

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
Update on Cross Community WGs, WHOIS studies, IDN Variants, IRTP D, SCI
Saturday 16 November 2013**

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

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: All right everyone, if we could commence the next session please, it would be great to get you all in order and let's prepare for the next session. So if we could prepare to start the recording and when I give you all the indication we'll get going.

Are we okay with the recording? Sound? Are we okay with the recording?
Great.

So here we begin the next session after the afternoon break. This is an update on the Cross Community Working Group's Initiative. It's going to be brought to us by staff member - ICANN Staff member Mary Wong.

So over to you Mary, thanks very much.

Mary Wong: Thanks Jonathan. So we only have a couple of slides because in some ways the timing of this meeting is fortuitous. There is, as we heard just now, going to be a joint meeting with the ccNSO on Monday and there are certain action items they are teeing up. So some discussion I think would be very helpful on this topic.

I think most of the councilors will recall this, but for the benefit of others in the room, there was a drafting team effort by the GNSO some time ago which resulted in a set of original draft principles approved by the GNSO Council in March 2012. And upon its approval, the Council also asked the other SOs and ACs for feedback, and some of the most constructive feedback was received from the ccNSO in June of this year.

As a consequence, the Council convened to discuss next steps. And you see on the slide it says that at one of its meetings last month, the Council approved a formation of a new drafting team and appointed Counselor John Berard as the GNSO Co-Chair. And we'll explain a little bit about that in a little bit.

The other co-chair we are hoping will come from the ccNSO, and to that end letters were sent by Jonathan to the ccNSA Chair as well as to the Chairs of all the other SOs and ACs letting them know of this new effort and inviting them to send representatives of their community to join this new Cross Community Drafting Team.

So the next steps really are that following from a staff paper that was sent around on, I believe, the 10th of November which summarizes the work that the GNSO did in early 2012 as well as the feedback that was received, is to of course first of all to convene the new drafting team hopefully with as many representatives across the community as possible shortly after this meeting in Buenos Aires. And hopefully the team will then be able to review some of the recommendations made and the staff paper for moving forward with this effort.

I won't go through the whole staff paper here, copies have been sent and published I believe on the Web site. But this light shows some of the questions that were raised by the ccNSO and its feedback.

And I should say at this point that prior to the Council's October meeting, the original GNSO Drafting Team met and considered the feedback and actually recommended this particular way forward. But I've listed some of the more high level topics that the ccNSO pointed out. Either there's issues that were not considered by the original GNSO principles or issues that would require further work development and clarification.

So I wanted to really just highlight this as well as - the next slide please - procedurally some steps forward as to how the new DT might be able to do its job efficiently. Because as I think everybody in this room who is on the GNSO has said several times, the development of a coherent set of operating principles that would be applicable to all of the different SOs and ACs with the different rules and remits, but that would also lead to effective development of policy recommendations on issues across come to interest would be something that we would very much like to see in the very near future.

So here, just some of the procedural recommendations and hopefully we can engender some discussion on this point. Unless John, do you want to add to this?

John Berard: No, only to suggest that it's ironic that a point where we need leadership that is sensitive, collaborative and opened to other people's points of view, I got Dick.

But I think that, all joking aside, the key thing here is whether or not your letters get a response.

Jonathan - I mean we need to find out if there's any interest at all among the other SOs and ACs.

Jonathan Robinson: I mean isn't it - it strikes me that this is probably something that is - goes beyond letters now (unintelligible) conversations isn't it really, it's much you're

saying, you know, what appetite have you got to work on anything in this regard?

Any other comments or questions or input? Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, I think your time's invalid. I refer again to the meeting yesterday because there was a topic (unintelligible) at the SO AC's Chair's meeting with the Senior Staff (unintelligible).

So let me say Fadi is, at this level, and also some of the senior staff people are not aware of this activity. But they are keen on to get some results, you know, because they see, okay, the community is complex and there must have been many - much cooperation between the different types, different parts of the communities here, different SOs and ACs.

So Fadi - he was about - well, to start a kind of initiative on staff side in this election about to take ordination for that. And I would like to ask you because, to help us to keep him a little bit relaxed in that because we are doing this channel right now.

So on the other hand I'm wondering whether - why we do not get this point from others, SOs and ACs, because they are claiming that this part is missing. So ALAC and others throughout - ALAC is wonderful explaining now because we need that and we need a body which is not driven by the GNSO charters.

And so I really wonder why there is no answering, and I would like really to ask those who are willing to help in this thing.

Jonathan Robinson: No doubt that Mary will be on my case reminding me to do that. I can sense it already. So you know, I'll work with her to make sure we do follow that up with some in-person contact and try to understand. Alan's not here.

Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: And Jonathan, yes I will. But additionally, I think we're talking about a number of very different SOs and ACs with very different issues on their mind at this point.

I think in some ways, I'm not sure if ALAC is necessarily going to be representative of the other groups. I think as everybody knows, there were ALAC participants in that originally GNSO drafting team, and I think we know that this is a fairly high priority issue for the ALAC.

It may be that for the other groups, it's not that they're not interested, but perhaps timing might have been an issue. And certainly I think the letters, I think when Jonathan sent them out, I think he was very well aware that they wouldn't be enough, that there would need to be follow-up. The timing was such that, as you mentioned Jonathan, the personal outreach and contact at this meeting followed by further follow-ups by next week will then give us some sense of what the level of interest is.

Jonathan Robinson: John.

John Berard: John Berard, Business Constituency. As comments mentioned earlier, there is the anxiety within the ccNSO with regard to the way ICANN is handling its operations, its budgeting, its strategic planning. That could be a point of departure as well for validating the need for Cross Community working groups because that exercise affects the entire community not just the ccNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point, so you make that reference as a potential example of where the tangible examples of future work. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I personally think that this is a really critically area that's been put off for too long so I'm very supportive of it. I'm not saying I'm volunteering because I'm already spread pretty thin.

But I think this is an area where some people who are wanting to get a little more involved and get their feet wet could contribute pretty easily. It's not a hugely controversially one I don't think, it's a matter of kind of putting heads together between the SOs and ACs. But we each have our own policies and working towards some things and answering these questions.

So what I'm throwing out, and I'll certainly try to encourage this on the Regarding Stakeholder Groups side is that if there's somebody that would like to get their feet wet in a drafting team - and drafting teams are typically a little bit easier than working groups too. This would be a good area.

