, so thanks for that reminder. Ching?

Ching Chiao: Thanks David and Keith and thanks Dan for the update. I just have a quick question on the clarification actually, a definition of what exactly a competition authorities or all authorities means in terms of would other governments, for example in Asia or China and other places, will you consider their authority in terms of defining, I mean, competition issues or are you just referring to a U.S. or - based definition?

Dan Halloran: Thanks for that question. So that is one thing that I think is directly addressed in this - if you go again to the Registry Services Policy and then you can find this link to the preliminary determination of competition issues, and again this is just for information.

It was actually posted, you know, a ways ago before we were talking about Vertical Integration for new gTLDs but it talks about it. Craig, you could scroll to the bottom of this page.

It talks about how we go about figuring out who the relevant competition authority is, you know. A little bit higher there - the preliminary determination - yours looks different than mine.

I see a numbered, bulleted outline on this one. Anyway yes, so where - right above where it says, "Factors for determination include the location of the requesting Registry and the geographic dispersion and corresponding

concentration, et cetera," and then if it's a U.S.-based Registrar with majority in the U.S. it would be the Anti-Trust Division of the FTC, but for others it could be, you know, the European Commission or - so it's not just U.S. You're welcome.

Keith Drazek: Okay this is Keith. I think we've got a queue. Jonathan, I'd like to put myself in the queue. Is there anybody else who'd like to talk about Vertical Integration and cross-ownership at this point?

John McCormick: I'd like to say something about the stats. John McCormick.

Dan Halloran: So if we could actually, I mean, I got another topic so, I mean, we only have until 11:00.

Man: One of the people calling in - I didn't catch who it is.

Dan Halloran: It's John McCormick.

John McCormick: John McCormick, yes.

Dan Halloran: Go ahead.

John McCormick: Okay, basically from the stats I've seen or rather check every month, about 83% of the domains are on the top 1000 hosters in each of the mature TLDs, so the - establishing which operator or which Registry is a significant operator in that market is actually quite easy.

Dan Halloran: Thank you. You have a queue Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Mine's a follow up from Fred's question I think and I, I mean, to me there seems to be two issues and forgive me if you addressed this earlier and I missed it then just by all means bypass it.

But the issue is you've got this new niche TLD and it could be backed by an incumbent in one or more ways, first of all by virtue of - as a back end operator, and second by a potential back end operator and/or investor.

What are the thresholds? What are the tests that determine whether or not that is a "new gTLD" that wouldn't be subject to any competition review or would be?

Dan Halloran: Thanks for that. So I think on this one I want to play the I'm not the expert on this card. I think - I'd guide you - first look at the - what's in the guidebook.

It talks about, you know, under what circumstances ICANN might refer an application for a new gTLD to a competition review. The threshold is not, you know, ICANN doesn't have to figure out itself, "Is this a market - is this a competition issue?"

We have to decide if it might be a competition issue and if it is, you know, we can refer that to a competition authority and, you know, I tried to point to this for information how we go about for a new - for a funnel request.

We haven't yet done even this level of TL - for new gTLDs. Whether we'd use exactly the same procedure or these same factors or I think there's going to be new issues, because with the funnel we're talking about existing Registries bringing out new services with existing customers, existing installed Registrars.

It'd be very different with a new - for a new Registrar. So again we don't know yet so it's going to take more work. It might now also just be purely a cross-ownership issue.

There might be other competition issues that I don't want to speculate about, but if you think about like let's say bringing market power in other sectors into this sector and whether that might be an issue.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry Keith and others. The follow up then is - and then the same test for VI or, I mean, would the - would you, I mean, are there particular thresholds that you might say integration as a Registrar is possible or not in a certain amount of - in a new TLD?

Dan Halloran: Yes, I don't want to - I think that it's probably better to get a written question and try to get a written answer on that. I'm just - my mind is going back to all the various proposals that came out.

I don't know how closely you followed the VI Working Group, and there were all kinds of proposals for using thresholds and numbers and none of that has made it into the guidebook.

I don't know whether it would be relevant for trying to figure out whether it might be a competition issue.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. This is Keith. Just one last observation unless anybody has anything else on this issue, and then we can move on to the next topics. I know we're running short on time.

I noted in the Board resolution yesterday that it talks about - again and this is language that we've seen from ICANN before on this issue is the abuse of market power rather than the existence or the possession of market power.

And the language in the Department of Justice letter, the recent letter, simply talks about the possession of market power and it's a - I think it's a pretty important distinction moving forward, you know, as to how ICANN and the government agencies, competition authorities, whatever that you engage with in - on this issue, that those definitions become very important.

And I noted also that in the ICANN's communication to the GAC in terms of the unresolved issues or the issues where the GAC advice was not taken that Vertical Integration and cross-ownership was not included.

It wasn't one of the issues and almost as if ICANN doesn't do that as a GAC concern or a GAC issue, but really almost more of a, you know, an issue for unilateral, you know, discussion with government competition authorities and things like that, so go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Well jut to the last point. You know, when we saw the initial GAC language about, you know, encouraging competition and innovation and a model for that but not allowing Vertical Integration in cases where market power could be abused, we thought we were, you know, pretty much on all fours with them.

So if you just read that language - and so we really had two sections in our document on GAC rationale and where we're differing. The first section is here's where we're different and then there was another section that recognized that the GAC gave us stuff to do, even where they were making concessions.

So we had put work on a Registry/Registrar separation I think in that, or did we take that out?

Dan Halloran: It must be going to what we took out but I don't see it here.

Ken Stubbs: Okay it's not there.

Dan Halloran: So anyway thank you on that. Unless there's any other questions on Vertical Integration why don't we move on? Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so I wanted to ask about my favorite continued operations instrument, because that's - I think has been one of - in talking to a number of applicants it's - once they realize that they owe that it becomes one of their biggest issues.

And so I know that we're, you know, contemplating doing either RFI, RFP, something for emergency back end providers. So, you know, and I heard what you talked about Kurt at the GNSO Council session.

I'm just a little concerned about what the model is that you're looking for, so if you get an RFI to pick emergency back end providers, you know, how are you - what's your plan on compensating them?

Is that just from ICANN? And the reason I'm thinking about that is initially from reading the previous materials, it sounded like the emergency back end provider got compensated out of a letter of credit if they ever - if there's ever an emergency.

The problem is the guidebook goes into detail that any new Registry is going to have to routinely test with the emergency back end provider. So whether or not there's going to be an emergency or not, the back end provider is going to still need to be compensated to integrate with all the existing Registries.

So that's kind of just another reason why the continued operations instrument might not work. And then I have a follow up but...

Dan Halloran: So two things and one is where - Frank is looking at that - looking up about the testing. Certainly there are a few ways to skin that cat, a few ways to run that business model whether - and that's why we want to do this RFP is determine, you know, what proposals we'll get from potential back end service providers with regard to, you know, how much - what kind of fees they would request up front for set up versus how they might run their business based on, you know, the receipts of the COI.

