

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting  
IPC meeting  
Tuesday 19 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 Zuck: Jonathan Zuck from the Association for Competitive Technology.

(John McElwain): (John McElwain) with (Nelson Moen).

Man: (Unintelligible), Federation of Intellectual Property (unintelligible).

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt, (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) from the (unintelligible), Paris.

(Peter): (Peter) (unintelligible) from Taiwan, and (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), from (unintelligible), Argentina.

(Fernando): (Fernando) (unintelligible) from Brazil. (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) Network.

Man: (Unintelligible). National Information Technology Development (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible). Italia.

Andrew Barrett: Andrew Barrett, EnCirca. Not a member.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Dave): (Dave) (Unintelligible), Microsoft. IPC member.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Fabricio Vayra: Fabricio Vayra, Time Warner.

Man: (Unintelligible). Member IPC.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Richard Graham): (Richard Graham), (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Keith Barrett): (Keith Barrett), (unintelligible), Washington, DC.

Steve Metalitz: As (Christina) indicated, this is Steve Metalitz.

By the way...

We're starting off with a brief presentation from (unintelligible) are here at (unintelligible) about the for the Asia-Pacific region. One might ask why that's the focus here in Buenos Aires? And the real - the reason is that there's a new ICANN (unintelligible) called CROC - Community Regional Outreach (unintelligible). In any case, it's helped the constituencies - our constituencies do outreach and get more people involved, particularly from the regions of the world where we don't have a lot of participation.

It's great to see so many people here from Latin America, but for the (unintelligible) levels of participation are in the United States, or North America and in Europe, so we want to reach out to other regions. And with the Singapore meeting coming up next, because of the planning and approval process, we need to get started now, or very soon, to figure out how we're going to make use of this support and help bring some more people (unintelligible) intellectual property involved in the Asia-Pacific region.

Put out on the list a request for volunteers to participate in helping us take advantage of this. I know a couple of those people are (unintelligible) and there's others that weren't able to be here. So we'll be doing - over the next month or two, we'll be trying to figure out how best to make use of this program. But the key is to integrate it with the ICANN outreach strategy, so that's why we invited (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) to be here, and let me just turn the (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) from again (unintelligible) actually the new office in Singapore other Asia-Pacific (unintelligible). We started with two staff. Now we have five staff, and we are really looking at thinking about how to engage the community (unintelligible) our long-term continuity.

And some of them, we have engaged them very strongly previously, but after some time the engagement (unintelligible).

So what we have been doing the past three months is really going back to talk to these stakeholders and asking them actually what are their needs? So (unintelligible) right now.

Some of the key findings of what we have gathered so far in the past three months. We're still working on an engagement strategy for Asia-Pacific. (Unintelligible) will talk a little bit more about the Australia region and the islands. But for Asia-Pacific as a whole, some common themes came up and we are looking at these common themes and how we can work out comprehensive programs or other programs where we can engage our stakeholders better.

Not only in terms of the traditional ones, most of our traditional constituencies are the technical community, but we want to reach out to other stakeholders that are considered non-traditional like business and even governments in Asia are not that well engaged, as well as groupings like non-government organizations.

So the themes coming back again, some key themes, the first one is awareness. So not that many people know about ICANN within the region, especially Asia.

And the second one is capacity building. So within Asia, the technical expertise and knowledge is really diverse because diverse regions. Some countries are more developed. Some are really not that well developed, so there is a huge gap in (unintelligible).

The first one is language localization. ICANN materials that we have, while we work very hard to have them translated in the six UN official languages, but not that many of these languages are spoken in Asia.

First is getting more Asia voices, especially involved in ICANN meetings as well as Internet governance here. Asians cannot speak up a lot at international meetings, mostly - not because we don't have an idea in our heads, but in our culture we cannot speak up as strongly as (unintelligible).

So within the region when you are more comfortable with each other, people actually do speak up, so the idea is how can we propel these voices within the international ICANN (unintelligible) stakeholder participation? So how do we increase more - to get more stakeholders to participate at (unintelligible), at the (unintelligible) meetings and come together to do the (unintelligible)?

So these are the five themes, and we're very happy that we can share these with IPC here. I know you guys want to reach out to Asia-Pacific. We are in the listening mode. And based on these themes, if there are some things that you feel that you have a common interest in, we can come up with ideas and see how we can work together on this.

