

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
ISPCP 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

Coordinator: The call is now being recorded you may proceed.

Man: Thank you Operator.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Good afternoon everybody and welcome, this is a meeting of the ISP and connectivity providers constituency. So apologies for starting a little late as most of you saw we had to wait to get into the room so we're still prepping to start.

Mikey is going to be running the Adobe and hopefully we'll be organized soon but while we're waiting we should probably just whip around and do a round of introductions.

So as I said I'm Tony Holmes from BT and but currently - but currently chair this group, move forward.

Man: (Unintelligible) German in that note and still outgoing counselor and vice chair of the GNSO council.

(Glen Odenor): (Glen Odenor) I'm from (unintelligible) I am the actually one of the GNSO counselors right now.

(Oni Okitoni): (Oni Okitoni) from Japan I am from (unintelligible), which is an (NII) in Japan distributing IP address to all ISP's.

Man: (Unintelligible) on Europe - European Internet provider association.

(Michael Ordif): (Michael Ordif) from Echo the German ISP association.

(Anthony Stedish): (Anthony Stedish) from (enterprise) business association.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Marvin Klen): (Marvin Klen) from interconnect communications in Wales in the UK.

(Christian Belsen): (Christian Belsen) from the Internet infrastructure coalition (unintelligible) association for the people who build the nuts and bolts of the Internet and applicant to ISCP.

(Rob Lugarth): (Rob Lugarth) ICANN staff Washington, DC, USA.

(Jessica Jones): (Jessica Jones) BT.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Andrea): (Andrea) (unintelligible) dot com.

(Michelle Jeflo): (Michelle Jeflo) (unintelligible) dot com and a member of the meeting (unintelligible) working group.

(Daniel Finberg): (Daniel Finberg) computer for networks.

Man: (Unintelligible) from (unintelligible) the ISP association here in (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) from (unintelligible) IPS association (unintelligible).

(Alan Ritso): (Alan Ritso) also from (unintelligible) and then also for the (unintelligible) IX from the ISP association in Latin America and Caribbean.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris ISPCP, I'm sorry this is the ISPCP (unintelligible) Argentina.

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey O'Connor quite late member of the ISPCP. I represent IXP and I am the incoming counselor filling Wolf-Urich's very large shoes on Thursday.

Tony Holmes: Okay thanks, are there any last PCP members behind us? If not I don't think we will bother to get the roaming mike at the stage. What we have decided to do is slightly rethink the order because (Michelle) we'd invite you to be along from the meeting strategy committee to have some discussion around issues and I'm aware that you need to leave.

So I believe you also sent Mikey some slides are we getting close Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Really close.

Tony Holmes: Okay if you can just bear with us. There will be a sheet that circulates in for people to sign in with their dates out so I very much appreciate if you can make sure that goes around the table and comes back to me that would be helpful.

(Michelle Jeflo): I wouldn't start Tony without the slides.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: I think Mikey's right on time so thank you for joining us (Michelle) and over to you.

(Michelle Jeflo): Okay thank you for inviting me. I just wanted to give a quick update on the work that's going on the meeting strategy working group, which obviously affects all of us that attend the meeting.

The meeting strategy working group is - has been made up 16 cross constituency members and there's actually three staff members who are part of the group and two board members, Sebastien and Chris Disspain.

And basically our mission is to discuss the purpose and the strategy structure of the meeting. We're covering the number of ICANN meetings per year, the types of meetings global, regional or topical meetings, stakeholder meetings.

The objective is meetings and conferences and organizations including rotation role of the local (unintelligible) be that language services and remove participation.

At the moment we have no (factory) calls actually and at this moment we have a two-day face-to-face scheduled for the 5th and 6th of February and we will either put out a draft report just before that face-to-face or just after.

And you're okay, you're okay there. Okay so this slide here that we have now basically when we first set up the group we set - we split down into three subgroups.

The first group the people were looking at scope, the second one was organization and I actually chaired the third one, which was on engagement and support.

If you can go to the next slide. These are the kind of things that we looked and we're still looking at within the three subsections and we prepared a

document, Sebastian Bachollet that he presented to the board on the 27th of September.

Okay if you could go into the next slide and as I said before the timeline is that we'll have the final decision for the board will be in the London meeting and the first draft report that will go through community will be either just before or just after, which is about February time.

Being certain I wanted to handle it when I mentioned to the BC regional meetings this is something that's being discussed. We're also working on three different scenarios.

It's a very complex process because there isn't a model to please everybody but at the moment we're working on three scenarios. One, is basically (state) is clear what we have now.

And then we have two quite different scenarios with different lengths of days et cetera and also we're talking about the possibility of hub cities. One of the things I would like to ask this group in particular is, you know, how would regional meetings work for yourselves?

If, you know, I don't know this group but meeting regionally how would that work? Okay thanks (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: (Michelle) when you talk about regions what are the actual regions? Are they the ICANN defined regions?

(Michelle Jeflo): As far as I know yes I think they're talking of the five regions yes, yes. So this group (unintelligible) meeting after would that work?

Tony Holmes: Right, any comments, Erin you're looking confused?

(Michelle Jeflo): (Unintelligible).

Erin Vivion: I am aware of original meetings when there was some (greeter) work in admissions. So ICANN we don't have any organizational position on the (unintelligible) so.

So I don't see how it can work this revision on (unintelligible).

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes I think some groups do have a natural (unintelligible) regional regions but people like the BC, the CSG and the GAC I can't - personally I can't see that that could work but, you know, this is one of the questions that I want to hear from other people.

Tony Holmes: But certainly I don't think we have any drive to go down that far...

(Michelle Jeflo): To go regionally.

Tony Holmes: ...to go regionally.

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes, please.

Woman: (Unintelligible). I was wondering about the relationship within - between the actual ICANN meeting and the regional meetings because if it means that (HP) will have to attend the regional meetings in addition to the ICANN meetings that's just going to add like extra burden.

So how does it work...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...does it factor the regional missing?

(Michelle Jeflo): It's a very good point yes, it's a very good point and nothing can seem to be defined but I'm glad that you said that because you're kind of echoing my thoughts.

And also ICANN is a global organization with a global (bonus) as well.

Man: I think it also depends really much on what kind of meeting we're talking about. I mean I think it would be difficult of course if we would have a constituency meeting in Africa or somewhere else on this planet and on the other hand if the attention is to reach out to, you know, to certain markets to ISP's in Europe or to ISP's in Japan or whatever.

And then I still think it could be useful so I'm talking for (unintelligible) representing (unintelligible) ISP's all over Europe and I think they would be very much interested in working with you.

And if a regional meeting would focus on that in order to expand what we are doing in this constituency, what we are doing within ICANN that could be useful.

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes, yes it's very useful and (unintelligible) a particular location like now in Buenos Aires it's really good to reach out to the people who are on the doorsteps of the ICANN meeting.

Could you clip onto the next slide Mikey?