So I think there's a couple ways of conducting those negotiations and so we'd want to, you know, choose the - choose that form of business arrangement that provides the best value.

I don't know but I don't think it's set in stone yet exactly how the compensation that we wrote would work. Right, and they get some money from the COI. They have to do some work.

Jeff Neuman: Well they wouldn't get anything from the COI unless it's actually an emergency.

Dan Halloran: Right.

Jeff Neuman: But they're still on an ongoing basis testing with all the Registries to make sure that if God forbids there's an emergency, they're up, they're running and they can take over immediately.

Dan Halloran: Right.

Jeff Neuman: And in fact if that's the case then there may be a model in which if ICANN's compensating them, that the amount of the COI is actually not that much because if you're testing routinely it's not going to take that much to actually pull the switch and actually transition to the emergency.

Dan Halloran: Right.

Jeff Neuman: But all this kind of - there's a lot of questions that are unanswered and again, I mean, our applicants are saying, "How much do we put aside?" because this is money they can't use anywhere else.

                  It's not like a performance bond, right, where you could pay a couple thousand dollars and get some sort of higher coverage. This is a pretty big deal for all of them.

Dan Halloran: So I would - that's right and I won't know the - we won't know. We all won't know the answer to that until, you know, some companies that will be - will offer to become the (eboros) kind of project what their business models might be and what ICANN fees might be, and then what the remainder might be.

                  Maybe, you know, maybe it'll be like a company that performs the IANA function for free.

Jeff Neuman: For free? I don't know. There's a lot of money in the budget for the IANA functions. So - but working backwards and I know it was kind of - it actually wasn't even listed and we talked about this at the last session yesterday.

It wasn't even listed as a service provider that you needed to do an RFP on quickly but, I mean, just working backwards even though the window doesn't open till January this is the type of issue that there - it seems to be to me that within the next, you know, couple of weeks you'd probably want to do your RFI/RFP and - yes.

Dan Halloran: That's exactly right and the reason it wasn't in Mike's list was because she was - his list was about service providers that were doing the evaluation for getting processing evaluation.

There's other service providers that are more operational, you know, running the business. Understand. So that doesn't mean we're not doing it but, I mean, it's not on a timetable.

It just means that's why it wasn't on Mike's slide. He was listing the service providers. He was recruiting to do application evaluation.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I do all the clearinghouses on there too. But yes, and then - so again just - they're needing to just know the costs and so the sooner we can do all that the easier it is.

Keith Drazek: Okay are there any other questions to Kurt and Dan? Otherwise I - Dennis is here. Dennis - anyone else? Do you want to address the IDN variance?

Dennis Jennings: Should you wish. I understand that you have some slides.

Dan Halloran: David we - Kurt and I have to go. Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you for joining us. Appreciate your time.

Dennis Jennings: While the slides are coming up perhaps Kurt do you - he wants to make an introduction to this. Kurt, do you want to make a - say a word about this project before I run through the presentation?

Kurt Pritz: Sure, so IDN variance but a very important topic and we've been struggling for ways to find solutions so we can delegate IDN variance. We've had a number of Working Groups on this.

We had an IDN Working Group chaired by (Brom) and (Harold) at one point. To oversimplify it, you know, to me the conversation becomes complex when we have discussion about variance for Chinese script and then Arabic script.

And we, you know, we get - we make some headway on one script and they say, "Well wait, this doesn't work for the Arabic script." And so our - several of our Board members hit on a plan that we would conduct individual case studies, one for each script.

So the issues for that script could be arrived at independently sort of with blinders on, and then sets of solutions after the issue statements were created could be generated.

So we saw that as a way of moving forward and the Board resolved that we should form five case study, that going to six, each to undertake this study out of order the issues associated with delegating variance.

At the end of the day we think there'll be this family of issues that are shared across all scripts and - but then with some issues that are specific to individual scripts.

And so the - with Dennis' able help, you know, ICANN's gone out and created the six case study teams that are now staffed with 65 volunteers. We've received offers and accepted offers of host organizations that are going to provide varying forms of support, but at least meeting space, but in some cases, you know, money for conference calls, secretariat support, maybe support for travel.

So it's - so we're right to the point where we have a lot of momentum. We have a lot of people that have volunteered for the teams and they're meeting here, and they've made plans to complete work that's supposed to be done by the end of the calendar year.

So I - it's, you know, it's a group largely led by Francisco and also Steve Sheng and Naela at ICANN and we have enlisted David - Dennis' help who's really, really doing a great deal of coordination and providing a lot of leadership with outside entities and given the project a lot of gravitas. So with that I'll turn it over to Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you and my slide deck will essentially sit at - sit slightly more - no, no, that's fine. It's - that's a great summary. Thank you Kurt. Why the project?

Well there's a longstanding request for IDNs and currently as you know the IDN variance are not going to be delegated. They can be applied for. You can apply for a string in the new gTLD program.

You could declare a variant. There's some work we have to do on the language in the guidebook to make that a little bit clearer I believe, but the current position - the current Board position and the rationale has been published that IDN variance will not be delegated until we know what we're doing.

So there's a longstanding request for this and the Board got involved and instructed that this project go ahead. And then after I'd left the Board and I was involved in that stuff, Rod asked me to come on board as a consultant to lead the project.

So I just wanted to explain that although I was involved in the - instructing the CEO to set up this project, I then left the Board and then Rod turned around and asked me would I do it as a consultant and I was very happy.

I regard this as the most exciting thing and most challenging technical thing that ICANN is doing, so really quite tough to be doing it. So that's just repeating where we are today.

Next slide. Our scope is two things. First of all it's an issues project. It's designed to identify the issues, to identify the requirements and challenges, to state the problem because one of the things that we found when we looked for - when people said, "Well this can't be too hard. Surely there are technical solutions," the technical people came back and said, "Well if we knew what the problem was maybe we could tell you whether there's a technical solution. The problem is not well defined."

So the first thing is to define the glossary of terms and we've - we have a definition of terms that is shared with the case study teams and it's published.

And it turns out that there is no common agreement on what a variant is let alone on more subtle details.

So we have published a document, which is a glossary of terms instead of definitions. We've shared that with the case study teams and they've done - already done some work on it.

That's the first task and first activity, and the second is to identify the issues, the challenges based on things like linguistic accuracy and so on. Next slide. We published the initial proposal for comments, stock comments, and revised the proposal and published that on the 20th of April.

And as a result of the comments we added a sixth case study. We had originally specified Arabic, Cyrillic, Chinese, Indic - yes, and one is Latin. Francisco I'd like - yes, that's it.

And the feedback we got was that we - that from the Greeks in particular that they would like to have a study, and we thought that was a reasonable statement or request.

And so we added the Greek case study and we also refined the Indic case study, and Indic is a sort of general word for a whole set of scripts. We've actually been more precisely focused on a single script, the Devanagari case study, and so that was very positive feedback from the community.

We published then a call for volunteers to form the six case studies because essentially this is an ICANN project in the sense that it's an ICANN community project, not an ICANN Staff project.