(Javier): (Javier) for the transcript. One thing that we've been working with - in terms of the Australian and the Pacific Islands, when we come to this meeting, (unintelligible) region, the (unintelligible) in terms of we have the Australian communities that are - some of them are in counselors (unintelligible). Some are in the - on the Board of ICANN, and others are actually involved in the working groups. But what - the component that has been missing is the - some of the Pacific Islands.

But you know, when we do introduce some of the (unintelligible) community members to the - to ICANN, they have taken on the role to actively engage, so that's a good thing. But I think we still need a lot more.

A good thing, when we're talking here today about sort of (unintelligible) initiative on how we can reach out, what we have decided in the (unintelligible) working group is that you know, is that we need to perform from this working group that can actively engage with ICANN.

So to date, what I can say is that you know for the Pacific and ocean (unintelligible) region, we have a working group that has been formed. Tomorrow we will be having another meeting here. So far, we've only had one meeting since the Durbin meeting when we were formed.

But, we will be looking to engage widely with the communities, and I'm glad that this is even for me, I've been in ICANN for a number of years, it's the first time I'm coming to this IPC meeting. And, I understand that there will be a lot of your constituencies out there in (unintelligible) Asia-Pacific that we could reach out with your help.

So definitely I think going forward, because we do not have a documented strategy as yet, we will you know look for you to - for advice on who your members are in the regions, how we can reach them. Or even if you have identified some of these entities, think you could go to just - you know informally, you could just send us email.

Because at the end of the day, I think under the program, it's the original Vice President that is going to work with you in terms of identifying how - which areas (unintelligible). So I think we are open to working closely with you and I think I'll leave it at that. And if we have questions.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you very much gentlemen, and we open the floor to questions or comments.

(Ellen), and anybody else want to be in the queue?

(Ellen): Could you please explain a little bit more (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) in terms of for example coming to ICANN, there are groups of stakeholders that are not (unintelligible) because they do not really understand (unintelligible).

One of the ways to bridge this gap is that we can come up with some suggestions that the community (unintelligible) has briefing sessions for our Asia-Pacific stakeholders understand more about some updates.

For example, they can't come to the Buenos Aries, but we can have updates for them within the region so that they can understand what (unintelligible) the issues that are being discussed. And when we have a meeting in Singapore in March next year, they can be up-to-date. And during that time, they can participate (unintelligible).

(Javier): (Unintelligible) for capacity building in the Pacific Islands mainly has been focused on other governments understanding of (unintelligible).

Also, one of the things that were very - I highlighted from the region is more on the technical capacities. Like we have ccTLD's in the region that require best practices. How they can deploy (unintelligible). Can we partner with other organizations out there like the (unintelligible) and ICANN? And (unintelligible) but in capacity building.

Man: It's your turn, (Mike).

(Mike): I just wanted a point of clarification. It sounds like there's a separate (Ocean) or Pacific Island working group. There are also working groups for other areas within the region, or is that something that's (unintelligible). How is that being coordinated?

And if there are any other meetings on-site, would you let us know?

(Javier): Thanks for the question. This is (Javier). On Sunday we had a presentation to the whole Asia-Pacific group, and then (unintelligible) Whois Vice President for Asia, (unintelligible). We heard from (unintelligible). Got some ideas from within the different meetings that they've had.

There is an option for them to form a working group if the Asian community thinks that they should have a working group.

When you look at the other regions of ICANN that have set up their strategy plan, they had formed the working groups for their own regions. So it's open, but I don't think that the community has come back in deciding on whether they want to form a working group.

But for the (Ocean) area region, which would be a subset of the whole Asia-Pacific, we decided that we wanted to have a working group, so we've got community members from the (unintelligible), from (unintelligible).

Woman: But working groups, there are - the contact person is (unintelligible)...

(Javier): (Unintelligible). We have this GSC Community Wiki that we are promoting. In that Wiki we will have all the working group members, the work that's going on in the working group, and even its open to the community too. If you have a Wiki it can - we can input the comments to that, and we are very open to that.

I'll provide you the link.

Man: Our (GSE) community will (unintelligible) what I mentioned about the (unintelligible) and can take comment, but actually don't need an account to comment. Public can - public members can actually go onto the site to view. That would be a lot more helpful (unintelligible) not have to sign up for an account and (unintelligible). So these issues I think are more or less resolved.