Tony Holmes: Could I just remind people when you speak at the mike just to say who you are for the record, thanks.

(Michelle Jeflo): Okay this next slide was one of the - basically the logistics and statistics we were looking at. And one of the things that you will hear people saying from the meeting group is that it's very difficult to find venues to hold so many people in one room.

Now this graph is basically the morning and the afternoon of each day at the ICANN meeting. And you probably can't see the peaks from here but they're really big peaks on that graph.

The opening ceremony weighs with over 1000 people and the other peak is the actually the ICANN (unintelligible). So if you look between the - they're the most two popular events of the whole ICANN meeting as you can imagine.

If you look between the graph we're looking at basically around about 3, 400 people in the room. And these are people who are actually in the session it doesn't mean the people who are in the hotel or in the coffee bar or answering their emails in their hotel room or going on what I refer to as the people that are in this session. So that's running at about 3, 400 people on each day.

And if anybody else has got any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

Tony Holmes: (John).

(John): Yes I was wondering looking at this it is a little far for me to see in detail.

((Crosstalk))

(John): And I have some problems with eyesight unfortunately but is this taken into account that you have a lot of simultaneous events during the day because I'm sure you've taken the main hull into consideration but what about when you have like right now we have maybe 10 sessions going on at the same time.

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes it's accumulative it's everybody is in a session whether we're in this group or we're down on the first floor. It's heads that are actually in rooms meeting.

(John): And you see there on a Tuesday for example you have 400 people in these rooms at the same time?

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes in different rooms all around the...

((Crosstalk))

(John): (Unintelligible) have 200 at least in that meeting.

(Michelle Jeflo): I know yes, yes it's hard to believe and if you look around there's a lady going around with a - particular at this meeting these suggestions were taken from the Beijing meeting and there's someone going around and she's popping into all the rooms at the moment doing a little counting.

So it would be good to actually compare the statistics as well on these two meetings, yes.

(John): (Unintelligible) thank you.

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes.

Tony Holmes: What I would like to try and do (Michelle) is provide a simple summary for you to take away from this constituency.

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes.

Tony Holmes: And from what I heard that whilst there's a desire to certainly engage in outcomes ICANN's outreach and strategy on a regional basis that shouldn't be in any way replace the schedule of global meetings that we have now.

So I think that's the message that I heard to take back from that angle. The other item you had on there was hub cities.

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes.

Tony Holmes: And we haven't really given a view to you on that as well. Are you able to tell us what some of the problems were that you experienced in the committee that caused us to basically focus around hub cities?

(Michelle Jeflo): The proposed hub cities and (unintelligible) and LA. We still haven't got very accurate information. I asked the question what was the most expensive meeting from the last 10 meetings.

And it's hard, it's very hard to get out metrics but I do believe that (Nick) has been talking (unintelligible) introducing the poll and if we do say three meetings consecutive (unintelligible) it could be good for the budget.

But also, you know, there's a lot of conflicts here if we're in the same place we're not going around the world, we're not spreading the news of ICANN around the world.

So there's pros and cons for absolutely everything and one of the things that we're going to do is in these scenarios is actually write down here are the three scenarios and this is the pro, this is the con and this is how it would possibly work.

Tony Holmes: Okay so let's ask if there are any views on that particular issue. From my own perspective I think as a constituency we've been quite successful when we've gone to different places around the world in pulling in the localized ISP community.

And we have actually had some meetings where there has been standing room only for the ISP's because it's been that engaged. It's not always the case so there are other times when it goes the other way.

But I would suggest from our constituency we have been quite successful and we've put in more into outreach now. So personally I would prefer to keep to that schedule rather than focus on three hubs where we're not going to have the ability to pull in those other (unintelligible) but that's just a personal view. Any other, yes (John).

(John): I think we should not underrate the importance of what was just said about going around the world because you do get participation and interest in ICANN, which then can in many cases can become continuous.

(Michelle Jeflo): Of course.

(John): If you go around the world and people have a chance to participate otherwise it's something a little remote for a lot of people. And also in second instances, which was discussed in our CSG meetings we do have a lot on the agenda right now, which does require discussion and when you do it in a meeting it becomes very fruitful, thank you.

(Michelle Jeflo): One of the things that we did consider was basically out of the three meetings use one as a hub, you know, so it might just be one hub every three times but nothing has been - at the moment we're just taking information from everybody and then preparing - we will prepare a report at some stage obviously.

(John): I'm sorry who chose this (Sanbo) (unintelligible) that's not a place I'd really, you know, find to go to.

(Michelle Jeflo): I think it's the meeting between the East and the West isn't it something like that I think that was probably the attraction but I don't know who, I don't know who.

Tony Holmes: Okay so...

(Enna): How do you define - (Enna) speaking, how do you define hubs?

(Michelle Jeflo): In - good question I suppose a hub is somewhere where it's easy to get to, you know, if I think of a hub in the world for example to fly in I would think of Bangkok, I would also think of London I wouldn't think of (Sanbo).

This is a very good question I suppose the hub also would be somewhere where ICANN has a representative office as well yes in that respect.

Man: I'd like to say something if possible. When I was in (Durban) the (Durban) meeting I met a young man named (Benjamin Nakamoyi)...

Man: I'm sorry...

Man: ...his name is (Benjamin) and he's a young man who was coming to his first ICANN with a dream of setting up an IXP in West Africa. And he was trying to find out as much information as he could from the people around him, how he could go ahead and do that.

And that's a real incredible tangible benefit for an organization...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...that we're going to miss if we go to home meetings.

(Michelle Jeflo): Yes I totally agree with you it's fantastic, you know, we simply could be setting up the next (Google) and, you know, work on the ICANN (unintelligible).

Man: Absolutely.

(Michelle Jeflo): I'm totally with you on that.

Tony Holmes: Okay so we need to bring this to a halt. Thank you very much for joining us (Michelle) and I hope...

(Michelle Jeflo): My pleasure.

Tony Holmes: ...we've give you the information that you can take back on that issue so thank you.

(Michelle Jeflo): Thank you very much.

Tony Holmes: We look forward to the outcome. Let's get back onto our schedule agenda now. The very first thing on our list I believe Mikey was...

Mikey O'Connor: Name collisions.

Man: So if that's the only question for procedure right did you go through the agenda items, which agenda items are on the list or on...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: The agenda's been posted so you should be aware - everybody is aware of that.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: There's folks getting involved so and we're running right along.

Man: So we have something (AOB)?

Tony Holmes: Well I hope we're going to have time for (AOB).

Man: We should we need them.

Tony Holmes: So to go back to name collisions we had the discussion this morning with the NCGS meeting. We then had the discussion with the board. We are going to be joined later in the meeting by KIS and if someone could alert me when they're with us I would appreciate that.

But this is our opportunity to reflect back on the discussions we've had in the broader group now and this is an issue that's particularly important for ISP's. We heard this morning almost from the board that our offer of moving forward and setting up some form of joint activity with the steering group it wasn't readily accepted.