It's supported by the Staff but it's essentially a community project. We asked for volunteers. We got over 70 applications across the six case study teams, and we formed the teams and published the team members.

We also selected case study coordinators and if we look at the next slide, we get some more information about the teams. The teams have expertise, which we asked for, in the areas listed on the slides: DNS Registry operations, Registrar operations, linguistics, security policy and so on.

They're led by a case study team coordinator who is essentially the key individual who's running the case, the project leader, a chairman, whatever title you want, but that case study coordinator.

And we are supporting the case study coordinators with the project team and specifically with a case study liaison person, who's the key contact person to help the case study coordinators in their work and to provide support, and the work will be done by teleconference and face-to-face meetings.

Okay next slide. We've also hired a couple of external experts in two areas, DNS and IDNA and in linguistics. And Andrew Sullivan is well known in that world.

He's our consultant hired to support the team. The case studies themselves have individual expertise, but we felt we needed some project team - ICANN Staff project team support to keep us on the straight and narrow in this area and in the linguistic area.

We've hired Nicholas Ostler both with - well Nicholas is here and Andrew's been on the phone. In addition we invited organizations to be host organizations for the case study teams and to provide a range of services,

ranging from just providing meeting space through admin support, telecommunications support, even travel support and we have selected six host organizations: ictQATAR for the Arabic case study; CDNC, the Chinese Domain Name Consortium for the Chinese study; UNESCO in Paris for the Cyrillic case study; the Department of Information and Technology which includes CDAC and NIC SI to important organizations, part of the Ministry of Communications in India for Devanagari case study; FORTH-ICS for the Greek case study based in Crete; and the well known Swedish Internet Infrastructure Foundation Organization which runs .se for the Latin case study.

I mentioned the definitions document, this is our initial attempt at the glossary of terms, we needed to define the terms being used and we thought we'd done a pretty good job of that but there's actually a lot of questioning about that as a result of the initial work that's being done.

So we've developed a document, we're looking for case study team feedback which we're getting and we've used obviously existing references, we're not inventing all these terms.

And we have some new definitions that we found as we went through the definitions that we were - we needed some more terms to find so as to be quite precise and we've asked the case study teams to use the terms only as defined.

So that when they use a word it means what it says it means in the definitions and if they want to use or if they find a definition insufficient or undesirable that they come up with a new term.

I mean it could be variant X or variant for the Arabic case study or - just as an example. But to be absolutely sure that we only use a word with the precise meaning that is document.

Because one thing that's bedeviled this whole area is using words loosely and not actually knowing but having these conversations of the deaf, I won't use the phrase that I understand was used on Sunday to which I would have replied, pardon, I didn't hear you?

But dial out to the deaf when you think you've said the same word and actually you're talking about something completely different.

And the goal of this restriction obviously is to minimize the work late. Anybody who wants to participate in the general level can join up on a mailing list. The mailing list for the case studies are private because we want them to be able to work.

But the outputs will be published on a community wiki so anything that the case studies actually produced they'll be - I mean there will be lots of openness and transparency.

The actual mailing list for the case study teams are closed so they can get on with their work at a rapid pace.

And the wiki is there for people to follow what's going on. We encourage people to get involved. This project has moved at a very rapid pace, the team has achieved a tremendous amount including pulling together the case study teams and getting some of them here for last Saturday, getting some of them funded to come here for a whole day working session, a couple of plenary sessions and case study sessions.

And the case study coordinators presented a summary of their work on Monday at the public session and I'm very impressed really with the amount of work that has been done.

So for example on Saturday we'd only got three rooms and we've six case studies, but the case study teams needed no encouragement to go and find a corner and sit together .

And even though they haven't got the most participation to get on with the work, and if you were at the session on Monday you'll see that some of them are very detailed project plans after 24 hours of work.

And there are meetings going on all during the week as the case study teams progress the work. I'm really very impressed, but with the energy and enthusiasm, the effort and also the amount of work that has been done in the past that's been exposed and been brought into this project.

We'll have a lot of teleconference, a lot of intercession on meetings, with details being worked on and we have set the deadline, we're keeping to this deadline for the moment, the 30 of September for the case studies to produce their issues report.

And the 15 of December for the final cross issues, cross case study report. That's pretty challenging but certainly the enthusiasm of the teams suggest that they're determined to meet that.

And as you know in some parts of the world, summer in the northern hemisphere is not the greatest time, there are lots of holidays. But I'm very impressed.

And that's really where we are. Thank you.

Man: Thanks David, thanks Dennis and thanks for volunteering for this new task
                        and supporting the process, appreciate that.

Man: I should point out that I'm a paid consultant.

Man: Oh, okay, well thanks for still leading this, I appreciate that. The - one of the
                        intercession you referred to indirectly there that where the terms deaf and
                        stupid were used one of the issues that was brought up in that discussion
                        between the GAC and the board was the issue of bundling of TLD strings.

                        And I'm going to ask you to react to what I'm going to say next to see if I
                        assessed it correctly but one of the responses to that equated bundling to
                        variance and I think it's an illustration of what you're talking about, that
                        people don't understand the definition of variance.

                        Because I don't think bundling has anything to do with variance, any string
                        could have a variance somewhere. But I don't think it's related there.

                        And I thought that was a misstatement. I've had a couple nice conversations
                        with Susana Wolf on that since then too. But your comments that the terms -
                        the definition of variance certainly is really important that we get those down,
                        everybody understands it.

Man: Edmon, go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Dennis wanted to respond first.

Dennis Jennings: For the scribes and the record, Dennis Jennings again. I don't know what bundling means, it's not a term that has been defined. I could see that in the variant context it might refer to a bundle of a variance, a string and its variance.

But it certainly isn't a concept that is necessarily limited to variance and I'm sure it wasn't used in that context on Sunday.

But it's a good illustration using the word which means what you want it to mean when you want it to mean something.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, this is Edmon. So we meet again Dennis. Tend to meet on plans. And I'm really happy that I'm finally able to take off my (Jake) chair hat and take off my ALAC hat and be just a participant from the GNSO and ROISG.

There are a number of things that I have wanted to put out, one of which is to really following from what Chuck just mentioned and what Alan mentioned in the ALAC just now.

One of the things that I'm very frustrated about is that particular issue, that confusion between what is now called bundling of different TLDs and IDN variance coming from staff essentially you know it was CO, is very frustrating because this is an issue that I think you know should be at least not to confuse the community, to do a better job I think from staff to do a better job not to confuse the two issues.

I think there might be incentives to - or motivations to confuse the two but it really doesn't help the overall discussion.

So I think you know a number of other things, I think the group, I sort of participate in the groups some of the discussions now and a few things sort of - I'd like to get a sense of in terms of clarifying the process for it, one of which is I see that there's some reference documents there, but there's no reference to the GNSO IDN working group outcomes.

You know there's no reference to the GNSO gTLD recommendations, so I'm a little bit worried about that because if we - you know some of the discussions that we're going down would touch on gTLD policies.