So I guess what I'm throwing out to everyone is in your respective groups, if you know somebody or you even can seek somebody that would like to kind of pass the waters a little bit, I think this is one that could be done and it's not overly complex. It's not that hard to look at the GNSO PDP procedures, the ccNSO PDP procedures and so forth and do this.

So I just throw that out as a way to maybe get some new blood, and that will be helpful to have some continuity too from players that were on the other drafting team or that have been around for awhile, so a combination I think would be healthy.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck, I think it's a very good point. Getting your feet wet doesn't sound too attractive. Maybe you could say gaining some valuable experience. But I take the point; it's great.

So any other thoughts or comments? Great. Thanks Mary, thanks for the contributions. I think Mary, you are next up on the item. So let's pause for a moment, stop the recording and then we'll pick up immediately afterwards.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Are you ready with the recording? Okay thank you. So next item is an update on the Whois studies which is going to be given by Mary Wong and - okay, please. Start (unintelligible) and then we can if we have questions.

Mary Wong: Thank you Wolf. It wouldn't be an ICANN Meeting or a GNSO discussion without some Whois discussion so here we are.

But there are some positive developments and news, and hopefully again there can be some good discussion because again, this is a topic of long-standing interest within the GNSO and elsewhere in the community.

As everybody knows, I think there were several studies on various aspects of the Whois system that were commissioned by the GNSO a couple of years ago. And two remain, both are listed here on the screen.

The first by NPL on Privacy and Proxy Abuse was published for public comment. And we'd like to think everybody, individuals, GNSO groups as well as others who submitted public comment which closed a couple of days ago. So ICANN staff will review, analyze and talk the researchers about some of the public comments, and I will have a couple of comments on that a little bit later. But to expect a summary analysis for further discussion by the GNSO are next steps following that.

I should say also at this point that obviously, when these studies were commissioned, some of the current work that's going on in ICANN about aspects of Whois haven't yet started. Obviously the Whois review team at the time hadn't published its final report, and the expert working group was only set up late last year.

So the one of the points that would be very helpful for the GNSO to consider is not just the findings and the results of each of those studies, but really how those findings, results and your analyses of them can feed into the future

work, not just at the GNSO. For example, the PDP on Privacy and Proxy Services that we'll talk about in a little bit, but also the work of ICANN in respect of the Whois system.

So the other study then that is awaiting public comment but we have not published it, is the study on Whois Misuse that was performed by SMU here in the U.S.A. through their side lab. They are finalizing the report even as I speak and we should receive a final copy of that report sometime this week given that the Buenos Aires meeting is just about to start.

And cognoscente of concerns in the past about too many papers published before a meeting, opening and having public comments during an ICANN meeting, it seemed to us that it would actually be quite good timing to have that report released right after the Buenos Aires meeting.

And as you all know, basically what happens then is that for the three or four weeks that the public comment period is first opened, the researchers will present the findings to the community.

So I don't want to spend too much time on the first, the Privacy and Proxy Abuse Study. I think many of you attended the Webinar; certainly a lot of presentations are available. And there are a number of nights here that we are just going to flash through because they do summarize the study.

But again, cognoscente that there may be folks who are not too familiar with the study or the findings as well as for the record, we've put in a few more slides than the time really had in order to accomplish that purpose.

So if we can just skip through these next slides. Maybe we'll stop at this one - sorry Lars. Can we go back to the last one?

Some of the public comments, we haven't yet analyzed all of them but did comment that the study, I think most of the public comments commended the

office for some very thorough useful research, but some of the public comments addressed issues that the study did not go into, and we summarize them here.

I'd like to say generally, not responding to any particular public comment, but that generally, the terms of reference for all of the studies including this and CMU's study were approved by the Council developed with the help of the community. And certainly in the case of this particular study, there was some refinement, there were revisions that happened along the way. And we'll put full analyses of these into the response to the public comments when they come.

So this is just a summary of the findings. Again, I don't really want to go into them. It's coming.

And so that really is just a reminder of where we are with the Privacy and Proxy Abuse Study. The Whois Misuse Study which studies a particularly different aspect of the Whois system, here we put on this slide the nature of the study as well as the hypothesis that ICANN charged CMU to test, and that's in italics at the bottom of the screen as in whether they can show that public access to Whois data leads to a measurable degree of misuse.

And I want to say here that not just for this study or even the Privacy and Proxy Study but all the studies that were commissioned by the GNSO in terms of the terms that were used and the definitions that were used as well as the gTLDs that were tested, it was all the same thing to the same definitions the top five gTLDs that were tested, and in the thought that would actually contribute to some useful findings.

Next slide please. So again, we haven't got the final final copy of the report which we hope to do and publish by next week, but a fairly high level preview of the findings is this.

I should say that the study was divided into two parts; first what was called a descriptive study or a survey of registrants, registrars, registries, law enforcement and so forth. The response rates were fairly low for a number of reasons, but we thought that some of the percentages that they found were interesting. And it was on the basis of these findings and percentages that the second part of the study which was an experimental study was designed to test whether or not these could be corroborated.

And what was found by CMU was that it was these three types of misuse that was most reported, and they were able to measure some of it. Although they tried to test for other types of misuse as required by the terms of reference, they found no others at least at a statistically significant level.

The draft report and the webinar that CMU will give as a consequence will go into much more detail about reasons for this including whether it was any of the gTLDs themselves that was significant or the pricing had an effect and the effect of any anti-harvesting techniques that might be in use by registries or registrars.

So that's sort of a preview of what we can expect from the CMU study. And next steps then, like I said, ICANN staff will provide an analysis of NPL's study of public comments received in response to NPL's study. We'll publish the (McHugh's) study, and hopefully the GNSO throughout this process and after can then consider next steps like I said, not just what to do with the findings and the jobs, but how that will feed into GNSO policy work as well as to the overall work of ICANN on Whois. That's it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Oh thank you very much Mary for this presentation. So we can expect with regard to the Privacy and Proxy (unintelligible) some results in the near future, the more detailed results.

So if I may, I just have a first question is so the next steps you're outlining here is for (Jon Venay) all to consider next steps. How does this fit into the

work for the expert working group? Is there any connection between this and the work that they are doing and how is it done?

Mary Wong: So I think as everybody is aware and I said earlier the expert working group was formed after some of these studies were commissioned, but I'd like to say that there has been some coordination at least amongst those of us who support all of these groups because we, of the very question that you asked, the possibility that any of the findings from each of the groups could be useful to that other groups work and then feedback to this group.