The response was that many of the issues that we had concerns about the board indicated that or Akram certainly that they're looking to address those. We haven't had any visibility of how they're doing that whatsoever. Certainly there wasn't enough information there to take our concerns away.

I think there may be some follow up opportunity here for a few of us to meet with Akram and (unintelligible) to discuss that. And I certainly had a conversation with a couple of board members after.

So personally I still have some concerns that the level of concern that we have around this issue isn't being fully appreciated. The impact on ISP's isn't being fully appreciated, the impacts on ISP customers isn't fully appreciated.

And we heard this talk this morning of an outreach campaign that's going to hit various IT industries. There was a suggestion that ICANN would be providing 24/7 support, I don't know what that means.

It worries me that most of the people that are going to be impacted by name collisions they don't even know ICANN exists. So ICANN as an organization is going to deal with that and I think everything he's gone with shows (unintelligible).

Other things - there were many issues within that that we need to consider and probably need to consider some next steps. So I'd like to open the floor up now for some discussion around the events that happened today and future steps for us as our constituency. Mikey this is name collisions.

Mikey O'Connor: I've got an awful lot of things going on here. I just participated in an interview with (Brad White) who is the PR person for ICANN along with Jeff.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Jeff Smith I was checking to see if he's here, he's not well anyway one of the messages that am switching to - I'm changing my stance and you're witnessing it as this meeting progresses because my stance up until this week has been with the goal of energizing to use an oft quoted word from this week I think the community to the severity of this issue.

And I feel like I've accomplished that goal, you know, listening to Tony I feel like I've got you moving. So now what I'm doing is focusing on what we should do next.

And I think that what we need to start doing is saying what needs to happen next is the get ready campaign, that campaign to reach out to all these communities very rapidly and start preparing them for what's to come and so that was the focus of the comments that I made today.

I agree that there are still some organizational shortcomings in the way that this program has been put together but I also lobbied on the videotape for the coordinated projects, the single leader and a community advisory committee to help guide that effort.

With the thought that ISP's and other impacted parties would then be able to participate on a much more frequent level than the normal wait for public response kind of cycle, you know. I think on this issue the nimbleness, the

speed with which we can shape the work, draw in the work that you're doing in Japan, draw in the work that many others are doing.

(Christian's) gearing up to do stuff, (Semantic) is gearing up to do stuff to the extent that we can start drawing that core community together and getting sort of a consistent plan put in place so that we can all pull towards that shared destination, I think that will help a lot.

I agree that, you know, we - this debate has been characterized up until this time as primarily a debate between people who believe that there are serious impacts and in some cases perhaps are overstating their view thus losing their credibility in doing that.

And people who think it's a silly thing that nothings going to happen, which is identical to the spectrum that we way in the Y2K initially where doom bloomers were marginalized because they were to extreme.

And we had Polly Anna's who were very influential but were ultimately wrong and the way out of that dilemma back in 98 when I was running a big Y2K initiative in the U.S. was to begin to draw the focus away from the two extremes and start to build the plan as to what we're going to do.

And in terms of what we do I think we have a fairly short list of goals. We think we clearly want to have a goal that says that those of us who are impacted need a fast response with good quality mitigation tools and analysis tools if we or our customers run into a problem.

So that if a customer calls us we can very quickly turn to a deep pool of resources that can help us solve those problems. I don't think it's fair for ISP's as individual entities to spin that up on their own. I think they need resources that are shared more broadly that they can leverage, so that's one goal.

I think another goal is to prepare a fairly deep cadre of people who understand these issues and can intervene in an emergency. So people who understand network design, who understand how to reconfigure network to take down a problem.

And this is where I think Dave Piscitello's initiative is aimed that he described yesterday. And again I want this coordination to take place with a global outreach effort that presumably lives under (Sally Costriton) who is the vice president of outreach, lives under her realm and in her budget, you know.

So my goal for this meeting is to make sure that those silos are bridged and I am changing my message because, you know, a month ago if you listened to me you'd have heard me very eloquently describing the severity of this issue it's a very, very significant problem but I'm moving on to the next phase.

(Oni Okitoni): It's (Oni Okitoni) I agree with Mikey on not focusing on whether the issue is city or not because it can be quite subjective and focus on what we can do. And I have two approaches in mind, one is consider what exactly are the affects based on, you know, types of organizations and what would be an impact in terms of DSN operators.

And what would be an impact in terms of our inside networks. And I think the information provided from ICANN at the moment is quite raw so we have to extract this information and also hopefully if there is a way of advising, okay this would be the way that will resolve the problem I think that would be more helpful in addition to just sharing the problem itself.

And in Japan as I said we plan to gather a couple of DNS operators and other people who have like who knows about the network, you know, like inside networks and then gather as an expertise and we plan to spread those words within our DNS operators communities, the ISP's and if we can also reach out to the inside network operators who are system integrated, that's what we plan to do so that's plan one.

And this is just within Japan and I'm aware that we need to, you know, reach out to much wider regions globally. So maybe we can try to think of where would be good (unintelligible) or communities that we can reach for example we can like reach out to like regional North such as (Nanog) in Europe maybe (unintelligible) or I don't know.

And I think there are also like DNS operators for like globally so maybe we can start listing up so what are the kind of communities that we want to reach out to those messages?

Tony Holmes: Thank you, Roy.

Roy: Roy speaking, actually a great tool for both of you and then I think one thing you want to know in the - before that meeting that is the question of risk our relation, it's for like that was - everytime this question, which might have been addressed in a quantified way.

But it was also - it was addressed by the FSAC as well but more in a qualifying way and it's good that through that meeting here right now on different levels this has been addressed and it has been made (unintelligible) about I think it's needed more to be done behind that discussion.

It's who is going to do that so we are talking about a study and a trial and so it seems. So that is really question for the ISP people for the (unintelligible) behind ISP. If you broad send they would like to know yes what is your risk about that, what are you talking about tell me, tell me figures yes.

And so every time same question and then if you just come to them with this just not in a quantifying way then it's very hard to get back. I think we are on the right way now we can so if you can get more information with regard to this it's very helpful then, thanks.

Tony Holmes: Yes so just a quick response to that, my understanding that it is from the (unintelligible) barely assess that members that we can get more information by doing more studies.

It's difficult to do but you're never going to get the full picture and there comes a time when you have to make some judgment call. Mitigations were I think from FSAC that there was more done, more work to do because they did call for that.

And one of the follow on actions we got this morning is to CSG to go back up to the CSG level and say to FSAC yes we want you to look at this it's a priority and get as much information as you can I would think we have that in hand, so (Christian).

(Christian Belsen): I wanted to talk for a moment about what I as an individual working with our association know how to do and what I don't know how to do and maybe you can help me with but I don't know how to do.

I've been happy to hear (Azumi) talk about outreach because outreach is definitely what I'm most interested in. I want to get information even basic information into the hands of (SIS) events because that is going to make all the difference in allowing them to figure out to start to figure out if they see a problem.