And I - you know if we change those policies those need to go back to the GNSO, go back to the council. One of the things that you know I guess part of the JIG is trying to do is not to change any of those policy which came by you know after a lot of hard discussion.

So that's one of the areas that I'm a little bit worried about that there's no - you know the reason why I didn't bring it up in the JIG is because we have to take care of the ccNSO as well and they don't abide by those.

And it's sort of in my participation that I try to make sure that the GNSO policies or not you know deviated from, but you know now as a participant I'm bringing this up.

Other part is - and also on that I want to I guess you know you probably if you go back you would see the discussion and see the recommendations that there were provisions for IDN variance.

And it was very clear that IDN variance were supposed to be allowed in the IN working group outcome support. So the other - the second item that I'm a little worried about in terms of timeline and how public comment periods and

the budget for - time budget for the public comment periods would come into play.

We have a fairly aggressive timeline for coming up with the integrated report by the end of the year and I guess at least a reasonable target is to have this in place before the delegation for the first round of applications happen at least I think it would be a reasonable target so that it - you know the variance could still be in the first round as the delegate, not necessarily as they apply.

But after delegation point, so those are the two items.

Dennis Jennings: Several things there I think Edmon. First of all this is an issues project and yes, it's - that's our deadline and then having identified the problem we have to find whether there are solutions and that's the follow on project.

And yes, clearly if that can all come together in time for the delegation that all makes sense, but I'm not here to make any commitments or promises along those lines.

Secondly there is no intent to change policy. Obviously this is let's find the issues, let's find solutions and if that raises policy issues they'll go back to the appropriate forum.

And lastly your somewhat critical comment about the CEO picking up the meaning of bundling in a particular way, I think that rather than be critical I would just say that illustrated the problem.

On the fly he got bundling and associated it with variance, which he had probably been thinking about before and responded in that fashion. Shouldn't have happened but perfectly understandable.

So I think I've covered your points.

Man: So on the follow up on that, the seriousness of it in the case of that mistake was is that he used that misunderstanding to say that bundling of TLD strings in an application was very complicated because variants are very complicated and that was totally wrong.

And so it does mislead the community and leads staff down a path of ignoring the idea and it was brought up for the sake of underserved language communities and it was unfortunate.

But we don't need to belabor that.

Dennis Jennings: I can't possibly comment, I don't know what bundling is and so...

Man: It's very simple, all it is is that one applicant could apply for multiple strings each in a different script, only one per script though.

So for example a dot museum could apply for a dot museum in Mandarin, one in Cyrillic, one in another script, okay?

But each one in a different script so then having to do a variance. Now some of those could have other variance associated with them, but they're not applying for those.

Keith Drazek: And this is Keith, just one more point of context on that is that the discussion was around bundling and the idea of the - a disadvantaged or developing community would not have to pay multiple applications fees.

It was that they would be able to bundle the application, right? Or am I mistaken? Is that...

Man: That's correct, so in other words the bottom line is that it's not - for underserved language community, it's not going to make business sense for a TLD operator to pay $185,000 plus whatever other costs go in.

For each - for strings, especially for these small communities it just doesn't make business sense. But if there was some way of bundling them together in another application, so that they're not paying that full evaluation fee it's a way of facilitating getting IDN TLD services to developing and underdeveloped regions much faster than we will otherwise.

So see, you had it right.

Dennis Jennings: So Dennis Jennings here again, Francisco will take that feedback back Craig to the - to make sure that some clarification. That is that comment has caused confusion that some clarification would be appropriate but it's out of scope.

I cannot possibly comment on the whole area.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here again. So just quickly I probably spoke too long just now on the two questions, one of which is do you think it's appropriate to reference back the IDN working group's outcomes report for some of the discussions at the site team?

And the second one is what's the budget - time budget for public comment periods as we work through these issues reports?

Man: Can I just say I'll take note of the questions and we'll come back to you.

Man: Just wanted to add something, there is this mailing list where anyone can participate so it's a better way really to participate in these questions.

                And also for the case studies even though the mailing list are closed in the sense of only members can post the archives are available for anyone so you can follow the discussions even if you are not part of the mailing lists.

Man: Thank you Dennis.

Man: Just one last thing David and this is - I don't think it will take very long but I know we have some people on some of the teams, I know Edmon's going to be an observer on probably all of the teams.

                Is there anyone else, good.

Vladimir Shadrunov: This is Vladimir, I'm on the Cyrillic Case Study Team.

Man: Excellent, that's really good.

Man: Sorry, we have - also have Eric Brown in there, Latin team, we have (unintelligible) in the Latin team, we have (Joan).

Man: No, I'm aware of the ones from us, so yeah, we have (June Seo) in the - which most of you know on the Chinese team, a little shorter on the Latin team and Manish on the Devanagari team.

                So just to let people know so that we kind of know what registry people are involved as we move forward on these things.

Man: Thank you again, thank you very much for the opportunity. Thank you.

Man: It appears from looking around the room that a break has been declared informally so I need a formal break. Let's make it quick, about five minutes. Thanks.

Could I ask everyone to sit down? Yeah, have we found out yet where - if there is a lunch or what - is any - we're on our own.

I sent a message to Glen and I was asking if there's a common area where the stakeholder group can go have lunch. But I hadn't heard back yet and now I'm hearing you all saying that you're on your own.

Which I just didn't know how today was being handled.

Man: No, wasn't the decision made that we're on our own for lunch.

Man: That's right, we made the decision to basically take a lunch break and everybody's on their own rather than having lunch brought in and having a working lunch.

Man: Do you want to talk...

Ken Stubbs: I want you to know I sent 50 subs to you guys from Orlando Florida and they may be delivering them soon. They might not be very fresh because I ordered them four days ago, but what the heck, we tried.

Man: Yeah we really appreciate that Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Are there any hawker markets close to where the center is David?

David Jennings: Not that I know of.

Man: Okay, do you want to resume on the charter or do you want to talk about the board meeting?

Keith Drazek: This is Keith, I think we ought to go and discuss the board meeting, I mean just because of the timing because we're going to want to take a break and get something to eat.

                   I think we ought to focus on the board discussion and then resume with the charter. We can do the charter this afternoon after the board meeting if necessary. That's my preference.

Man: That sounds good to me.

Man: Plus one.

Man: The agenda that I have only has three items for the board, one is the new gTLD contract which is open to all the things I assume that we've been discussing.

                   Is there - does anyone want to refine that or offer...

Man: My question is what do we want to talk about with regard to that? We've submitted some questions into the question line and we got a response from staff on the one that we submitted.

We actually - we VeriSign got a response on the one we sent. Is there something else on the contracts we want to talk about? If not I would say we drop that one.

One of the things - I don't know how many of you were in the GNSO session on Saturday and the preparation for their interaction with the board I thought was really weak.

And fortunately it didn't come out too bad in the session with the board, but the way it started is these two things on ALC were thrown out and in a way that the board didn't have a clue what was being asked.

In fact Steve Crocker was kind of heading the board people on that, said what do you want me to respond to?