I believe that the session plan tomorrow for an update on EWG, and I think as most folks know, they published a status report just a few days ago or week ago, that does talk for instance about Privacy and Proxy, and specifically also focuses on delay and reveal which was the subject of a feasibility survey done by the GNSO awhile ago.

So while I can't give a definitive answer as to exactly how and which finding, I think it's very useful that you are having these discussions with the EWG, and certainly on the staff side, we're going to continue to monitor and communicate. And that may become clearer as the EWG comes closer to finishing its work, as for example in the GNSO, if the privacy and proxy accreditation PDP kicks off with the working group as well.

And don't forget that sort of at the backend way after this, there is a GNSO PDP on gTLD registration data services that also needs to be kicked off after the EWG completes its report. So we are very aware of the need to coordinate.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, do you have a session tomorrow that I think it will answer with the EWG Expert Working Group and then we can raise those questions as well now.

Is there any from the audience, any input/comments, questions? I see Chuck first.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Wolf. Having reviewed the Expert Working Group report, I encourage everybody to do that, and it ties into what the Whois studies and so forth because it's all about Whois.

The direction they're going and the whole idea of using an Expert Working Group to the extent that this one was used, I think has, I personally think, that has some real potential in terms of how we can improve the PDP process. I know there were some concerns from even our stakeholder group with regard to that and the way it was handled. I think we got the clarity we needed; it wasn't policy development, it would feed into policy development later on by the GNSO and that's the way it should be.

But as I read through that report, and I also see this data that we got in the Privacy and Proxy Study, I really think those things will make our job easier when we move into policy development going forward. So I guess call out to your attention, and I think there's some real good that can come out of this and especially as it relates to probably the most complicated and different issues that we've had to deal with since the start of ICANN and that's with regard to registration data.

So you haven't at least glanced at that and look at where they're going, I encourage you to do that because they really did some good work since Durbin.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thanks Chuck. Any further comment/question regarding our missteps or fully understood how and where we are going? Okay so no more comments; thank you. And I think we could close, come to a close of this session.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: So we are okay with the recording - yes for the next session.

So actually we have three sessions left. The first one about IDN variants, and we will have one about the IRTP and the Registrar Transfer Policy Part D, and then the last one is regarding an update from the standing committee of GNSO improvements. So that is for the rest of this day.

We will start with the IDN Variance, and I think we will get an update from staff and I'll hand it over to you. Please introduce yourself please.

Naela Sarras: Thank you, yes. So my name Naela Sarras; I work on the IDN Variant TLD program which is what I'm specifically speaking about here, but I also work on IDN TLDs in general.

And so today we are here to give an update about the program - just the program that's been in the works for awhile. We're in faith for the program.

And specifically, the Variant program requested at the request of the ICANN Board back in April requested input from their SOs and ACs to give guidance and advice that they wish to give on implementation of the recommendations some of the user experience study.

And the input we got from the GNSO back in, I believe October, in the letter from the Council said that the Council wanted to remain updated on the status of the program and the implementation of Variant's handling mechanisms. So that's the context of why we're here giving this update.

So can you take me to the next slide please? I can do that; thank you.

So today I'm going to give you two pieces of updates; one is implementation of the IDN root label generation group procedure and I'll explain a little bit of what that is. And then the - how we're incorporating the input that we got on the implementation of the recommendations on the user experience study.

So by way of giving just a little bit of a background of why we're doing this, and hopefully - so one of the things that we're doing, we have been doing since 2009, is we have had a process open for accepting IDN ccTLDs. So country codes are going into the root zone, and then the new gTLD program opened the doors for IDN gTLDs to be applied for.

That's all good. What's missing, if you will, is the rules of what's a valid IDN label on how do we get administratively decide what's a valid Unicode code point or a character that we can safely put in the root zone. So that's one thing that's missing. And so the evaluations that are being now are done by experts on a case-by-case basis, but we don't have, if you will, some of you will be probably to discern IDN table for the root zone which is what ICANN administers. So that's one piece.

And then the other piece is we don't have a way to identify for a label what are the corresponding variants. So in writing systems, for example take Chinese, there's a typically a traditional Chinese label and then a corresponding simplified Chinese.

So we don't have a way to say, "Okay, for this traditional this is the corresponding simplified and vice-versa." We know and understand a lot more about the Chinese script because the Chinese community has done a lot more work on it.

But we don't know as much about other scripts; how does it work in the Arabic community and the Arabic script and the Indian language scripts, and you know, you name it. So we need - because the root zone is a shared resource, there needs to be a set of rules that apply to that we can deterministically apply.

So that's the background behind the Variant Program. So one of the stages that it just finished is a procedure to try and come up with these rules for the root zone. And this procedure is currently in implementation.

So the procedure entails having generation panels, these are community panels that are established as a script level so a Chinese one, an Arabic one, I think the Indian one - the one for the Indian language is going to be called (Neobrawny) etcetera.

So the community's on the panels come up with a proposal, submit it to the Integration Panel which is a panel of experts that ICANN hired. They vet the input that's coming from the community and eventually when it's accepted it gets added into what's called the Unified Labels Integration Rules for the Root Zone. So you can think of that and see IDN tables for the Root Zone, that's the last bubble at the bottom.

So in order for us to implement this procedure is a procedure called for the Integration Panel to be formed first. So in our - when we did the update in Durbin, we said that we are in the process of hiring the Integration Panel. That's now been done and the panel is seated - and the next one. And you can actually see the panel right here; here's a picture of the panel.

They've had their first face-to-face meeting where they basically went over what we call the start-up tasks, and determined sort of a work plan of how to come up with the start-up tasks including the maximal start-up repertoire which is all the maximum set of points that could be included in the LGR. And then they also work on something called The Whole Label Evaluation Rules, and then also a format, an excellent format, in which their community panels will submit the work to ICANN.

So that's - so the panel is seated, they're on their way to do the work. And in addition to the procedures, (unintelligible) developed something called Supplemental Guide to basically fill in some gaps where it wasn't really clear from the procedure how to operationally run the panel. That's what the Supplemental Guide is about and it's available on the project Web site.

So I talked a little bit about this, what that panel is doing first - their start up tasks. And those tasks need to be done because they represent the starting points for their generation panels or the community panels. And so the panels don't each individually have to work on them so it reduces duplication of work.

And then the next focus with ICANN staff will do now that the Integration Panel is seated is on Generation panels. I have number of slides here so I won't - in the interest of time I won't go too far into each of the slides.