Steve Metalitz: (Unintelligible). As I said, we've tried to get a group of volunteers together to figure out how we could best make use of this opportunity, focusing on Asia-Pacific over the next few months. Obviously, is - (unintelligible), we'll be looking at other regions too.

So (unintelligible) are interested and you have contacts in the Asia-Pacific (unintelligible) in particular, that we would love to have you participate. So (unintelligible).

With that, I'd like to - unless there are any other questions, thank our guests. You're welcome to stay if you wish.

Woman: It's a pretty short time. (Unintelligible) 20 minutes. (Unintelligible) time permits it, tomorrow, 8:30, please (unintelligible).

With me in the audience today from the Compliance Team I have Carlos Alvarez, Victor Oppenheimer, Greg DiBiase.

Man: First, we'd like to state that ICANN's bulk Whois inaccuracy complaint submission is now in production. This means that users can submit multiple Whois inaccuracy complaints in one single file upload. The systems is based on a test pilot that we ran earlier this year in which that a user who agreed to the terms of use (unintelligible) hundred Whois inaccuracy complaints per week.

Man: (Unintelligible). They're already addressing (unintelligible) effective upon execution.

Man: That's basically the bottom of the (unintelligible).

Victor Oppenheimer: (Unintelligible) Victor Oppenheimer. The takeaway from this slide is for us compliance's effort (unintelligible) right half of the slide, or if you look at the (unintelligible) label concession (unintelligible) our efforts have been (unintelligible) next to applicant (unintelligible) and the location of material which (unintelligible) lifecycle of the (unintelligible) what we call legacy complaints, meaning (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) or agreements that are in the (unintelligible).

Some things that are really unique to (unintelligible).

There's a link on the previous slide that you can - I encourage you to go and (unintelligible)...

Woman: What happened? ICANN (unintelligible) launched is a random selection. What I want to highlight is under the registrars, (unintelligible) registrars (unintelligible). You will notice that we have (unintelligible) have five registrars that we rolled in for Year 2 audit for another audit.

What that means is on those registrars were found on compliance (unintelligible). They were collaborating, which was (unintelligible). By the time they executed on their remediation plan and provided all the information to ICANN, the audit program for Year 1 had (unintelligible). They are now the lucky winners of another audit this year.

The - from the registry side, as you know, it is not in their contract to (unintelligible), and we do receive collaboration (unintelligible) of that obligation.

Having said that, we have just closed what we call the RFI phase, which is the beginning, where we sent for contract the audit announcements (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) have used the compliance process to allow for collaboration, and now we've closed that phase and we moved to what we call the audit phase.

(Unintelligible) audit program request and (unintelligible) the audit phase, we will continue the collaboration efforts for compliance protest with the contract parties.

Annual audit program will be published for Year 2 at the closure and (unintelligible) sometime around end of April or June.

With that, I'd like to open the floor for questions.

Jonathan Zuck: I think when we come to a new culture, we should embrace that culture entirely. So any city in which we really don't eat dinner until 10:00, there shouldn't be any 8:00 am (unintelligible).

So you know, that's - at ICANN Geneva, or something like that, you know, we can all be in bed by 8:00 pm and have 6:00 am meetings. That'll be great. I think this half and half thing is not working.

So Maggie thanks again for your presentation, and always a joy. And I know that I often give Compliance a hard time, and it's really actually because it's where I see the most opportunity to have a more metric and measurement based management than a lot of the other areas in ICANN.

And I think that's really the issue. So I think if anybody needed to look at the operation you've built compared to anything that's happened before, they could express nothing but glee, right. I mean it's remarkable what you've accomplished in the time that you (unintelligible).

The issue that, you know, I continue to press on from the standpoint of metrics is not just measuring them but managing to them. And so I look forward to a time when you have a set of metrics that you're putting in front of us and saying here's where we are now and here's what I would like these numbers to look like a year from now.

Here's what we're doing to make that happen, and then a year from now saying well, we made it; this we didn't, and here's what we'll do differently in order to reach those goals. To me that's the nirvana of sort of managing to the numbers that I'd really love to see over time. (Unintelligible) managing to them and not just tracking them or following the reporting on them but to set objectives based on those numbers.

Because I think the organization as a whole suffers from a lack of definition when it comes to success. So we (unintelligible) after the fact and try to find a way to make what happened appear successful and (unintelligible) a healthy exercise for an organization which has grown as much as this has as fast as it has with stakes that we have in the international arena.