So let's make sure we have specific objectives and we're clear with the board so that we maximize our time.

Man: Okay, I'm open to suggestion. The other two subjects are the notification of breach, this is basically the dot jobs question where we sent a letter to the board, requested a response which we never got.

And the third item is the - simply the stakeholder's group input to the board.

Man: I personally think those two topics would be good ones but we need to make sure what we want, where we want those to go and lead that. The - I mean just complaining to the board that we haven't got a response on that letter I don't think we want to do that.

Because that just - what can the, you know, but we could say you know we did send that, we did express some concerns and explain what our concerns were.

And just ask you know we'd like to know - we think that it would be better to have communicated with the - are we off base there? Is the board in sync with us or what, you know?

And in the case of communications with the board, you know we're doing things differently now. Again we need to be - have clear objectives and make sure that we don't just throw something out there hanging and the board doesn't know what we're looking for.

Keith Drazek: So this is Keith, are there any other topics that people think we ought to raise? I think we ought to consider vertical integration and cross ownership coming out of the discussion this morning, or at least talk about it here.

But Vladimir go ahead.

Vladimir Shadrunov: Yeah, I would like - I raised that concern but for Kurt and then I would like to be - I would like it to be raised at the highest level as possible and as loud as possible because I think this is a valid concern.

But I don't know what the group thinks because we didn't have any discussion inside the group. Is there any support that the smaller TLDs should be allowed to vertically integrate or...

Man: I think it's a good subject, I wouldn't limit it to the smaller ones because I know BIS was mentioned and the Department of Justice letter and I have some meetings with them next week and afterwards.

But if anyone could consider a TLD that has 1.65% of the market as being a dominant player that's - I think we could bring up the subject. So I heard what you said before, I just didn't like the way you phrased it about saying that there are five that may but what about the smaller ones?

I would phrase it in kind of a different way to say you know to talk about that registry in order to compete in the marketplace you're allowing new registries to become - or registrars to become new registries.

And they're allowed to be vertically integrated. You know what is your process for moving forward, you've deferred the whole topic of whether an existing registry can basically be a registrar in their own TLD.

Okay, that's great you deferred it but deferred it to what? What are your next steps? What are the action items and then how long have you deferred it, how can we keep this moving forward?

This is not something we just want to see deferred and forgotten about for two years.

Man: By the way Ken has his hand up.

Man: Go ahead Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, I'd like to revisit Jeff's issue that we've talked a little bit about, the continuing - the registry - what's the (Baro), you know what I'm talking about. I'm very concerned about the fact that I don't know whether ICANN really has any clarity on what it costs to manage operations like that.

I also am very concerned about the tenure of the RFP, you know if that's driven by the attitudes that have been reflected at the board level we're going to be in real trouble because you know I don't think they're really willing to look at how this can be managed in a way to take care of the core issues that were listed in the appendix.

I think it was an appendix to the DAG or at least to the agreement and I think we really need to maybe get the board to talk to some of the existing registries, whether or not they be gTLDs or ccTLDs.

I mean you know - or know as well as I do (Nominat) and (DE Nick) incur costs that are quite similar to the cost that would be incurred by a Neustar, an Affilius or anybody else, you know.

So I really think they need to do some consultations before they just pump out an RFP because I have a feeling we may not be happy with the way it's structured, and that's just my thoughts.

Man: Anyone else? If not should we raise that issue of the escrow fund, that COI? Can somebody tell me what COI stands for?

Man: Continued operations instrument.

Man: Just talking about?

Man: Continued operations instrument.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, that's what I'm referring to, the methodology they're going to use in determining how large that instrument will be and are they going to use business plans provided by their applicants?

Are they going to use research that they've garnered from registries that they've gone to, to try to get some ideas on cost?

Are they going to use the RFP quotes that they get from various providers that may offer to - their services?

Chuck Gomes: No. Well, let's not forget what Kurt just - Kurt and Dan just told us on that issue, okay, so that we keep all this in context. And - because we know that the Board's going to go right back to staff, right? So - in fact, Kurt may be here with the Board, okay, and Dan may be here with the Board.

So they told us what (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: (They'll) be here with the Board. We were told that Kurt was going to be at that meeting.

Jeff Neuman: Did you hear that Ken? From Craig?

Ken Stubbs: I'm just don't know. I'm sure that Kurt and (John) and/or Dan will be at that 1:00 meeting that you have with the Board.

Chuck Gomes: So now whether we think that answer is satisfactory or not, we know they're going to send out an RFP to try to get some information. And so we don't need that answer repeated to us from Kurt, which is probably what's going to happen if we do that.

Now if there are some statements we want to make to make the Board aware of the concerns we have, than can be a legitimate objective. But I think asking the same question again, all the Board's going to do is go right back to Kurt and Dan, or whoever is there.

Ken Stubbs: So you may not agree with me guys, but what I'm saying is I don't think we should ask the questions. I mean, I think we need to help give them a way forward so that we're - they're not totally relying on the staff, because the staff really needs to go out to organizations like ours and get the information.

And I think if they're going to rely strictly on numbers that they get in response to an RFP, a lot of that's going to be a highly RFP structure. Whether the - a respondents build in what kind of profit margins they're building in. You know, there's a lot of things that I think - the Board needs to be aware of the fact that this should not be done in a vacuum.

Craig Schwartz: Hi, this is Craig. So I think most folks will probably remember that back in March, we actually did engage with the registry stakeholder group and a number of individual registries when we circulated this draft cost model - this draft COI cost model and got input from folks like (Joe Walder) at VeriSign and (Eric Brown) at NeuStar, and some others about shaping up what this cost model like - what this cost model might look like because we intended to include that in the RFP so that when we put it out we'd actually get back information that the registry said we should be asking for and that it would be presented in a way that would generate information that would be useful to applicants.

So, there's already been pretty significant consultation with the registry stakeholder group, also some of the ccTLDs as well. Whether you think there needs to be broader community consultation is probably a different

conversation. But let's not say in front of Senior Staff and the Board that you should talk to us when that's happened pretty substantially in March and April of this year.

Chuck Gomes: A quick question for you Craig. This is Chuck. Did that get into financial numbers at all that work? Because I think that's where a lot of the people are starting to see there's some big issues, especially for new players, smaller players, and so forth, in terms of that continuing - their ability to get - you know, they may have to put cash down, okay. And that could be quite expensive.

So, did that group cover that?

Craig Schwartz: And so it didn't get into specific cost numbers, but for example with regard to DNS services, we looked at what it costs for varying ranges of DNS queries and that. But I think we provide a small query range, a medium query range, and a large query range based upon the feedback that we got from you guys or from the registries.

There was information related to customer service elements that we hadn't considered that you all suggested need to be included. That there are transition costs associated with you know, taking a registry from the current provider to the (EVERO).

So to answer your question directly, Chuck, I don't think there were specific cost questions or cost discussions. And I think that was intended to be the information that we would get out of the RFP.