Well this might be a domain collision, a collision issue and to start to research it. Because my organization represents - we're a small and young organization but because we represent some of the largest Web hosting companies as part of our membership we have access to companies that have up to hundreds of thousands of domain resolvers.

It means that there could be a lot of problems on those people's networks but also it could be an interesting source of information. I highly encourage people to take a look at (Mike Reed's) slide deck at ispc.info where he's got

some really good ideas about how to take the people, how to empower the people that have - that run domain resolvers to try and identify problems ahead of time, ahead of delegations.

So I know how to go to our members, which represent a good number of the bigger some of the bigger and smaller companies in our industry but just a small portion of the overall infrastructure ecosystem and teach them a little about that this is happening, which is a start.

Get some basic information into the hands of (unintelligible) to start and maybe start some of Mikey's great ideas about how they can try to identify problems ahead of time.

But for the people that aren't in my little community I don't know how to get any greater impact for the tool that I'm going to build than I would just in a general blog post, which is going to get, you know, hundreds to a few thousand views.

So looking how to build these resources collaboratively as groups, get things into the hands of (unintelligible) at a global level is something I'm very interested in figuring out how I can plug into and not do.

Tony Holmes: Thanks is there anyone who wants to speak who hasn't spoken so far?
Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to step right at the end of (Christian's) last paragraph and continue on. It seems to me that with (Azumi's) work and your work and some of the other work that's going on it's time to get organized.

It's time to get an email list going, it's time to start thinking about how we organize and to that end I would like to direct you to the ISPCP Web site, which is entirely maintained by Mikey and thus is somewhat less than perfect.

But there is a section on the name collision issue and mitigation issues on the site and in that section there are two email lists to subscribe to and I encourage us all to do that.

So you need to - I'm winging this because I should have thought of this in advance but I forgot so I'm going to ISPCP short for ISP and connectivity provider, ispcp.info not com info, so go there.

This will probably crash my server this is all going to many sitting tiny little rack on a personal network so if it's a little slow it's my fault. It came up for me and across the top you see a black strip that has among other things in it policy resources over on the right side.

If you just click on that you'll go to a page that shows you three sub pages and the one I'm going to direct you to is the new gTLD's name collisions page.

Tony Holmes: And you're not showing that on the screen.

Mikey O'Connor: I could but, you know, I don't know about you but this stuff on the screen - this is so small that I think it's better to just talk it off and sort of get it into your browsers and then you can bookmark it and come back.

But on that page there are a whole bunch of resources and the two that I want to point you to is there's an email list that's called collisions discussion list and another one that's called new gTLD delegations list.

And I think from an ISP perspective you may want to if you're interested in helping with the organizer like I hope that (Christian) and (Azumi) will be, please subscribe to the collision discussion list because that I think is the place that we'll carry this discussion on after the meeting.

If you're interested in getting a weekly update on the new gTLD's that have gone into the root subscribe to the new gTLD delegations list because I've failed I'm not doing this weeks publication because I've been here at ICANN but I try to publish the list of new gTLD's that went into the root in the past week and both of these are archived lists so that you can go back and look.

And then at the bottom of this page I'm trying to maintain a list of the (unintelligible) of the total.

Tony Holmes: You're jumping ahead then Mikey that was an issue for later on the agenda so...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I want to drive this home right now because we're at the organizing point in this conversation. So there you go.

Tony Holmes: But what I would suggest we need to do here it's a little bit more than that as well because one of the strengths that may come out of this group would be to hit on some common messages that we can all take back.

So I would suggest that we need to dedicate some time to producing those messages that we can basically rollout with a common thread. I would also suggest that one of the things we need to do here is to maybe go back when it's perhaps in the public forum and make the point to the ICANN board that the offer that we made to engage is still there.

It's something that we still desire to take forward and we have intentions anyway to get out and outreach to our community. We're going to do that regardless of the board action.

It would be much better if we could do it in concert with the other parts of ICANN as well and maybe that would help get some attraction. If it hasn't

happened before as I mentioned earlier there is some indication that some people who were there this morning from the board want to have the dialogue around that. So I will shape that input depending on what happens between now and the public meeting.

But I think it would be helpful to have common messages get out there, get out to the community as much as we can and engage with others earlier I think it would be helpful maybe if we can engage with you to hit the early (unintelligible) we need to hit the other (unintelligible) as well to try and spread the word because there isn't a broader way and it is a very complex issue.

I'm sure as time goes by and we see the report that comes back from JAS then that is going to help us with that message. And on top of that there is the further dialogue we will be having with the FSAC looking at what actions they - we can help them with as well.

So is Jeff here now? Okay I'm aware that he has got some other groups to go to this afternoon so once he comes in then we'll be in a position to have a dialogue with him as to how this fits together with the work that he is doing.

Any other comments on this particular issue before Jeff joins us? Okay so we will move on to the next item on our agenda, which is the whole issue of Internet governance and there's been a lot of discussion here.

We heard this morning during our session with the board that it started its plan to now have an open session tomorrow morning. I haven't been in a position where I've been able to follow up to see whether that's posted.

Mikey O'Connor: It is.

Tony Holmes: Okay is there any indication around that meeting as to how it's being positioned in terms of input from the community Mikey what is it billed as?

Mikey O'Connor: It's - this is Mikey and all I've got is a note from Jonathan Robinson who is the chair of the GNSO to the council list saying that a meeting has been added at 7:00 am tomorrow morning until 8:30, that's it that's what I got.

Tony Holmes: Okay so they have to put out interpretation on what we heard this morning. I believe what was proposed was that this is an opportunity to provide some initial news, guidance, steer, call it whatever you want into taking this issue forward from an ICANN perspective towards the event to be held in Brazil in April.

So it's come at us rather quickly, this is probably our only opportunity to have some discussion around those issues as a group and I'd like to open the floor up for some views around the table, Tony.

Tony: My concern as a member of this constituency would be what representation will the ISP and connectivity provider industry let's call it that have at this meeting?

I mean who selects the people who are invited and will we be invited to the party that's my question?

Tony Holmes: Yes, which party are you referring to?

Tony: The meeting to be scheduled in Brazil in (Sanpower). I'm posing this question as something, which if anybody speaks tomorrow for the constituency in this open meeting it might be interesting to know if we will be part of this very high level meeting or not.

Tony Holmes: Well the indication that I got was that there will obviously be various layers involved in that meeting. But the indication I got at the beginning of the week that was that there would be eight representatives from eight (unintelligible) right from government.

And then on the opposite side for the multi-stakeholder model there would be eight basically eight places and this is from what I remember I don't think anything was set in stone.

But there would be eight places that was all at the multi-stakeholder model so there would probably be a couple people from business. I do not think there will be a specific representation from ISP except that top level how the multi-stakeholder engagement works in terms of preparation towards that and how we fit in with that big picture scenario, right.

I don't understand I think what you are actually suggesting here is that the key question is what is going to be the structure of the meeting and how all of the multi-stakeholders engage within that process. That's something that is a number one issue and something we need to work on.