So I'm sorry to put all that on your shoulders because it isn't really meant to be on your shoulders specifically. I actually just see the nature of your work has touched that it's where the greatest opportunity to set the example for the organization as a whole exists.

Maggie Mansourkia: (Unintelligible) are here to provide that service. And if you don't tell us what your expectations are we can never be able to meet those expectations.

One expectation Jonathan that I want to make clear, in order you will see how we are managing to the numbers but please, I want to set the record clear guys.

To tell you how I'm going to be a year from now on some of the numbers, unless I'm missing something -- and by all means I'm willing to take your input if I'm missing something on this one -- I don't know if we can predict complaints.

So we're managing the numbers into an aspect that I will report on tomorrow on turnaround time for measuring the numbers on closure rates. But I don't think we can manage the numbers. If anyone has a crystal ball in this room to tell me about the new G-complaint volume, I would love it.

Trying to predict resources; trying to predict tools, volumes, so all these things. You're not stopping us like okay, what are we expecting, you know?

And it depends which constituent group you talk to, it's doomsday on one end; it's confidence on the other. So tomorrow we will present more. But what I want to mention to the team here, are you familiar on my ICANN.org, we are - and there's a compliance tab that has a lot of information. To Jonathan's point, there are a lot of numbers.

And we publish those without touching them. We internally take them and manage our operations. The reason this is up there is because we get tabs by policy, by working groups to help determine PDPs and get data. So this is there for you to use, so we'll provide that.

I can't help you with the 8:30 wakeup call thing; I'm sorry.

Something I wanted and I neglected to share with the team in here is that we do have a global presence now in Istanbul if you're keeping up with our news or you look on our Web site.

We have established an office in Istanbul. It's staffed with three people. We are in the process of almost finalizing on the Singapore candidate. With that, the Compliance team now is - will be 19 which is what we committed in our strategic plan for fiscal year '14.

But with that we've completed the consolidation of our tools. We've completed all the FAQs. And I wanted to thank, in this public space, because Steve Metalitz has reached out like Jonathan too in the past, and provided us input.

So take a look at the Web site at the FAQs provided and let us know if there needs to be more clarity in that aspect.

Man: I want to add something to what Maggie said Jonathan (unintelligible) hopefully work with those registrants and those people (unintelligible) like what's here in Latin America. All that comes from (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: And just to clarify, I mean I'm worried about the mention of a crystal ball because I'm not saying anything about that or anything like it. I'm saying if you have an objective; publish it and manage to that objective.

And I don't even think it's our position to be angry if you don't meet that objective. It just becomes a way to look at whether or not the things you did to try and meet the objective were in fact effective.

And more often than not what we hear is well we hired as many people as we said we would. And that to me is not a metric. It's not an interesting number, right.

Of all the numbers you could be measuring, how many staff you have is not interesting. Things like, you know, the time to resolution or Whois data accuracy etcetera, those are interesting numbers, and they're hard.

I'm not trying to say they aren't, but that's where we should be setting objectives and then plans to meet those objectives and then changing the plans if they don't work.

That's all it's about. It's not about holding you accountable for the unknown, it's about just trying to set objectives and managing those objectives and changing the plan if they're not met. . Do it's not about a crystal ball.

Maggie Mansourkia: Tomorrow, 8:30 Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, yes, yes I know.

Woman: All right, so I have in the queue Claudio, Metalitz; I'm going to put myself in very briefly. Anyone else? I would ask all of us, myself included, to be (unintelligible).

Claudio Di Gangi: About the new gTLD dates, the Board accepted the GAC's safeguard advice to (unintelligible) and proactively sample (unintelligible).

I was wondering if you could talk a little bit about the role that Compliance has been (unintelligible). Will that also apply to this (unintelligible)?

(Victor Oppenheimer): This is (Victor Oppenheimer). Whatever is in the factual publication for registries, Compliance will monitor (unintelligible). But regardless of if it's (unintelligible).

This is a specification already in place for public publication data services I believe, specification size I think. So we are - you know, Compliance will monitor that specification.

Maggie Mansourkia: So Claudio, I'm not sure if I understood. I understand that GAC approved that. Our role and what's gotten approved.

Claudio Di Gangi: The Board accepted the GAC advice. I mean the GAC advice is that the registries should do this (unintelligible).

Maggie Mansourkia: So that's what we call monitoring in our department. So basically when they are in production and (unintelligible), there are two facets to compliance. There is what we call reactive work which is based on compliant (unintelligible), and there's the proactive type.