Ken Stubbs: Well Craig, here would be my concern. I'm not trying to make the staff look bad or anything like that, but let's assume you're doing an underwriting

function. In the proposals that are going to the Board - the JAS recommendations and so forth, they're literally talking about an abatement for these proposed applicants that would be covered under that JAS recommendation for any escrowing at all.

Well you know, you've got to insure for that one way or the other. And, I'm concerned that other applicants who have resources are going to be for lack of a better term, taxed to cover that burden one way or another, because I don't see ICANN funding for that contingency in their subsidies for applicants. I really don't.

So you know, maybe it is a discussion that's too deep for the one hour that we have, but it's certainly an issue that needs to be looked at somewhere down the road.

Chuck Gomes: Can I make a - we're running out of time really fast. Can I make a suggestion for handling this?

What if we identify a primary spokesman to identify the concerns we have? Not put the Board on the spot or staff, or anything else in terms of what's happening, but make sure that the Board is aware of the concerns we have with this and it become a communication session, and then they can ask us a question.

Now the primary spokesperson would just take the lead in identifying the issues. I know Jeff's been one on this area. He might be one, or whoever we identify. I don't care. But to just lay out the issues in five minutes or so. And then if the Board has questions, they can ask us and it'd be a communication thing, not a thing asking for the Board to solve a problem right now. They're not going to be able to.

So, what about an approach like that on this?

Ken Stubbs: I don't have any problems with that. I'd much prefer that it be done by a person who's live there. I think it's easier for Jeff or someone like Jeff to respond if there becomes an interaction there.

Jeff Neuman: I'm just not sure this is a Board issue right now. I mean, I'm happy to bring it up to a...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: I'm just throwing it out. As far as I'm concerned, we can pass on it. It sounds to me like we're going to fill the hour with the other issues we already have there anyway. If they get bored and want to hear something else, I'm sure somebody at that meeting will pop up with something that's relevant and timely.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: All right. (Unintelligible), and I have a couple of quick comments. One, I share Chuck's sentiments completely. I mean, the GNSO interaction with the Board was not satisfactory from a kind of hot - ease of interaction and just an effectiveness of the interaction - so as prepared as we can be.

I just wondered Jeff, are we prepared - I mean, I accept that the previous comments have suggested we potentially drop this topic, but have we done it properly? This whole concept of some kind of insurance-based, or transaction-based, or periodic fee as opposed to a lump sum for the continued operations instrument?

I mean you know, we were told that - I understood - I think we were told that that had been looked at previously and was not - that some sort of insurance-based fund was not - no longer a potential consideration? Do you think this is a closed door or is this something we can discuss there?

And second, is it - are we saying that that's still not appropriate to discuss with the Board as part of this particular topic?

Jeff Neuman: So yes. We got that answer from staff I guess at the GNSO Council session. I have - what I heard at the Council session was that Kurt - that ICANN staff had met with some bankers and some other people, but I never saw any of that published in the couple years - I even went back. So they may have internally considered it, but that was never considered externally that I've notices.

But my point is I - this is just too detailed for the Board. Their eyes are going to glaze over. They've probably never even discussed it, and I'm not sure it's an issue that needs to go beyond the staff level. Just - I mean Craig, I don't know if you agree or not, but...

Craig Schwartz: Someone said it a moment ago, but they're going to look at the staff for a response on this. And it doesn't seem like that's going to be a really good use of your limited time with them.

Man: Jeff, hi. I have to agree with you. The deeper we get into this, the more convoluted it becomes for that kind of a session.

Chuck Gomes: I was only talking about it because others seemed to be interested in it. So, I have no problem with dropping it.

Ken Stubbs: I think it's an issue that we as a constituency need to take up in the very near future and provide some input away from the ICANN Singapore meeting that can be meaningful. Either an interaction with the staff specifically to discuss these issues, you know, or a formal correspondence with whoever we feel is relevant, either selected - the Board probably has a committee that's dealing with this thing. It would sure be nice to know who's kind of spearheading this effort on the Board. Whether it's (Steve) or (George Sudowsky), or whoever it may be.

Man: Okay. What are we going to talk about with the Board?

Jeff Neuman: So are the - if we just are looking for topics, you know, one thing we might ask them is they've scheduled this new workshop for Saturday to talk about the challenges that ICANN is facing. It's a very - like two sentence kind of announcement. I'd like to hear from their viewpoint as to what they believe the challenges they're facing and why is it necessary - to the communication back and forth, what are they're addressing?

Chuck Gomes: I don't even know what you're talking about? What workshop?

Jeff Neuman: The Board announced yesterday that - or there was an announcement yesterday on the site that there is a meeting on Saturday - a closed meeting of just Board members to discuss - they put a summary up. What they said is - now there've been rumors, but they said that the primary focus of the workshop will be the challenges facing ICANN on the coordination of Board and management directions.

    Now the rumor is that it's to talk about - I'm not going to say what the rumor is because we're being recorded. There's rumors, but I'd like to hear from

them what they believe the challenges are and what they believe they're going to address in the weekend.

Chuck Gomes: But if in fact it is what you think it is, and I know what you're talking about, that would be very inappropriate to put them on the spot on that.

Jeff Neuman: It could be other things. I don't know what it's about.

Chuck Gomes: It could be, but what if it's not? I mean, it...

Jeff Neuman: Well they - but they put out an announcement...

Chuck Gomes: It's closed. It's probably closed for a very specific reason. I think that's putting the Board in a very awkward position and they'll probably just have to say, "Sorry. It's confidential."

Jeff Neuman: Right. But if they were having a - it's kind of weird that they put out an announcement that they're having a meeting. I thought that was kind of bizarre.

Craig Schwartz: Jeff, where's the announcement? Because I'm looking at the announcements page and I don't see it.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Go to the Board meeting minutes and agendas, and whatever that page is.

Ken Stubbs: Well, my guess is if they put something out, they did it because they were concerned about transparency issues. And anytime they get together in the future, I think they're just obligated to at least make an announcement that they are meeting and they can be as vague as they want to be about the topics,

whether it's you know community relations or personnel, or whatever the hell it may be.

But I think...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ken Stubbs: ...they'd be really hard pressed if they met on Saturday and nobody knew it.

Chuck Gomes: Well again, we could just ask the question, "We noticed you set up a meeting for Saturday. You know, what are - you said the focus will be the challenges facing ICANN. You know, what do you view as those challenges?"

Jonathan Robinson: Of hand - it's Jonathan. I mean, what - if we are to raise - I mean perhaps the way to raise that is it's better to say are they in a position to discuss anymore about that? And at least if it makes it quite open ended for them to say, "Unfortunately, we're not," or, "Yes. By all means, we can go into that."

So you know to the extent that they've made an announcement, it's a meeting. I mean, that might be a suggestive phrasing. If one could simply say, "You know, we understand you are meeting. You've got an extraordinary meeting and you've made a very rudimentary announcement. Are you in any position to discuss that any further, or is it a closed topic?"

So at least it leaves an elegant exit for them without being confrontational.