I don't think we have enough details of the meeting even as far as the invitation is concerned that's - was at one time I think coming out this week. It's now going to come out next week.

So until we get some basic information we can only raise these points as issues.

Tony: Yes I agree I was just wondering if it might be appropriate to flag the fact that as infrastructure providers and the front line of the Internet it might be useful to hear our voices at the meeting because I'm not to sure we will be included if there's only eight seats.

We will probably see silver society getting five of the eight seats I'd be, you know.

Man: I think that's right so it was told by Bakary and that, you know, he was - just come back from (unintelligible) and then they were talking about that and it

was told that yesterday or today there was an announcement given by the president (unintelligible) government.

I didn't see that I don't know...

Tony Holmes: That (unintelligible) referring to, you know, will take place next week is my understanding.

Man: ...so next week okay. So and that's what is evolved to say there is some places I do not know the (unintelligible) slots number maybe they play this for business participant for that (unintelligible).

So we do not have the information so I think it's (unintelligible) but to go for that - there are some slots for business more business needs isn't to be discussed, you know, in this community.

That's ISP (unintelligible) doing that, that's what I understand.

Tony Holmes: We're floundering with this because of the lack of (unintelligible) that's the problem.

Woman: So it's related to the opinion about making sure that our voices are presented I want to take a step back a little bit and maybe very, very basic question. For example in IGO anybody can participate instead of a representative.

So probably will need some - I want to confirm if it is not like the IGSO and the fact that, you know, we need to choose a representative. Is it a fact that is already fixed and so really to, you know, consider like IGS kind of thing where everybody can participate.

And my second question is doing this, you know, in able to fix this, you know, we have to choose representatives. How do we make sure that our voices will be heard through representatives because I very much (unintelligible)

concerned how do we make sure that (unintelligible) representative the voices of the ISP will be heard.

And we want to make sure that there is a way to ensure even if you can't participate yourself we can make sure that our opinions are well representative - was presented by whoever would be representing us so (unintelligible).

Tony Homes: (Rueben).

(Ruben): I think the special thing about the Brazil conference is that it is more a stakeholder conference that will be hosted by government and that we will make sure that we will discuss multi-stakeholder (unintelligible) on a very high-level.

And what (Echel) does in Germany and what (Urasta) is recommending to the national members is to get in touch directly with your government. Telling your government that it's important that ISP as an infrastructure provider will be heard in this meeting.

And try to get in touch directly with the government, try to get part of the government delegation if there would be one. I assume that many government with delegation composed of different stakeholders and that's at least what we try to do in Germany on the (unintelligible) and what (Urasta) is recommending to the national members to do.

Woman: Thank you it's me again, we already already do that and I think that's a very good point collaborating with the government and making sure that we are not saying different things within our economy I still very much agree with you on that.

Tony Holmes: I think that is the model that a number of us look towards engaging with. One of the questions that (unintelligible) that is as a community within ICANN how do we take forward this discussion.

It's fine having hour and a half starting at 7 o'clock tomorrow but I just see that as a first step. So one of the other questions I think we should ask tomorrow is what we need to do to make sure the whole of the ICANN multi-stakeholder community has the ability to contribute going forward.

I don't understand how that's going to happen currently it's already frequently points to (unintelligible), which is fine in itself but somebody's got to draw all of that information together at some stage and I don't understand how that's going to happen.

So I think these are the organizational questions or issues that maybe we need to raise within that session tomorrow and try to encourage everyone who has any questions around that to participate in that session tomorrow at 7 o'clock, I'm trying to get the basis so some framework that we can all work with in between and more certainly and the April timeframe.

And I think we're struggling with the same issues knowing how it fits together. Does anyone want to offer anymore input on that in terms of what we should be looking to achieve as part of that discussion or things that you feel should be on the table? Is it to early to have any discussion around that?

It's certainly a case where it's tough to get your mind around what is actually a focus for the (unintelligible) and what is going to be up for discussion and what isn't.

(Olivier): (Olivier) here from Europe maybe it is to early however would - offer plans within this constituency or would it make sense to talk about something like drafting the messages from the ISP's to the (unintelligible) conference just to make sure that our positions are heard and to make sure that we have all the same ideas of what we would like to have discussed or considered and from an ISP view (unintelligible).

I mean if you look at (unintelligible) that meant there are several aspects that are crucial to ISP's that are talking about fragmentation of the Internet and going back to a national level. They are talking about IP (unintelligible), which is a crucial issue for many ISP's.

And so at the given point of time I think we should make up our minds about what is our position on these issues as the constituency (unintelligible) conference.

Tony Holmes: Times going to be very tight on this for sure so maybe as far as we can go is to engage in the discussion tomorrow morning and to make sure that we have an ISPCP call within the next two to three weeks and make this one of the agenda items where we try and put some flesh on it during that debate.

Otherwise we could spend a lot of time talking about this here without really knowing whether it's relevant or not. Okay thanks is Jeff here now?

Man: But Thomas is here we can do Thomas' agenda item.

Tony Holmes: Yes good to have you back with us Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much Tony.

Tony Holmes: The issue on the agenda that Thomas can help us with and we've had quite a bit of discussion with our counselors around is the IGO, INGO debate (unintelligible) been very engaged in this within the council.

And certainly Thomas you've been very engaged in it so maybe to get everyone on the same page if you could just explain the activities that have taken place and where we actually are in terms of the GNSO position on this now.

Thomas Rickert: More than willing to do that, tell me would you like me to talk about the substance of the recommendation as well as where we are?

Tony Holmes: Very much yes please.

Thomas Rickert: Now first of all it's good to be here I am currently a NomCom appointee to the GNSO council and I'm allocated by the nominating committee to the contracted parties, which is why I'm only here on several occasions to see you guys but it's good to be here today.

I have taken the challenge to be the chair of the IGO, INGO PDP working group. Now that's a lot of acronyms but what it basically means is that the GNSO wanted to work on the policy response to various requests that came to both the ICANN board as well as to the GAC when organizations such as the International Red Cross, red crescent movement, international Olympic committee, international government and organizations as well as various international non-government organizations requested special protections for their names and the acronyms that they use.

And so we felt that it would be appropriate to look at this whole question very holistically in order to hopefully avoid that these groups or representatives of these groups would in future approach ICANN and ask for special treatment.

You know, there has been work on reserved names and all that in the previous years but none that asked the question of how to protect if at all the identifiers of IGO's and INGO's has not exhaustedly been discussed.

So we set out a little bit more than a year go with this PDP working group to look at various aspects of these protections for these four types of organizations.

That is top level protections as well as protections of the second level. We looked at full name identical match protection as well as acronym protection.

We looked at in what languages if at all the protection should be granted should it be just English, should it be in languages, should it be more languages than that.

And we were looking at various options to protect for example reserving names that would be putting names into a database such as the clearinghouse so then their services on that for protection.