I'll be honest with you, initially I probably would take a little bit of - I can't commit to that. It might be something we will explore once we strengthen and we tie.

What we're focusing on now is outreach with the newly delegated TLDs. (Unintelligible) with several of them this morning where we explained the process; explained the explanation, the area of scope, and how we will work with them and what was expected of them for process.

So we're trying to kind of ramp up those efforts. But if and when that space becomes effective and we start doing our monitoring rules, we will definitely (unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Steve Metalitz. My question was on the same point, and I think you raised a good - an interesting aspect of this, that because of the way the Board responded to the GAC advice, this is not in the registry contract.

The Board said you don't need to put that into the registry contract for the registries to do it because we're going to it. In fact what the Board said was we are doing it. We have the tool to do it.

Well today, several months later, we don't have the tool yet but it's in process as I understand it. Then the question is, how does that interface with Compliance?

So for example if the tool that ICANN is going to provide, identifies apparently inaccurate Whois data, registry X, does that report get fed into your compliant process for false Whois data? Just how does it fit together?

Maggie Mansourkia: So yes, the effort - I know there's an effort in the registrar's case (unintelligible) ICANN. And basically what happens is they will have the tools, the sample and feed into on the Whois (unintelligible) through the process and will follow the compliance process, not only to ensure that it becomes accurate or that the registrar takes that, but also for reporting purposes. The entity which is responsible for that sampling to (unintelligible).

Woman: I just want to let you and your entire team know that I -- and I don't get to say this very often -- I was very happy to see (unintelligible), in particular the part of the section that I thought was very critical.

Because those of us who do IP enforcement (unintelligible) all the time and enter into a (unintelligible) site, that there has been a response that's under review (unintelligible); yes.

Well I think that is it. I apologize that we had (unintelligible). But again, thank you very much; you and your team (unintelligible).

Maggie Mansourkia: Thank you very much. And please -- thank you, thank you -- please let us know. Continuous improvement. Don't complain, especially at 8:00 am in the morning, right. That's the only thing I don't listen to in the morning.

But give us feedback -- productive feedback like we've been hearing from you. And I thank you for that because that's how we continue to improve when we come to this audience. Have a great rest of the week.

Woman: Karen, I believe you're up. We've invited Karen Lentz to talk with us about RPMs and (unintelligible) and what it is exactly we want to know. So while she's getting set up, I guess for those of you who had specifically requested (unintelligible); anyone else?

Before Karen - okay, go (unintelligible).

Man: We did forget a last minute (unintelligible). I apologize. Those topics did make it to where I think it was probably just a few hours ago so, I do apologize.

Woman: And I would just note - and those of you - I think some of you know this, but in response to the comment in the statement in the final RPM requirements that basically (unintelligible) has had a drafting team working on that. We did have a drafting team who were working on it. (Unintelligible) let them know where we are and get some input and guidance from them.

I think that was generally (unintelligible) category of (unintelligible) governments where there is local (unintelligible).

Karen Lentz: Okay, thank you Christina and thank you everybody for inviting me.

I want to start out by saying that I only have 20 minutes and for questions that came up in the right (unintelligible), from the staff side, but we're certainly open to have any follow-up discussions from (unintelligible).

So I was asked to talk to three topics, one being the name collision, delegation reporting, and the framework for evaluating programs under the NOA CRPM requirements.

So on the name collision, what was published earlier this week was a set of blocked, second level labels for each (unintelligible) question that has arisen is as the plan says that those names must be blocked, what does that actually mean? (Unintelligible) blocked and then released at some point after the sunrise - (unintelligible) part of the sunrise. We're actually looking at that; how to (unintelligible) it.

In terms of the other aspect of the name collision (unintelligible), it doesn't really impact the sunrise of (unintelligible) topics. But under the RPM requirements are part of the registry agreement and they (unintelligible).

The final version that was posted did provide for the ability to request if they wanted to do some sort of (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) applications vary in some (unintelligible), it was a lot of detail provided and there was - (unintelligible) what information was out there was the comment (unintelligible). Also, whether a particular request has been approved in the past.

So once you have a (unintelligible) have been found to (unintelligible), it's determined that there were more complex issues raised by a proposal. We always have the opportunity to post it.

So I understand from (unintelligible) a set of steps or factors that are taken into account (unintelligible) that might be very low risk in terms of (unintelligible).