But potentially, as I said at the beginning, this is a two-pass system or a two-pass process to generate - the communities do their work, come up with a proposal or what they want in their label generation rules for their script. They submit it to ICANN. ICANN, through its work with the Integration Panel - the Integration Panel is essentially the set of experts that review their input coming from the generation panel. There may be some back-and-forth about the information coming through, and then eventually when it's accepted, it's submitted into the larger set.

We have today since we've published the call for generation panels to form themselves has received interest from (unintelligible) from Arabic, Chinese, Sarilik and (Neoprobe Script). And have a link up there for the call for Generation Panel. This is essentially an open call, so we don't have a time limit of when a panel comes through.

Obviously, this process depends a lot on the community coming through and doing their work and so the call will remain open ended. And I imagine what will happen is once we get some of the scripts that are already in the works to come through, I think ICANN will go out and do more for the scripts that are not represented up there.

So I think I talked a little bit about this with the GP - what the Generation Panels do. They propose a set of good points for the scripts and then they

work on whether applicable variants. The process here - I don't know who presented while there is a lot of back-and-forth between them and the Integration Panel so it's not - we'd like and we're going to encourage a lot of cooperation before because if you wait until the end then we face just a rejection right off the bat. So we want a lot of the cooperation before.

If a community is interested in forming a Generation Panel, we have defined the guide that we also published and in the call, we defined how they go about forming their panel and sub-communities that are already working groups that are working on such issues, so it would make sense for them to build on that. Once they figure out what makes more sense for their community, they basically put together a proposal and submit it to ICANN.

So according to the procedure, ICANN and with advice from the Integration Panel will review the proposal or the work plan of the Generation Panel. Once accepted, the generation panel can start doing their work.

And in terms of things that we've put in place to help support the entire project, we have, as called for in the procedure, we have a project-wide mailing list appeal process called LGI ICANN Network. So this is for that and it has public archives so this is so that any interaction between the Generation and the Integration Panel can be - anyone can basically email to this mailing list and anyone can review the archives.

There's email areas up there - IDNs and TLDs with ICANN that you can email us. It goes to small group of staff if you have any questions about this.

And then finally, we do have, just like we did for the integration panel, set up a supplemental guide for the Generation Panel where the procedure was - did not have quite enough details for how to run the Generation Panel.

So I encourage you to go to the Wiki if you want information about the project that's - it's a Wiki platform but it's - we're locking it down to only staff to do the

updates. So it's only because it makes it easier for us to do the update. So we're using it as a Web page "even though it's a Wiki platform."

And then the next set of updates that we wanted to give here is the input that we've gotten from the SOs and ACs. So as I said at the beginning, back in March of this year, there was a report that was produced from this program, from the Variant program, there was a report on user experience implications with (access) Variant CLDs. And then at the time in April, the ICANN board asked for input from the SOs and ACs on how to incorporate and implement those recommendations.

So to date, we have input from ALAC, GNSO, and SSAC, and those are all posted on the Variant Web page.

So what we did here without going into too much detail of what the different pieces of input were, a little bit of a summary of the collective inputs, and there's basically comments between them.

So one of the ones that comes through is that we don't need additional policy development here, and in fact we need to expedite the introduction of IDN and TLDs. There needs to be a tie between what we're going to call the primary TLD and the corresponding Variant of Variant, so they need to be tied together or bundled together.

And that as we introduce or should the technical rules decide that there are variance that can be faithfully introduced into the root zone, we need to limit confusion and collision in the root zone. And that's essentially what the procedure calls for is to be conservative, to block delegation of Variant TLDs to do different operators. Delegation of Variant TLDs should technical rules determine that they are okay to delegate, should be based on necessities of not an automatic delegation.

And then the LGR itself is in - it's going to be a set of rules that are automated; it's not a one-on-one judgment of what's a variant and what's not.

And then there's a theme of contorting with language communities when building or evaluating Variant TLD applications.

Then we have here the specific highlights from SSAC recommendations. I believe in the Durbin meeting we went through this so I won't go through them again because at the time this was already out. So again, to be conservative with respect to good points that are committed in the root zone, to have backward compatibility, etcetera.

ALAC recommendations also commented and specifically highlighted cooperation between technical communities and logistic communities and then expediting the process.

And I think the GNSO recommendations also went back to the findings from the IDN Working Group which I think the report is from 9-2007, right, 2007. And the highlights are up there, delegating one string to IDN gTLD, and then I think confusion, etcetera.

And then all of the above, what I have here is that these are being implemented basically through two different paths that are going on at the same time right now. One is what we described at the beginning is this set of rules that we're building, the IDN label generation rules for the root zone, and then any processes that we're starting to build and think about for handling, for Variant handling mechanisms, including operations of how to delegate those for ITLDs should they be deemed delegate-able. I have to say that.

And then up here we just have some links - some of the reports that we refer to. They're not coming across very well here but they - should probably lighten up this slide a little bit.

And that's all I had here. I realize every time we come and talk about Variant TLDs it's kind of a weird topic, so please if you have any questions I'm here to answer them.

I think the message we wanted to drive is we have two things to think about. We have to build this label generation rules for the root zone. That work is highly dependent on the community work being submitted to ICANN. So even though, you know, on the - what we said back in Beijing in April this year, you know, we thought it would around the middle of next year for the IDN LGRs to actually exist so it would be a reality. But again, this is all dependent on the community work.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much for this comprehensive presentation. And it seems to be a lot of process work going on behind that, you know, to get the system running. Also it has to be tested and these things are going on and it is very top of interest to us all, you know, that Root is safe enough, you know, by implementing the system.

So are there any questions/comments on that? I see Ching please. Can you give us your name for the transcriber.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Wolf. This is Ching Chiao from the Registry Stakeholder Group. And thank you Naela for the update. I actually just have a few very quick questions, and actually non-technical ones.

First of all, you mention about the Generation Panel and ICANN is actually contracting experts kind of feuding this whole Generation Variant - I meant the whole point Generation process. I have to apologize. I haven't read much of the ICANN budget relating to the allocation of budget to this process. So could you give us a rough like number or how - I mean pretty much how much ICANN is planning to - I mean allocate which is feuding this whole process or this kind of services. Could you give us a rough number on this?

Naela Sarras: Sure, thank you. So just to be clear, we - the Generation Panel, that term, it's confusing because it's generating the IDN LGR - the Label Generation Rules. And there's the actual term for Generation Panels. Those are community panels based on volunteers so ICANN is not paying anything for those panels to form themselves. They're volunteered based and community based.