We looked at curative mechanisms such as the URS and the UDRP, which cannot widely be used by many of these organizations. And we also discussed other options that might help these organizations for example a fee waivers for maybe rights objections or fee waivers for URS and other mechanisms.

So as you can see this is highly complex both legally as well as technically and the working group I think in an excellent collaborative effort were in this working group more than 40 members have subscribed and more than half of them have attended our weekly two-hour calls and that was quite a challenge.

And now we've produced a more than 80-page final report, we've come up with 29 recommendations and I'd like to briefly show you what these recommendations mean.

Now what did we support in the working group? We supported top level reservation, which means ineligibility for delegation for all four types of organizations.

That means that the word Olympic for example cannot be applied for future TLD (unintelligible) gTLD application law. Nonetheless we also recommended that together with this recommendation there should be an exception procedure for legitimacies, now that is the top level.

Then we had consensus on second level reservation...

Then we had consensus on second level reservation of full names for the International Red Cross Red Crescent movement for the International Olympic Committee for the names of the international governmental organizations. That is - these are names that are be put to what is now Specification 5 of the registry agreement. So the full names of these three types of organizations are going to be reserved.

Then we have consensus on adding certain identifiers to the Trademark Clearinghouse for the purpose of granting the benefits of the 90-day trademark claim service.

And that would be for the - for additional RCRC, which means Red Cross Red Crescent movement names then the acronyms of international governmental organizations and the full names of international non-governmental organizations. So that is a step lower than that.

So for the INGOs, the international non-governmental organizations just to refresh your memory they would not be granted any protections in terms of reservation. So they only get the benefit of the 90 days claim service via the clearinghouse.

And how is this achieved? Our recommendation is that these designations should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse. So the organizations don't need to go to the TMTH one-by-one and have the string added.

And then there's another recommendation that is in the final report and that is that certain designations that go into the Trademark Clearinghouse can actually benefit from the sunrise service. But this sunrise recommendation as well as the recommendation for the inclusion of IGO acronyms into the Trademark Clearinghouse only is the strong support but significant opposition, which is a little bit less than consensus.

We also have a recommendation whereby an issue report should be requested for modifying the uniform rapid suspension system as well as the uniform dispute resolution policy so that all four types of organizations can benefit from these curative mechanisms.

We can't just recommend that they can be used because the UDRP exists already and we need a PDP - an extra PDP to get that changed. And for those who are not too familiar with the policy development process, and I would sympathize with everybody that doesn't go into all that detail - all the detail.

The request of an issue report is the starting point for a PDP or it can be. Right. So that - with that we sort of kick off a policy development for the amendment to these two curative mechanisms, i.e., the UDRP and the URL - the UDRP and the URS.

And then we also have a recommendation dealing with a request to the so-called Standing Committee on Improvement. So Volker is also very active. That is, you know, we tend to neglect that for the time being. That is a question that we want the Council to ask or to pose to the SCI as we call it because we think that the vocabulary in the working group guidelines to describe consensus levels is not sufficient.

I'll give you an example. There is full consensus, which means that everybody supports the recommendation. Then we have consensus, which is also called rough consensus where only a few are not fine with the recommendation.

Then we have strong support with significant opposition, which I think is self-explanatory so you have two (camps) so that it could be a typical 55-45 scenario or 60-40 scenario. And then everything below that would be divergence.

And for the proposal to reserve IGO acronyms, everybody but the beneficials, i.e., those that would get the protection were against (it). So the working group members had a huge debate and felt that divergence means that there are different views inside the group.

But they thought that divergence would not accurately describe the position whereby only those that request something are in favor of it but the rest of the community is against it. Right. So we want that question to be answered by the SCI so maybe they come up with language such as consensus against, you know, to make very clear that the community wouldn't oppose a certain recommendation.

And then we had additional proposals that did not find either consensus or strong support with significant opposition. And that was the acronym reservation protection that I alluded to. Fee waivers did not get sufficient support. And a permanent trademark claim service also did not find support.

So how do you craft all that for all these four organizations into a motion that for example for the GAC and this is something of the highest interest for the GAC that the GAC can understand.

You know, there's a lot of history to the outcome of this. And therefore, you know, and Mikey starts to smile because we had huge debates about this. But this actually led to what I think is the longest motion in ICANN's history.

So we have a lot of whereas clauses giving an historic overview and making reference to the various documents, GAC advised Board actions. You will remember that the Board already granted provisional protections for the ICO and the RCRC. They also said something for the IGOs.

So we need to make sure that everybody feels comfortable, the Board as well as the GAC as well as the wider community that we took everything into consideration when we did our work.

You know, we could also have said whereas the working group produces final report resolve that the recommendations of the working group in the final report be adopted.

But we thought that was kind of little bit too short for the outside world to understand where we came from and why we did what and that we did our job. Remember it's quite an honor for me because both the GAC as well as the ICANN Board has said, okay, we take this PDP Working Group as a case study. So we wanted to ensure to demonstrate to the outside world that we were really diligent with what we did.

Okay. So basically we now have a motion that reflects more or less what I've been explaining to you. And there's a huge portion of recommendations that are consensus recommendations. So after consultation with our Council leadership, we now suggest that the GNSO Council votes on that - on those as a block.

And I think that should not pause - should not impose too much of the difficulty on the ISP's Council as (unintelligible) has been a very active member of the working group so you are fully into the picture on that.

The bit on the passing on this question to the Standing Committee on Improvement we cut out because that was - that's something that everybody supported so we moved that bit to what we call the consent agenda, which again is something that hopefully not all of you are forced to be familiar with.

But it's basically a portion on the agenda of the GNSO Council where undisputed proposals are put. So these can be voted yes on blocks. And only if one Council says I want to discuss this further. Then it's taken out of the

consent agenda and put on the regular agenda. That we did to also take a little bit of language out of the motion.

And then we have actually a third area, which is going to be the second item that we're going to vote on and these are the recommendations that only received strong support with significant opposition.

So you now need to make the decision whether you think that the council should pass on to the Board recommendations that did not reach consensus. And there are no clear guidelines in the working group guidelines for the other procedures for PDPs that would prevent the working group from doing so.

Until we were, you know, with one recommendation we were so close from consensus we thought we should bring it - bring this to the attention of the Council.

So I guess, you know, to put it in a nutshell there will be two votes; one on all the consensus position, one on the strong support with significant opposition positions. And you need to determine how you wish to instruct you Council. And I think I would like to leave it at that for the moment but I'm certainly more than willing to answer all your questions.

Man: Thank you. That's a really good explanation. And I certainly appreciate the work that you've done on this (folder) as well. This has been a really long haul and a lot of effort's gone into it (unintelligible).

Man: Yes. I would like also clarify which was our position during the working group because while I consulted with the constituency and I think we weren't the only constituency that in trying to reach consensus agreed to something that weren't totally agreeable to us.