And then (unintelligible), one of the factors that (unintelligible) process is the (unintelligible) scale of what's being proposed is this sort of limited case for, you know, X amount of the special thing (unintelligible) all of our names and all of the (unintelligible).

So anyway, I think (unintelligible) are (unintelligible). So in terms of the level of detail that we asked for, I mean we asked for them to get enough detail for us to review it, the ones I've seen have been (unintelligible) policy that, you know, we want to use.

I think if it, you know -- I can't say for sure -- but I don't think any of them have actually gone down to the level of using specific names, are the ones that issue the more categories or, you know, quality as this would need to be eligible. But certainly there is always the option to ask for more information (unintelligible).

Examples of (unintelligible), like none of them have been approved yet, looking at them, but what we've seen is kind of along the lines of what was proposed during the public comment period and (unintelligible).

So well the Founder's Program is sort of undefined, but you know any requests, right. I mean I think we would definitely err on the side of, you know, more opportunities for public review.

Claudio Gangi: Claudio Gangi. Karen, can you talk a little bit more about the thought behind (unintelligible) in the application and why that would create a presumption of (unintelligible)? Because I guess that - I guess in particular I'm thinking, is

that part of the application scored or evaluated by the evaluator (unintelligible), and why that would create a presumption to somebody?

Because at the time of the application there were no (unintelligible).

Karen Lentz: So the reasoning behind it is that, you know, this information has been available (unintelligible). In terms of where it is in the application; whether it was scored, that kind of varies across applications.

You know there is the question of being in a community and your goals involved. A lot of people put their startup plans in there.

There is a specific question on rights protection and how you're going to (unintelligible) parts of the application. But you know to the extent that applications were available and it wasn't - there was an opportunity if something did raise a concern, or something was (unintelligible) at some point over the (unintelligible), you know, automatic approval, but there is (unintelligible). So part of the evaluation scoring of this.

You know as I said, some of this was scattered throughout the application. When the rights protection question was specifically on the criteria of, you know, (unintelligible), have they hired, have they (unintelligible).

And so, you know, many applicants - some applicants answers will (unintelligible) think we're going to be using these things but you know regardless, we're going to comply with the requirements (unintelligible).

So you know it kind of varies what the answer was and how it was found by the evaluators to (unintelligible). But you know in any case the requirements now are the requirements (unintelligible).

I would just note personally (unintelligible), I questioned the validity of (unintelligible) if there was something in it (unintelligible). I don't think it's a

valid assumption to say that it (unintelligible) application (manager)  
(unintelligible) I thought it was the worst thing ever, it's not (supported), it  
didn't (unintelligible) was that there is some (unintelligible) failure to  
comment...

Woman: I understand your point and I wasn't thinking so much - or I wasn't thinking  
exclusively anyway of the formal comments in the public comment period. So  
there was a particular comment period for comments to be received  
(unintelligible) (all right) and it wasn't so much, you know (unintelligible) and  
was there any sort of (unintelligible) very, very much.

Woman: All right next this is from (unintelligible) what we'll do here is just start off, and  
I'll start off by (hitting) queue (unintelligible) So that there were some that  
were circulated on (unintelligible) I know that there were folks that specifically  
asked for (written for the TM)...

Woman: What it is you wanted to know.

Woman: Is there any information that - I have a couple of question, but is there  
anything that you - okay Claudio go ahead.

Claudio Di Gangi: Well my question has to do with declaration that (unintelligible) that's  
something that (Claire helped back against) or is that something that  
(unintelligible) I'll just trade like more in the clearinghouse (unintelligible)  
(pose) or cancelled (unintelligible) I have to be sure that that's in the  
summarized dispute resolution (unintelligible) policies that registries have or -  
what are your thoughts on that?

Woman: Honest I haven't...

Woman: All right the Asian (will hold the sign) (comes into the) (unintelligible) (record)  
they will notify the clearinghouse (unintelligible) and you will check and it's

also possible that a third party (unintelligible) no I saw Brian, I see Hector, I'm just going (back) (unintelligible) Brian go ahead.

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt, hum just a quick question, I know that we asked this on your last webinar but I was just wondering if there was any update regarding the issue for (crime they are publishing about), including trademark registrations that (unintelligible) for (around that) if there's a timeframe we can get just because we have few clients.

Man: So the update on the rule has been (designed) (unintelligible) published (unintelligible) give you all the details that the principle comes down to that (unintelligible) that support when they would have...