What the procedure calls for is for ICANN to provide advisors so that if a Generation Panel lacks certain expertise, the Generation Panel can come to ICANN and say, "We need an advisor, let's hear on IDN issues." And then ICANN assigns an advisor to that Generation Panel. So that cost is on ICANN to engage advisors. And there's room for volunteer advisors if they come through.

So that's on the Generation Panels to be clear. Those are volunteer panels.

On the Integration Panel, that is an ICANN hired panel and certainly not a true panel. So it currently has five panelists on it. I don't have specific numbers of what the projected cost of the panel is; I don't have that information right here with me.

But it's certainly something that ICANN has already since 2010, the Variant Program has been going on and has cost quite a bit. We could provide the numbers if you ask me too, but I'm just not prepared to like say, you know, "It's been 500K or anything like that." I don't even have that number so that's why I don't want to throw just a number out there.

Ching Chiao: Sure, I mean - so actually a follow-up question is please, if you can, you know, try to, you know, I mean ask for the specific or actually a rough number or budget, that would help us. At least we know that how much - I mean kind of resource has been put into this kind of project.

So the second, actually a follow-up question is that - so the contracted Integration Panel, are you saying that they will be making decisions on which

variants - sorry, let me just take a second. Who will be actually making a decision on which Variant is eligible for the rule? Is it that contracted Integration Panel or is the final call will be on like at the ICANN Board? Could you explain? Thank you.

Naela Sarras: Yes. So no ICANN board, so it's a two-pass system, this whole procedure. This procedure was developed in a previous stage of the program; it's called for a two-pass system.

The first determination of what are corresponding variants comes from the Generation Panels, from the communities. They say, "This is our valid code points that we want in the root zone and these are the corresponding variants." That then is submitted to the Integration Panel.

The Integration Panel, by design, their job is to basically and test and investigate all the input that's going to come from the Generation Panel, and they may very well disagree with the Generational Panel. And there will have to be some back-and-forth negotiation until a final set is agreed.

Ching Chiao: Okay.

Naela Sarras: And so the final call is with the Integration Panel, not with the ICANN Board.

Ching Chiao: So that would kind of - I'm not trying to - just maybe we can discuss this Naela. So I have some - so maybe you know this. There could be several scenarios.

Once the Integration Panel makes the call, but the applicant may not feel that this is - I mean the result that they prefer. So taking one quick example is that let's say for example, the Integration Panel says for security or safety reason there could be probably needs two or three variants, needs to be delegated.

I understand that there's a conservative kind of principle, but is for security or for safety the reason the Integration Panel suggests that two efficient or variants need to be delegate. But the applicant could say, "Hey, we just feel like getting one and probably we are only to pay one."

So I'm not trying to get answers here, but you know.

Naela Sarras: That's a really good question. Can I clarify it?

So the Integration Panel does not say, "These must be delegated." It does not say that. The procedure does this.

It identifies for this label, "I will give you a set of variants. Of these variants, this is set is allocatable meaning it can proceed to delegation, and this set is blocked. You can't have it." I can't have it, nobody can have it. It has to stay blocked.

So then, and this is the processes that we're working on next which is the variant handling mechanisms. "Of these allocatable ones, which ones do you want delegated as the applicant, and have you - are you able to establish necessity for why you want this one or three or whatever subset or the whole set of the allocatable ones." We haven't worked out those rules yet.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Ching, okay. I see Edmon. Please introduce yourself.

Edmon Chung: Yes, Edmon Chung here. So I guess just to add to what Naela was mentioning, the Integration Panel or the LGR process, that is separate from the evaluation process of new gTLDs and/or IDN ccTLDs.

So the Integration Panel nor the Generation Panel will ever be, you know, involved in the actual determination of a particular applicant, you know, the TLD and its Variants.

What the LGR program is supposed deliver is a generic set of, I guess, rules for the roots. So it's very important to distinguish the two. Once they're in, then there is, I guess, staff would be leading the efforts on the actual implementation. Once we have the tables and the mechanism from the LGR project, then when an application of an IDN TLD comes in, it's - well at least for now from what I understand, staff would utilize that the LGR traded as a tool and generate those variants.

What you mentioned Ching, I think is hugely important. In fact, I've been speaking to a number of people about that issue.

It's right now, I think supposedly in Project 6 if I'm not mistaken, six or seven - 7, sorry. Project 7 which is the implementation and the processes. What is missing right now from what I can see is exactly what you mentioned.

Whether the Generation Panel or the Integration Panel could have something to say when there is a must have variants delegated. That is non-existent currently in the LGR process. Whether if we as a community we think there are cases that requires that, then something should be said and something should be said in either in response to Project 7 or as the Generation Panels start doing their work.

I was talking about this to actually Han Chuan - I don't know whether he's arrived yet.

Naela Sarras: He arrives tomorrow night I think.

Edmon Chung: Right, so Han Chuan has suggested perhaps either the GNSO or some group might, if there is that particular problem that Ching you mentioned, we should take it on. And perhaps - I'm just, you know, really thinking out loud here - is perhaps the jig might be a place where this discussion could take place as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Edmon for this comment. You would like to answer?

Naela Sarras: If I can please. One last thing is so Edmon brought up a really excellent point. Thank you for differentiating that.

So in our Variant Update Session which happens on Wednesday at 4:45, we actually want to go more into these implementation questions that we have in mind, and maybe even have more of like dialog to get some of this input from the community because we thought it to document and think about some of the assumptions/questions. That's one thing.

And then anything that is even put together in form of any type of implementation will for sure go out for public comment. That is already in position as part of the implementation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. I have one question Naela. You mentioned - well, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. You mentioned that one of the goals is to limit confusion and collision. So also it's custom that we (unintelligible) the new LGR program.

So I wonder whether you have figured about what is the expectations, what could happen in this regard and what are the measures you are taking or have in mind to take against that?

Naela Sarras: Thank you. So we think of the Label Generation Rules procedure, so on the collision side, the reason why it's important to run this LGR is we want to make sure that two labels aren't - two labels that are variants of each other aren't being handed out to two different operators. So that's one thing. This set of rules we'll be able to determine.

On the confusion, I realize this topic of confusion is bigger than this program, and this program isn't trying to get into the whole confusing similarity issue if that's where you're going with this.

So we are in the process of trying to figure out at what point the output coming from this process is run through the confusing similarity algorithm so it can have that done as well on it, the confusing similarity. But it's not trying to change the rules what it currently exists for confusing similarities that makes sense, right. We're only trying to decide what are variants of each other, we're not trying to get into the confusing thing similarity or any of those issues at this point.