Eric Brunner-Williams: We're going to talk - we're going to ask them about vertical integration. And Vladimir, do you want to lead that? Do you want to...

Vladimir Shadrunov: Jeff - or Jeff had the suggestion - I think that there's - that's Chuck
mentioned from (unintelligible) supported that. So it can be me or Jeff.

Keith Drazek: This is Keith. Sorry. I mean, I've written up some notes here on the vertical
integration issue, and I'd be happy to volunteer to sort of tee it up and then
open it up for other discussion. But you know if it's appropriate, I could run
through what I've written here and give me your feedback and make sure that
that's okay.

And I'll make it clear that I'm speaking you know, as the alternate Chair - the
vice-Chair of the stakeholder group.

So what I've written is that you know, one of the things that we'd like to
discuss today is vertical integration and cross-ownership issue, specifically the
removal of cross-ownership restrictions for existing registries. We understand
that the resolution passed yesterday for new gTLDs deferred that decision
pending consultations with competition authorities.

We understand that the Board didn't want to delay a vote on the new gTLD
program, but this issue has significant implications for registries looking to
invest and potentially apply for new gTLDs. It also has an impact on new
gTLD applicants who may want to partner with existing registries, specifically
around the definition of affiliates and sort of the definitions of you know, what
market power may be and how that may be interpreted by ICANN in its
deliberations.

It also has implications for existing registries who want to vertically integrate
for their own existing TLDs and that those decisions - you know, that that
decision needs to be played out and the timing is important. And clear
definitions, procedures need to be established and thresholds for that

evaluation - that determination need to be clearly communicated and communicated as quickly as possible.

So that's what I've got. That's sort of what I captured from our discussion, but I'd welcome other's feedback.

Chuck Gomes: I just have one suggestion. I'm fine with you doing that, but make clear that you're doing that as follow-up to the discussion in the stakeholder group and it's not coming from VeriSign.

Keith Drazek: That's understood. Yes.

Vladimir Shadrunov: And one more thing. Next steps. So what are the next steps with regards to this process? Because that was quite a last minute decision, and we don't know. It may take a few weeks or it may take six months.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thanks Vladimir.

                   Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I was going to say that last part is the most critical.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Because again, you know, we need to have a definitive answer on all this by the time the new gTLDs come along and now you have registrars entering the registry space that already -they'll be able to sell their own TLDs. And so that's just critical.

Keith Drazek: So I think that what I'm trying to do is just sort of set the stage based on our conversation here that I would absolutely welcome Jeff, you and Vladimir and others to chime in and sort of reinforce those points that you think are really important. Does that make sense?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. How about if you do your intro, Vladimir comes in and expresses kind of what he said to us, and Jeff, if you want to do something. But why don't we then phrase the general question to them after that of do you have any feel for how this is going to be dealt with? We understand you're going to continue to consult with competition authorities and - any envision in terms of timing and how that's going to happen? Has that been talked about at all? Whatever?

Ken Stubbs: I have a real quick question about that meeting.

Keith Drazek: Yes, go ahead Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, Keith, it won't take a second. Number one, they're having serious problems with (load ban) with participation. Is this meeting going to be scribed, taped? What's the situation there? Does anyone know, because if it was being held...

(David):   I believe it is.

Ken Stubbs: ...in our room, it would.

(David):   I believe it's going to be transcribed.

Ken Stubbs: Okay.

Keith Drazek: It'll be both. It'll be recorded and then transcribed as it always is.

(David): And let me ask one quick question. We're not going to cover the COI? Is that - that's agreed now?

Man: Right.

(David): Okay, so the only - there are two things. First is vertical integration, second is the question about the Saturday workshop. What are the challenges? Can they expand on that?

Chuck Gomes: So are we going to talk about communications between registries and the Board or not? I'm not pushing for that, I just - that was another topic you had mentioned.

(David): That was one of the topics. I mean, what do you want to say?

Chuck Gomes: Well, we could ask them the question what is - you know, what works best for you in terms of communications? Is this kind of forum we're having today the best, or are there better ways for us to do that? Because we know - you know, we've been making some changes in those things. It'd be nice to get a feel for it.

And again, I'm not advocating this (unintelligible)...

(David): Is this a point which we could bring up the question of a response to our letter about .jobs?

(Ray): Yes. This is (Ray) on the phone. Can you hear me?

Keith Drazek: Yes.

(Ray): Just a quick input on that. I'm not sure that our letter to the Board was about .jobs as much as it was we feel it was - it's important for - to have - to make sure there's checks and balances between staff and Board for transparency, et cetera. That sound communications take place prior to a notice of breach. We said it the letter...

(David): (Unintelligible) right. I was just using the .jobs as shorthand.

(Ray): Okay.

(David): But the letter is about the question of notification before a Board action - or a staff action is taken to initiate legal proceedings.

(Ray): I think it's reasonable in that just to ask the question if they've considered our letter to them, and if they happen to have any response you know, now. You know, what consideration - they've been busy. They've got a lot of things on their plate. It could just very well be they've not yet even had an opportunity to consider it.

So I think just mentioning it and saying something to the effect that you know, "Have you considered the letter and do you have a response at this time?" And if they don't then move on to the next subject.

Keith Drazek: We don't have a next subject that's...

(Ray): Depending on the order that it comes in. Yes.

Keith Drazek: Unless you have - Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: I don't know how or whether we should bring something like this up, but it kind of relates to communication. It's something that's been bothering me. And now that the new gTLD program is going forward and they've already voted - because I didn't want to slow that down.

But I think a lot of things about the process in their negotiations with the GAC, I think - I want to point out that a number of the concessions that they made were ones that affected or impacted registries without ever talking to us as to whether things were feasible or not. An example is the last minute decision they made to decide to do both a sunrise and an IP claims, and have the IP claims go during the first 60 days of registration, right?

Nobody had talked to the registries about anything like that. In fact, if you looked at any of the past documents that dealt with that kind of thing, about a real time, you'd see that the registries and others had said that it was not practical and not feasible, yet you have a Board that basically on their own without consulting any of the registrees to see whether something's technologically feasible made a last minute decision to decide to do that.

And while a couple of registries got together, and registrars, to propose some sort of implementation that's going to be discussed tomorrow - again, that may not have been possible.

So the whole point is that when you're talking to the GAC, they are a stakeholder. They are a very important stakeholder. But before the Board makes any decisions that could either impact on our technical operations or that have a policy - a broader policy impact, it really needs to go back through the appropriate channels in order to do it.

We cannot forget, as much as the GAC is putting pressure on them and the governments are putting pressure on them, that the GAC's saying multi-stakeholder - it truly should mean multi-stakeholder. So if they provide advice to the Board, it's just advice.

Then, they should check back with the constituents that are going to be most impacted by that advice to make sure that they have enough to go forward. And on the decision for the IP claims, that to me was a completely last minute decision by the Board without checking with those that would be (unintelligible) as to whether it was feasible.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again, if it's okay to jump in. I'm okay with making that point. I think we ought to do it very tactfully in a sense, because when you really look at it - let's not over generalize and say they didn't consider registry input, because in a lot of cases they really did.