Man: Okay thank you so much that's a fantastic update, we really appreciate it.

Woman: (Hector)?

(Hector): Okay I want to know if you can give us a - some numbers about the registration of (Kramer) (unintelligible)?

Woman: ...out of those 17,000 records (unintelligible) (space starting with) (unintelligible) a lot of trademarks has a space in it so (they)...bigger number of actual (unintelligible) and (abuse) labels.

Man: (Do you have many cases)?

Woman: Use the (RPJ Fund).

Man: (Yes).

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Next in the queue, does anyone else want to be in the queue? All right, hum in my experience in recent (unintelligible) that obviously (unintelligible) like Japanese. So for example reaching out to Japanese council (can't)...

I (was using like) building to me that there seems to (unintelligible) still need (unintelligible) building (unintelligible) I know that you all have done a lot in terms of that. Here are the IT, what is it if any that (unintelligible) obviously the firms that I'm contacting now they know (unintelligible) us too (unintelligible) either our organization number organ (unintelligible) that are in Asia (unintelligible) are members that have members in Asia.

Woman: (Donna) (is there) any hope that we can get (unintelligible) access for example that they know have to register their ID...

Woman: ...translated our Web site comes to...

Man: I had a question about the common errors (existing a lot)...

Woman: Getting much better, hum...

Man: There's one more thing I'd like to (get) (unintelligible) office for three long (unintelligible) Option 4 (unintelligible) (and that period), guarantee we don't see (unintelligible) but on the other hand we hear from a lot of trademark (unintelligible) So we have ICANN and...

Man: All right just a webinar for (unintelligible) (based) on the number of questions... Also we could reply on but there's still someone - would it be possible for non-exclusive license to (be obtained)...

Woman: Clearinghouse we don't (unintelligible) that license agreement (unintelligible) (go get) the license agreement that (took) (unintelligible) be it a legal opinion

that we verify the information (unintelligible) the licensee and you're registered on the trademark record in some cases licensee you can...

If you sign a license declaration as provided on the Web site by the licensor and licensee don't make your categories in-between non-exclusive or exclusive licenses. It's simple but the licensor is indeed at that moment providing the licensee on that (gent) - licensee declaration some place from the clearinghouse, responsibility to register the trademark records and to have (unintelligible) licensee on the other (end)...

Woman: We had thought that we might be having a very, very, very short briefing from (Michelle Taflow) who is participating in (unintelligible) (as a conflicting) meeting.

Next item on our agenda is the G (unintelligible) Council update, so we'll just go ahead and move that up. I'm hoping that Heather and Brian could just fill us in on the motions that are going to be voted on. If there's anything for which you need guidance that you haven't yet received it I think now would be the time for us to get that sorted - so Heather, Brian the floor is yours.

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt, so we have two motions on the agenda for tomorrow. The first one is on the translation and transliteration of (Council) information.

Previously the Council unanimously passed a motion initiating a PDP examining whether IBM registration data should be translated into a single language like English or transliterated into a single script like Latin character. However the draft charter for the working group was deferred and then withdrawn by the RySG and the RSG to express concerns that the charter was too narrowly drawn and that the relationship of the working group to the outgoing work of the EWG on detailed directory services was not clearly (deleted).

A revised charter is poised for approve by the Council following clarifying amendments from the RySG on how various restoration efforts by the GNSO, EWG and Security and Stability Advisory Committee or SSAC will coordinate, compliment rather than compete with one another. Also amendments more specifically flesh out the goal to weigh the benefits to translation or transliteration against any capital monetary cost in making the changes.

We have sent this out to the list; it has not changed since then. I believe we are voting yes on this - does anyone have any questions or feedback to the contrary? Great, one motion down, one to go - the next motion that we have on the table is for the protection of inter-governmental and international governmental organization identifiers and all new gTLDs. The Council is poised to vote on this controversial motion endorsing the IGO, INGO working group recommendations.

I definitely defer to any working group members who are here presently. I know that we've actually had some discussion on the list that (Christina) help facilitate from the working group. The vast majority of the feedback that I received is that we should support the motion and vote yes. There's some portions of the motion that have - or there's some discussion about potentially breaking the motion out, it's very complex and very long.

There were also just recently some revisions made to it, they've done some questions and feedback that were brought up during our working sessions over the weekend. We need - Heather has distributed the revised motion to the list, so to the folks who are - particularly for the folks who participated in the working group and really everybody if you could take a look at that and see if that raises any concerns.