It's established that that's a different process on its own. So the output of this process, we'll still have to go through the confusing similarity process. So does that make sense yet?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So it's a procedural issue in your point, you know, the technical one.

Naela Sarras: Correct in that - well, we're not getting into the confusing similarity issues here. Our output - our operative is a different procedure that is run to determine variant labels. It is not getting into the confusing similarity.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Alan, please.

Alan Greenburg: Just for clarity, I presume when you're talking about confusing similarity you mean between these and other TLD's, not being confusion between the two variants which in many cases are deliberately confusing.

Naela Sarras: That is correct; yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible), it's confusing. Thanks. Okay, anymore questions for this presentation? So thank you very much again.

And we'll close this session and prepare for the next session.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Are we okay with your recording for the next session? Okay thank you very much so we are good in time so I think people are getting more and more exhausted and looking to finish up.

So we have still two sessions and come to the IRTP Part D (quality) relevant process and I would like to hand it over to James Bladel.

James Bladel: Thanks Wolfgang and co-chair Mikey O'Connor is here as well so we're probably going to tag team this one so and who is driving the slides is that Lars?

Okay so this is the overview very much the same updates that we provided to the council in (Durban). This is the last in the string of IRTP working groups. We kicked this off earlier this year and have been working at a fairly decent clip with the goal of having an initial report ready.

I think initially by this meeting but it's looking more like it's going to be towards the end of the year and we'll discuss that here in a moment but it's the last bullet point there.

We have through our work uncovered some interesting issues and concerns relative to the transfer dispute resolution process the TDRP no, policy sorry not process TDRP is policy and that is one of our charter questions.

And as we have explored that a little bit more we've found that it's probably more expeditious for us to form a working group a sub-team, which is led by our co-chair Mikey to flush out some of the questions and some of the recommendations that could spring from that issue.

Okay and this is a slide that touches on the broader issue of the TDRP. I think in general we've determined that despite the frequency of transfer confusion issues that are raised with ICANN and despite the high incidents of remaining hijacking that are encountered in the (wild Y) registrars.

The transfer dispute resolution policy is seldom used mostly for a variety of reasons partially at least some because of its perceived slowness and expense. It's not necessarily the best tool to resolve something like a hijack.

And then this last bullet point we did want to take a look at some of the recommendations that have been approved but not yet implemented from IRTPC that could also have some dependencies associated with the recommendations coming out of our TPD and that's one of the other complexities that was uncovered as well.

Thanks, so I'm going to turn it over to Mikey here and he can summarize some of the bullets on this screen but essentially this charter question while the other ones seem to be fairly straight forward this one was, you know, a rock that we turned over and we found more rocks that needed turning over. So Mikey do you want to walk us through these?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure James it's Mikey wow I'm nice and loud. I'm not going to go through all of these we do have a public session later in the week where we're going to spend about an hour or an hour and a half on these.

I just want to give the council a heads up that we do have some pretty substantive issues that we're taking a look at and essentially that this is the last in almost five years worth of PDP's and we've sort of scraped all the hard questions into the very last part.

It's not that surprising when we first set this up we sort of designed it that way and I think that design has really worked out because the group that's really at the core of this has now been together for five years and we are almost completing each others sentences and I think that's a really positive way to get through what are going to be some pretty interesting and I think substantial issues.

Basically at the root of a lot of this is the issue of hijacking. And what we've discovered in the early days the thought was that one key question should be whether or not registrants should be given access to the TDRP process.

And because today the registrants do not have access to that, today if there's an issue in the IRTP that needs resolving that can only be launched by registrars it can't be launched by a registrant.

And in the early days when these questions were formulated the thought was that that's something we should explore and that's what we're doing now. The interesting kind of connected piece is that in IRTPC we added another process to this, which is the inter-registrant transfer process.

And what we are realizing is that we built the process in IRTPC but we didn't build in a dispute resolution process when there's a collision there and so what we've got is overlaps and we need to sort of back up a bit and take a look at this from that perspective.

So just to rattle through this in a big hurry that first bullet is all about should this be opened up and the sub-questions that we've sort of overturned are what are the circumstances, if we do this how do we set a bar that's high enough in terms of documentation so that you don't get fraudulent or frivolous requests from registrants.

And then the whole who should pay for this question turned into a really interesting discovery that the cost of this is loaded with all kinds of different jobs to do. One of the costs is just the cost of processing it, who should pay for that.

Then there's sort of incentives and penalties, you know, we want to sort of incentivize good behavior and discourage bad behavior and so, you know, how does that work. And then we also and that's the good and bad behavior on the part of the registrants but then we also want to perhaps penalize bad

behavior on the part of registrars and as you can imagine that's an interesting discussion.

So rather than trying to crash through that for initial report here we're taking a little bit more time taking a little bit of care for that. The other two are less interesting questions in one sense but important in another especially the last one.

The TDRP process right now is a two-layer process. The first dispute resolution provider or typically the first dispute resolution provider is the registry if the registrars can't agree and then typically the next layer is to take it to a dispute resolution provider.

In the new world that we are entering now where we're having the possibility of quite a few more registries having to put a process in place to support perhaps not very many dispute resolution cases. It becomes a question of whether it's a good idea to require registries to provide that service at all or whether we should take that layer out.

The group is discovering that is not as simple of question to answer as we thought so we need a little more time on that as well, do you want to take that?

James Bladel: Yes I just wanted to weigh in on I mean even if we set aside the issue of hijacking the main control registrant disputes are very common and very messy whether it's a Web developer that has put together a Web site for a person or a small business.

And then that person believes they want to take their business elsewhere and they don't realize the domain name is not under their control or two partners have a falling out business partners or social partners or so, you know, wading into this minefield this is a very sticky landscape.

And I think that we can't overstate the fact that the costs are significant and the current status flow has registrars on the (lower) costs, which makes sense if registrars are allowed to decline to initiate the process if they feel like the case doesn't have any merit.

Now if they're in a situation where they're forced to participate in a process that they know they're going to lose and have to pay for it, it becomes a little bit more of like they, you know, where one party just kind of boxed out. So and then the other issue being that this could create downstream consequences if you're a little loose on defining who has standing and what a legitimate registrant claimant looks like because someone could use this perhaps to circumvent a loss in the UDRP or another process.

So it gets very, very - there are a lot of slippery slopes here that we're trying to avoid slipping down and I think that all of these things came out during the discussion of how do we make the TDRP more effective, more timely and less costly.