So that qualifies what consensus means and what not a significant opposition means. When there was significant opposition I think there was several constituencies a strong position against that condition. So personally I would in your case I think we should go against all those that didn't get consensus. And that's my personal view.

(Thomas): That's perfectly possible. You can say yes to the consensus position and you can say no to those that only get strong support with significant opposition. I know that the likes of Mikey would say that this question needs to be pushed back to the working group. But just, you know, if you're - if we are working without (unintelligible) the question that if we push it back to the working group, the outcome would not be any different.

If the various groups stick to their original opinions that they injected into the consensus clause, we would still have strong support with significant opposition.

So at that point in time, you know, the Council again would need to make a decision whether or not they would present these to the Board. Only if the registrars, which were the missing bits of the consensus clause would say yes to IGO acronym inclusion into the Trademark Clearinghouse, then that very point would be a consensus position.

But again, if the Council now also said - now says that they want this, then the Council can also vote it up. Right. So we would not gain anything by pushing it back and forth. We would only lose time.

And therefore I would strongly suggest that -- and I'm not only talking to you, I'm doing a little tour seeing all the groups offering information, not advice -- that we actually can come to a conclusion with this during tomorrow's meeting hopefully and that you make up your mind whether you want to vote up or down on each of the two items.

But it's the first time this situation has occurred in this way I think that is my understanding. I can ask whether there was another situation in ICANN's history where strong support with significant opposition items have been brought to the Council.

And I need to double check with staff. I'm not aware of any such instances. I think that most of the PDPs came up with clear-cut consensus positions but they were maybe tame animals compared to the - right.

Man: But I can't remember anything that's gone down that path before.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Go ahead sir.

Man: There are some historic examples when we had the six year Whois Working Group - don't know if it was six years. But at some times there were things presented which had - it did not say significant opposition but it did say, you know, it was some measure of opposition. Majority favorable and a small minority against. And we were forced by the minority to mention this in the documents.

(Thomas): That notion of being - getting requests from working group members to display certain aspects in the motion is familiar. So that was, you know, even the drafting of the motion was trying to find an adequate compromise.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. So I understand we have two things to think about. One is content wise related to the content of the motion. And the other one is just a process wise.

So my question towards (unintelligible) is that what you mentioned at the end of - and told us your personal view. So we have to find about is your personal view to be taken here from the constituency or what kind of conclusion we have with regards to that. (So then we give - so we have) Council have advised the constituency what to do tomorrow in this regard.

And with respect to the other thing, the process wise, I understand right now, (Thomas) do we have a package of motion that we have two motions or do we have a - one motion with two parts?

(Thomas): We have one motion with two different votes in it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Two different votes.

(Thomas): One motion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

(Thomas): One vote on the consensus position and then another vote on the strong support with significant opposition position.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. And we have still open - (and I trust you to complete it). The question, which is a (former point), which means, you know, the motion was already introduced and it is right now. And right now we come up with a kind of amendment or whatever.

So there's a process internally the GNSO how to handle an amendment. It's not a new motion was introduced because the old motion was already introduced.

(Thomas): I have communicated with Jeff Neuman who is the maker of the motion and he's communicated his willingness to accept the changes that are outlined to (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So as I'm a seconder of the motion, I have to think about it.

Man: All right. Let's separate out those two issues and think about each one independently. But before we go there, (Thomas), do you want to say anything about the interaction that's gone on either formally or informally with the GAC as well on this? Where - their view of where we've ended up. Is there anything you want to mention around that?

(Thomas): I've been asked this question earlier. Will this possibly make the GAC happy or will they be upset? I'm coming to you today with my working group Chair's hat on. And as such, it is - it would not be appropriate to take into account strategic considerations.

But I want to make sure that the integrity of the process is ensured. And I think that this very PDP with some many volunteers from the community whereas - when we started no compromise of any kind was in sight.

But we came up with I think very well thought out consensus positions and other recommendations that we pass on to the Council. And this is the best that the community can offer. Will this please the GAC? Probably not. Does it please any of the groups that have been involved with the process? Certainly not (as well they said) that you didn't get your way.

But I think that's the absence of what makes good bottom up policymaking. And this is what you can observe. If you certainly look at the working group meetings, everybody was standing firm by their positions. No willingness whatsoever to compromise.

And then over time when we explained and tried - and I tried to navigate the group to better understand each other's position, then sort of the - everything got more sympathetic, right. Not for everyone but we made it to a position which came up with meaningful results.

And I think that the GAC will hopefully appreciate this effort and they - and hopefully that will also help foster the relationship between the GNSO and the Board and the GAC.

You know, we came up with these recommendations on a very complex and contentious issue in a relatively short period of time. And that I think good enough to make good relationships with the GAC.

And I think that also the GAC over time has changed its position slightly by not being so demanding on particularly the IGO protection. I think there's been some movement on that side as well.

When others, not only us, for example pointed out to them that the legal basis for the protections that we're demanding was not as clear as they wanted to believe.

If you look at the Nairobi treaty that deals with the International Olympic Committee it's not the word Olympic that's protected by this treaty. It's the five interlock rings.

If you look at the Paris convention, which deals with the protection of the names of international governmental organizations and for those that are interested, look at (6 ter) of the Paris convention.

There are even disputes among legal experts whether this is actually a basis for protection. Some think that it is. Others say that the Paris convention is just a framework for the recognition of international governmental organizations. And that it only protects against commercial third party use. So it's no universal protection.

So I think that the complexity of this matter, you know, only became visible to the GAC as we moved on, right. So if you look at the GAC communiques, the language changed there as well.

So I do hope - I sincerely hope that during the state of work now that we present our results that the GAC will not be as upset if at all with the GNSO community as they probably would have been a year back. So we've all learned in this process.

Man: That is progress. Yeah. That's an excellent explanation as well. So I appreciate. So splitting those to parts of the motion apart. My understanding is that from the conversation we've had in the constituency before and indications that we've given you (assistance progress) as part of that. I think in general I would suggest we're in a situation now where we would support the first part of that. Is that correct?

Man: Yes. We compromised to get to that consensus. And a lot of our parts compromise. So it's - we have lots people say and many - for many of them that if we can't - we don't like them but we live with them.

So I think we could arrive to that. Personally I'm against any special protections for any organizations that's not given equally to others in the same situation. But I think we, as I said, we can live with it. We can accept it. But we cannot accept blind slate of reservations for names of non-governmental organizations that they are limitless. They can grow as wide as they want. So that's why we tired to limit the protections to the international governmental organizations.

(Thomas): I remember the discussion. I think we had it over...

Man: Yes.

(Thomas): ...the last two meetings when we've gone down this path. So unless there's any objection to the first part of the motion, I think that should be our situation going into the vote on this.

The more contentious part is the second part of the motion. I would welcome some other views before I express the view on this - on that second part of the motion. Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just what we were speaking on. Just to understand fully and then maybe it would be helpful if (Thomas) again just for that part to outline again the differences again in terms of sunrise (build), in terms of whatever part of the process, you know. The permission or the grants we have set in this Recommendation Number 7 is it now, yeah, here in this process because it will - if I recall that (slides been) very different this year.