The only concerns that were raised I believe were by Greg Shatan about one portion of the motion and I think that's where there were some changes that hopefully kind of address his concerns and will allow us to uniformly vote yes regardless of whether or not the motion stays in its entirety or is broken out. I

can go into more detail about the motion specifically or I can just answer questions and see if anyone from the working group would like to talk about their support of lack of support for the motion.

Woman: I don't - why don't we if any of the members of the working group that are here on the phone want to give us any overview. I understand that (Jim) (unintelligible) if not then perhaps we could...

Man: Yes that quickly that's the way we're going to vote on this - (these few) votes on the proposed amendments and...

Man: Is it clear from the list though if it's just concerning whether or not you consider this friendly? And if you consider it is friendly then we won't be voting. Are we waiting for Jeff's determination?

Man: Okay, so just to be clear there were some amendments proposed, it's unclear whether they're going to be considered friendly and therefore adopted as part of the motion or whether we're going to have to separately vote on the amendments that are being proposed and if that fails then we would go to the original language.

Woman: I have a question I don't know...

Woman: ...a few questions, first who has seconded the motion?

Woman: Second, there was (sincerely) extensive discussion (unintelligible) Council as to whether...

Man: ...(answer) my question (Christina), I'm not sure I can answer them for you. I will check and see who seconded it and let you know. I don't know off the top of my head, I can't remember. I know that Jeff Neuman is opposed to the motion originally.

As far as speaking guidance and feedback from the General Counsel's office I don't know that we've seen a discrimination (unintelligible) that's something else we'll have to look at. I haven't seen anything on the list. I mean it seems like all of that discussion that we did have extensively (over new) had really good points over the weekend frankly seem to me to be a kind of (left aside).

Or I don't know if people felt like the amendments that were made address this issue, but I haven't seen any further discussion on the list about feedback from General Counsel's office or if it's still...

Man: Do you have questions or is there anyone from the working group here in the room or on the phone that could talk a little bit about the work that you've done and how you feel about the motion?

Woman: Wolf-Ulrich actually seconded the motion.

Woman: Okay good, okay so it has (been) seconded, good.

Man: And I think that there maybe was (side interest) from ICANN Legal about the voting (specials). I think that ICANN Legal said essentially that approval of PDP motion requires an affirmative vote of a majority of each house.

And further that one GNSO Council member representative of at least three of the four stakeholder groups support the recommendation. The super majority vote merely makes it more difficult for the Board to determine that a policy is not in the best interest of ICANN (unintelligible) position of each one IGO, INGO working group recommendation for at least to impact new gTLD registries who have already executed the registry agreement.

And therefore should have by super majority in order to be more clearly constitute consensus policy amending the registry agreement. Authority and (then alternative) implementation mechanism...

Woman: ...have any reason to think...

Man: You know honestly I know that we had a robust discussion during the working session particularly around seeking that guidance and what the majority levels that were needed.

I mean honestly it didn't seem like anybody was against the motion. I don't know if people are just holding their cards very close to vest, but typically the people who I think might oppose this motion are silent. And I know that there was actual participation from across the different constituencies and stakeholder groups and the working group.

And so the sense I get from the Council discussions and I just sort of (Heather) if she agrees or she sees things differently is that there does seem to actually be consensus and support around this motion. So I'd be surprised if it does not pass again unless these people are sort of holding things close to vest and not being honest (with the) Council people - (it's a) possibility.

Woman: So I think (Matt) covers anything else Council I guess at the end of the meeting tomorrow after the first half of the meeting. When did the election happen? It happened in the Council meeting?

Man: I think we start the Council meeting with the election.

Woman: Okay.

Man: At the beginning.

Woman: Okay and I doubt that there's any confusion in case (unintelligible) to avoid any we obviously would like vote in support of Chair and David Cake as Vice Chair (unintelligible) Please don't do this to me right now.

Man: Yes sir, yes we understand that and I guess we should open up if anyone has any discussion points about either of the votes for the Chair or the Vice Chair, (but like it stands) a better understanding is that we're going to...

Woman: Well thank you both very much. This is the end of our - this is the end of the open portion of our ITC meeting, so we'll take a short break and then go into closed session.

We unfortunately have to ask those of you who are not active ITC (unintelligible) with that but there are some sensitive matters that we need to discuss, thank you.

END