Mikey O'Connor: Another thing about the TDRP for those of you who really want to, you know, are having trouble with insomnia is that this is one of the most complicated policies we've got when you read it.

And so another thing that the working group is doing is essentially rewriting it. So we've taken a pass through that we're going to try and just make it simpler.

Now I don't know if we've gotten any more slides are we done with these slides because I've got one more comment and then okay we've got some milestones coming up.

There's one other point that I'd like to make and that is that because IRTPC has not yet begun implementation we're thinking of - and James and I and others are on the implementation review team for IRTPC.

We're also taking a look at coordinating the implementation of IRTPC and D and putting them perhaps in the same bundle sort of the way a software company might do a release.

So that we're not sliding incremental requirements into registrars every few months but rather take a bunch of them and put them all together so that they can be implemented by registrars and registries to the extent that this hits registries in sort of a predictable way.

So that these things aren't kind of coming at them at random it's more like okay here's a date, here's the stuff that's likely to be coming and get people in the contracted parties some advance notice on what's coming so that they can prepare their organizations in systems and with that back to you James.

James Bladel: Well I think we're wrapping up there's one last slide that shows that we're targeting initial report for the end of this year and we would then put that out for public comment and then we'll incorporate some of the comments we'll receive here and start to build out that final report for the meeting in Singapore.

And then I can see that there's like Mr. Neuman just can't raise his hand hard enough.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I accept questions so question is one from Jeff and then Marika, please Jeff please.

Jeff Neuman: So how many TDRP cases have been filed since the process actually began in 2005?

Mikey O'Connor: Seventy.

Jeff Neuman: Seventy and you're talking about rewriting it, is that based on actual comments from people that have had a problem with it or...

Mikey O'Connor: No basically what is going on here is that depending on how this turns out the number of cases could increase quite a bit if it's also resolved in hijacking cases.

And so this was something that was launched before we came across this other issue, which is the need to pull apart the inter-registrar transfer issue from the inter-registrant.

So that's just something that's one of the many moving parts in this one that we're not quite ready to...

Jeff Neuman: ...so I guess my question is though have you actually had incidents of people with hijacking cases that have not been able to have their issues resolved?

Mikey O'Connor: ...no that's not the reason we're doing it. The reason we're...

Jeff Neuman: That's I guess that's what I'm trying to get to.

Mikey O'Connor: ...the reason we're doing it is because it's a very confusing policy upon which the base process is for contracted parties and dispute resolution providers.

Jeff Neuman: So who is confused?

Mikey O'Connor: Contracted parties and dispute resolution providers.

Jeff Neuman: So they come...

Mikey O'Connor: They're on the working group they're the ones that...

Jeff Neuman: ...yes, no I understand that I...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry, sorry, sorry do not cross the dialogue please, please put your question for your name and then we can continue please do that.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry Jeff Neuman. I guess my issue is that how do I put this nicely or delicately.

Mikey O'Connor: Good luck with that it's a lot of character.

Jeff Neuman: All right I'll just be more direct. It seems like we're doing a lot of work when I'm worried about spinning our wheels and having a bunch of people get together to talk about theoretical issues that have never resulted and rewriting something making it much more difficult for registries to implement.

When speaking on behalf of the registry (dot biz) that's been around since 2001 we've never even had one filed. So now you're talking about increasing it so that we get more disputes filed when nobody from the outside has actually complained that they need a dispute resolution policy or process to handle these.

And that's what worries me as frankly one of the council members that were not doing fact based, data based policy development and the second thing is that we are going to create a new or we're talking about creating a new dispute policy for a problem that's never been reported to the council or by the community that actually a problem exists and so help me with that.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But Mikey's comment does it fit with - through that discussion? Okay James then.

James Bladel: Okay thanks so Jeff I'm going to agree with you a little and disagree with you a lot. Okay so I'm going to agree with you a little that when you look at the problem it's we have all these complaints, hundreds of thousands of complaints regarding transfers.

Incidents of hijacking, incidents of dispute, no one questions that there's a whole universe of those issues. And here we have this particular policy, which is reported to be the remedy, which is never used.

So how do we - the first thing we looked at was how do we address that disconnect and we had tons of data from ICANN staff and ICANN compliance and registrars provided data as well.

And so we're trying to reconcile why is there this gap, why is there this huge problem and no one is using the tool. And I think I come down - I'm going to agree with you on one part, which is I'm not convinced that the problem is accessibility that no one knows it exists and they can't access the policy.

I don't believe that's the barrier but, you know, I may be in the minority on this working group on that. I think that others want to see the barriers to access lowered and make this a more accessible and predictable process.

You were talking about - now going back to rewriting it I want to emphasize these are not material changes. If you look at the text of the TDRP it does not conform to the other consensus policies and the way they're laid out and structured.

So it's making that look a little bit more like a - or organizing that language a little bit more like UDRP and IRTP and other policies. So don't let the word rewrite scare you right now because it's really more just a cut and paste and moving things around and getting rid of duplications.

But, you know, I'm still not 100% convinced that the problem with TDRP is that no one knows about it and no one knows how to use it. I think that the problem with TDRP is it's too slow, too expensive and too cumbersome so.

Jeff Neuman: So when you think it's (slow), analyzing 70 cases are out there or a perception that it's too slow?

James Bladel: When a hijacking dispute the damages - sorry this is James continuing to speak. When a hijacking or dispute damages could be measured in minutes or hours and the filing and, you know, document discovery and processing and panel decision of the TDRP could take weeks or months.

I think they're operating not too slow in terms of our finite measurement but they're operating on completely - two completely different timeframes, orders of magnitude apart from the harm.

Jeff Neuman: Understood but do you know of hijacking cases where there was one reported in the last couple years at least to the registry for (dot biz) and we called up both registrars got them on the phone immediately and solved it like that.

Having a dispute I'm wondering how many don't resolve like that and they just...

James Bladel: I'd just say (biz) is not really the problem.

Jeff Neuman: That's great.

Mikey O'Connor: So Jeffery it's late in the day if you want to really get into this join us on Wednesday or whenever our public session is.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's a good opportunity really to go into details Jeff. I don't think because - Jeff did you get any answers for this one answer right now it doesn't seem so? Can I help you to get those answers?

Jeff Neuman: Can you help me I guess I will ask some more questions but as a council I just want to make sure that we are responding to a - an actual that we're putting policy resources into something that's actually proven to be a problem and that that needs to be addressed.

Or whether this is one of those that we're just fulfilling because it happens to be the last in a series of transfer questions that came up in 2007 that we decided we needed to address.