They stood firm on not putting the infirmity - (affirmity) - where if you look at their rationale to the Board, remember the word affirmative conduct of a registry? That was the real problematic one for us in the UDRP. Staff stood up and the Board supported them on that.

So there are quite a few cases where they made changes in response to our input and were effective. So let's make sure we don't give the impression that they weren't - they didn't consider registry input.

Your point's still valid, especially with regard to that specific issue, and that's probably where I'd focus it.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got a suggestion here that I think - I mean, it sounds like we've got the key topic that Keith talked about. We've got the one that we discussed

about the meeting ought not - the extraordinary meeting and whether we raise on that, which is kind of - you know, it's almost like that's the third topic. And then if you've got this one.

My understanding is this is a communication and interactions topic in general, and it seems to break down into a couple of areas, or three areas that I can see at the moment. The one is the sort of new styles and approaches and approaches and mechanisms of communication and how is that working? And I'm not sure if we've got examples of that? You know, whether it's this change from the cocktail hour to coming into this - the issue about mechanisms of how we work with them.

Then there's this breach letter and we tried to - we were trying to thread that in, but I'm not sure if there are other examples of where this - it's essentially an example of an open and - or incomplete item; something that hasn't been addressed.

And then third, this issue of recognizing that while they've been under a lot of pressure with a critical and important stakeholder in the GAC, that they've got to be careful or we are aware that under those circumstances, they are potentially in a corner to try and make rapid decisions. But we have concern that occasionally that might raise issues of implementation.

So those seem to me - there seems to be a kind of set of themes under communication or - and/or interaction that can be dealt.

Ching Chiao: Thank you. (David). And I'd just like to echo what Jonathan just said, and we haven't got a chance to talk about some of the Council updates. There's one issue on the study group of use of names or countries and territories where the actual work hasn't been starting yet, but there - actually, some of the

discussion are talking about the ISO 3166-1FR3, which is the three letter code listed on the 3166 list.

So there, the cc's are talking about this just having this kind of a wild guess or a sense that the techs would like to get involved more on - for those who are submitting the three letter codes for the new gTLD application and what will be the (unintelligible) that benefit - especially on about Norway, and the (.nor) will be a cc - or (.nor) will be a gTLD, but file through a - sort of a need to be - need to have a country (speced up).

So certain issue, I would just like to bring this up, but so the - and sort of the government intervention has got - is getting - and push the (unintelligible).

(David):   We can add that to the list. If there's time, I can call on you to present that.

Ching Chiao: If we have time - if there's an interest of that, I mean this is just getting started. There's not even a formal meeting, but I'm just watching through and also one of this - one kind of this (unintelligible) to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So my question Ching, is this a Board level issue?

Ching Chiao: Right. So I'm just saying that this is a study group - it's being formed, but since Jonathan is talking more and more government intervention tools to whatever business that we are talking about. And we are agreeing - and I mean, those issues - I'm just pointing out there's one study group which might be an example that we should...

(David):   Is this something that the Board's aware of?

Ching Chiao: I don't know.

(David):   Okay.

                  What I'm getting is at is is this the right forum to bring that up? Because the Board may not even be aware of it, or is there a point we want to make to the Board?

Ching Chiao: That is true, but.

(David):   Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So if not, I would say this is not the right forum.

Ken Stubbs: I hate to sound like the profit of doom, but you guys have pushed yourselves into a 45 minute lunch. I hope you have food close by.

Man: Where are the suds?

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: You mean they haven't been delivered yet? Oh, God.

(David):   I think at this point, we probably ought to take the break and get...

Chuck Gomes: Let's give the Board the opportunity to see if they have any questions of us like they always do.

(David):   I always do.

Ken Stubbs: David, just a quick reminder. Anybody who's planning on dialing in later on, there is a different code that's required to get back on the call in the afternoon session.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Ken. So this is Keith. Just real quick before we break, just to make sure that we're all on the same page in terms of the order and ownership. (David), you're obviously going to lead the meeting from the registry stakeholder group side. I expect that you'll do a brief introduction with sort of the three points that we want to cover here? Or is it - how many points is it now?

(David):   I have vertical integration number one. The Saturday workshop number two. Notification of communication to the Board is number three. The GAC - the question of changes. And I think the way to describe that; it's the STI had a - reached a consensus - a GNSO consensus which then was changed without coming back to the GNSO for further input. Is that accurate?

Chuck Gomes: It's Jeff's issue that he was talking about with regard to the change that was made about requiring the two rights protection mechanisms. That was a GAC...

(David):   I think that's it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That was a GAC request.

(David):   Kind of predicted what the STI had agreed on.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. But I don't think I'd bring it up that way. I don't really care about the STI like - sorry. Sorry about that being transcribed and all. I do care. I liked it.

But no, I think - my point was basically that there were - in the GAC Board interaction, there were changes to the guidebook that implicated registries without ever going back to the registries. It's not so much that they counteracted the consensus, because the consensus is not - sort of part of it, but I don't think - I wouldn't take that tact. We tried that before.

(David): Okay. Well, I won't bring up the STI then. And then the last thing...

Man: Yes. I agree with Jeff. I think you're right there. It reeks a little of kind of fast and loose, and I...

Jeff Neuman: If you want to just introduce it with a few (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes (David), you don't have to do all the topics. I mean, you could just...

(David): I'm just giving a list, and the last one on the list is a question of mechanisms of communication, which would include the change from the luncheon meeting to this format and...

Jeff Neuman: Now there was - there is one area where - tied to the communication that they may be going back on what the consensus of the community was, both in - well in the STI and otherwise - the GNSO, which is now they're talking about not having - as a result of (Lifo)'s lobbying -- sorry -- they're not talking about not having agreements with URS providers, because the (unintelligible) property organization doesn't want it.

That would be going against the consensus of the community, so we can put in a reminder there that if there was something that came out of consensus of the community, and for whatever reason -- including a reason because of advice from the GAC -- they go against that consensus, they really do need to -- according to the bylaws -- come back to us to talk through those issues.

Chuck Gomes: Should we let Jeff take a lead on that one?

(David):   Yes. I think so.

                 Chuck, I think that's good. So I've got the lead on the VI issue, just to kick it off, okay. I mean on (one point) - I want to make sure we've got you know people assigned and responsible who are going to lead this discussion from our side. So who else is taking the lead on other issues?

Jonathan Robinson: Do you volunteer the question - the simple question on the retreat, I can then be answer it - or ask it.

(David):   Thank you, Jonathan.

                 Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Now a logistical issue. We need to make sure - I don't know how many Board members will be here, but we should have them at the table. So I'll let you have the table and I'll sit back.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Oh, we are? We're in their room. Oh. Oh, okay. I forgot.

Man: I was going to say it wasn't here.

Jeff Neuman: Operator you can - can you please stop the recording. I think we're breaking for lunch.

END