So are we going through the motions or are we actually solving a real problem? It seems like James is saying that there is a problem and so I guess that's the answer.

I would love to hear from the people that think it's a problem to what their - what they believe or what their hope is to get out of it as to the (ending).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Anyway we can put this under the prioritization with this question as well and control our - have other also other people having commenting sessions and Marika (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: It is (unintelligible) respond to this conversation as one of the aspects we're looking at as well as an outcome of IRTP Part C there's going to be a transfer of registrant policy for which we already know this big resolution policy exists.

So one of the questions the group is also looking at how that would incorporate there and having a dispute resolution and policy for that part of the process.

But the comment I actually wanted to make went back to the comment Mikey made on the implementation of IRTP Part C. I just wanted to clarify I think that we're talking about is the required...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So basically I wanted to reassure you that we're not just going through the motions here we are considering whether there is a need for extra policy and if so then how that policy should look like.

But I have my doubts though that there is such a need and I will raise that during the working group. It would be helpful if you could also come to our meeting on Wednesday (unintelligible) I think to reinforce that position. Okay Jeff please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I'm not sure if I can make that session or not but just to respond to Marika I totally understand that IRTP Part C called for registrants but are we putting the cart before the horse here by coming up with a dispute resolution policy before we've even seen that implemented to see what type of disputes are going to come out of it.

It's not that I, you know, if it turns out after we implement Part C that there are problems and we need the C regulation procedure then by all means let's do it at that time but do we need to think of the philosophical theoretical possibilities at this point in time until we've actually seen some results?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: James yes and then Marika..

James Bladel: So then just as a response this is James speaking. I'm going to go ahead and take the hit on that one Jeff because it did come up during IRTPC, which is if we're going to build such a radically new policy to perform this function it should have some mechanisms for to address, you know, fraudulent or error or whatever, you know, change your registrant.

And at that time what the working group decided was well we'll just use TDRP. So we kind of hooked onto, you know, this anchor in the next policy so we maybe it was an oversight or maybe we were just thinking that TDRP was something that it wasn't until we started putting under a microscope.

But the bottom line is that TDRP as it stands today is not suited to do what IRTPC says it's going to do when that's implemented.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika - this was mentioned as well I think it was already mentioned before but I think that the chance for a complaint that ICANN receives are still the number one consumer complaints that we collect, you know, probably from who is data accuracy complaints.

So as James says there does seem to be a disconnect somewhere between the process that's used relatively few times and indeed the number of issues that do seem to exist in relation to transfers.

And I think as well one of the questions and I, you know, I think you referred to the fact that this would maybe also create more work but I think one of the things you're looking at is, you know, should this become more of a UDRP style process where it's handled by third-party dispute resolution providers instead of (unintelligible) because now you have the first layer, second layer, which also needs I think adds to the complexity and the time involved that it may take to resolve.

But that's something as well the working group is considering now or discussing.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'll take the last two comments it was Mikey or James and then Jeff or...

Mikey O'Connor: I'll pass and let Jeff go first.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Jeff please.

Jeff Neuman: So I am all in favor of taking all of the transfer complaints that I can get and having ICANN compliance do some sort of categorization and figure it out but I'm not quite convinced that it has anything to do with the TDRP or IRTP part - you so we're on.

So if that...

Man: Now you're hurting me.

Jeff Neuman: ...needs to be the subject of something different that's fine but do we really believe that the transfer dispute resolution policy is the thing that will correlate to reduce the number of complaints that we get or are they really tied to things that we've tried to fix in A through Q already.
So that's I guess my question I just again in the time (limit) there's a lot of work on the council's plate or on the communities plate I should say. I think it's a healthy discussion I'm glad we're having it I have my doubts but we'll see, we'll see.

James Bladel: Jeff and there's no - I'm sorry I just wanted to actually just put a button on this and say that what we're discussing here very much reflects the first eight months of our discussion on this working group is what is the problem.

A lot of people have a different idea of why there is a problem, a lot of people even further ideas about what the right approach to solving the problem is. We're examining these things we have not tested any of them for consensus yet there are still a lot of voices that I'm sure will be raised, you know, during that process.

So, you know, I would say thank you for being kind of a good example of some of the doubts that have been raised throughout this whole process and condensing those into just a couple of minutes.

But, you know, let's not presume the outcome here we're working on those things and you're echoing a lot of the questions that we're butting our heads against right now so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay to sum up...

James Bladel: We're not overlooking these issues that's my reassurance.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...thanks James. To sum up first thank you very much for the presentation for the discussion here. I have a suggestion though we got in that point this was here this question of is it necessary to do so right now. So that you keep that in mind and for the - for one of the next council meetings take it to the agenda as well and just reflect on that with going forward within this working group how it works.

So then you can really (unintelligible) and understand full (unintelligible) as a member of this group is behind that question. So it's easy for me to say that because I'm going to leave the council so we have to keep it in mind here.

And as you know these both gentlemen they are going to join the council as well James and Mikey and you will have a chance then to inform between council and the working group in the future and to try to get it through so thank you.

We finish coming to close of the session and would like to wait for preparing for the next session please. Okay so we are on the very last part of our way today and I'm going to present Ron Andruff here from the chair of the SCI standing committee on GNSO improvements to present us.

Ron Andruff: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich and I propose that I take the microphone at the end of the day because in this very room this morning at 7:15 or 7:30 we started our SCI meeting and give a lot of credit to folks like Thomas Rickert his eyes are still open after 12 full hours almost.

So thank you all for your attention. I'm going to make this very brief Julie has prepared a number of slides for us and I'd just like to move if I can - who's preparing the slides?

If we could move right through to the - well don't worry about the slides. Let's start here, last time we got together we talked about where we were with regard to our charter revision and so rather than go through this entire slide you have seen our charter you've done the revision and you've accepted what we had put forward and I would like to say thank you very much for that.

It was quick work, it was diligent work and we're very pleased within the SCI to have a very clear mandate because there was some time there where we did not.

So now we'll move forward and we moved to the next issues that we're addressing right now, the next slide please. We're really working on a couple of new things that you've brought to us recently but I'd like to say that the resubmission of a motion this has taken a little bit of time much longer than we would have liked to have seen.

However we're working in the consensus environment and the IPC constituency had some questions and thoughts about where we're at and we will now if we can hold our timeline within a month of this meeting have that resolved and be able to come back to you with our resolution on that.

Working group self assessment this is a - an item that you may be familiar with but I just...

END