So we figure out to second level and who is (complete) the organization is going to be protected in which way is understood clearly on that, so.

(Thomas): Not sure whether we should - yes. I guess it might be too complicated to go into all the details and the scope of the identifiers in an answer to you now. But the contentious bits that we have with strong support but significant opposition are Number 1, should acronyms of international governmental organizations be added to the Trademark Clearinghouse and then benefit from the 90 days claim service. That's one thing. So that would for example mean that uno could go into the Trademark Clearinghouse and get 90 days claim service.

The second question is whether - you will remember the Trademark Clearinghouse is the central repository of data - the database. And then you have two services serve on top of that. That's the 90-day claim service and then the sunrise service.

And the second question deals with this very second service. Now all those names that go into the Trademark Clearinghouse shall they also benefit from the sunrise service?

And in the deliberations there was hesitancy by huge parts of the participants to grant this privilege. They said inclusion into the Trademark Clearinghouse and claims notice for 90 days is enough because otherwise they say uno could get privileged registration during the trademark sunrise period prior to general availability when they say others could register the names.

And this is what substantial opposition was against. So this is maybe to illustrate. Other - and I'm not sure whether you want to dive into more detail. But there was certain reluctance. You know, the people said okay this claims notice is okay for many designations except for the IGO acronyms.

And then they said okay, for those designations that go into the Trademark Clearinghouse they should not benefit from the sunrise service because that would mean that an international non-governmental organization - for the sake of simplicity, an acronym of an IGO, let's say uno, could be registered by the United Nations before somebody who is just a fan of the Italian number one, which is uno can register its domain name.

And this privilege, huge portions of the working group did not wish to grant. So that's the two things; inclusion of INGO - excuse me, of IGO acronyms into the Trademark Clearinghouse; and then opening it up for sunrise services.

Man: Any comment on that? It's not - well we'll try and do this the easy way, which is to suggest that walk through this exercise. (Unintelligible) has worked hard representing the constituency. And I would suggest at this stage that we take your advice on this and do not agree to that second part of the proposal. On that - that this is the only chance you have because the vote's during this meeting on the Council. Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I have - anyway we have to get a flavor on that, you know. Because it seems to me that is just a - the question what if you (unintelligible) for that. So it's - for me I could say privately. It doesn't matter looking at government organizations or private organizations. Organization with regards to this matter it's an organization. You know. So in this respect, yeah.

So the argument of okay, they open the bottle and there is no image to see with regards to governmental organization. Okay, then it might be lower than whatever the creation of new government organizations every day (without) - what I understand. I don't know if that is covered by the definition of that but okay.

So I'm not really - personally not I'm really sure. So I can't advise, yeah. But it should be discussed really so around to get a feeling so what is it about. It is - keeps to me really now to just to take over the - okay, yes. Let's go this way right now. So I did not really (unintelligible) got from that.

Man: (Thomas). Heard you say that and I'm not sure I got that clearly.

(Thomas): (Thomas).

Man: (Thomas).

(Thomas): I appreciate the question Wolf-Ulrich. Nonetheless we're now at a stage where the motion is in front of the GNSO Council. And the working group, which you've actively participated in, has deliberated in all these issues. Who should be a beneficiary? Will we open the floodgates? How many organizations will enter the (scene)? Who is the gatekeeper for that?

And we came up with recommendations that are very well thought out. So for the IGOs we will take a list produced by the GAC and for the international non-governmental organizations we will have the (ecosoft) list, which is a list

that is produced by a third party so you can't just say I'm a new organization, I want to have protections.

But there's a process behind it. So we have a gatekeeper elsewhere, all right, that would keep this quite narrow. And for the IOC that have a limited number of screens that they wanted to get protected. And for the RCRC meaning the International Red Cross Red Crescent name and they also came up with the conclusive list of strings.

So the working group has before it both the current status of our strings to be protected as well as a clear view on what the future development of that might be.

So I think at this point in time the question for the Council is is the policy development process done in good order. Did we look at it from all angles? And I think (as far as) that place to make a judgment on that.

And if there were flaws in the process then that needs to go back to the working group. But apart from that I think the Council is going to need to make a value judgment as to what should be protected or which organizations should be worthy of protection. That's all been done by the working group and in my view it's been done in a coherent and comprehensive manner.

Man: And that was the basis of my thinking as well that you put some boundary around the other parts of the motion. On this there isn't a boundary that I think is signification in the plans.

So would you be on that - I agree with (Thomas), we've got to make a decision here now...

Man: Yeah.

Man: ...as a constituency. And I believe for the reasons we're following this through earlier with you (unintelligible). And so the point that it always worries me to put anything out there that's gotten a boundary whatsoever. It's difficult.

Man: I just want to make it clear. Our position was very much more restricted when we started in the working group. Our position was almost to give no protection to...

Man: Yeah.

Man: ...any organization. We compromised with the other members of the group trying to reach a consensus position. And that's why we're reaching several points.

There are a couple of points we never agreed to. One is the acronyms because those - some international organizations have acronyms that identify them uniquely. There are others that don't. And there - even there are acronyms that are the same from two different organizations. So that was one of the points where not - trying not to protect three letters or a little more designations.

The INGOs - well first of all the INGOs weren't mentioned at the beginning. The GAC never mentioned the INGO. We introduced them. And then from my personal view, I have seen that it's very easy to create an international non-governmental organization.

Just any country can create one and declare it is international and that's it. The (ecosoft) restricts that a bit. But not that much. They're almost more than 2000 they reduced (there).

So that's why we - our position was not to grant them any special protection. So I think it was discussed. Of course there are some points that we can

agree or not. But because we're reaching a compromise that might be able to
- (unintelligible) the others.

But I think those are just a few points that can be discussed. We can talk
about them maybe if you want. But the problem is this is a very complex...

Man: Okay.

Man: ...condition.

Man: No. Thanks for that. My own view is that I - well I think we had this discussion
in the past and a number of us compromised far more than we were probably
content to do so. So to take it further is (pointless), so. But if we have that
conclusion. And that's where we'll be tomorrow.

(Thomas): Thanks so much for having me.

Man: Thank you very much. Always welcome here. But you were coming back at
some stage I hope as well (Thomas).

(Thomas): I will.

Man: Good. No, you're always welcome here at the PCP. Okay. So moving on the
agenda and back on the agenda, I think Jeff's with us, no. Could ask you to
take us through the work that you're going to be doing over the next few
months. Thanks.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you.

Jeff Schmidt: Great. Thank you everybody. Afternoon. My name is Jeff Schmidt. I run a boutique consulting firm, JAS Global Advisors. We focus on information security on matters particularly for critical infrastructure.

And we were engaged by ICANN to resolve the string collision issue. The - I won't go through the entire presentation. On Monday there was a very good session that contained the full, you know, comprehensive approach that is more than just our project but other projects as well; the outreach project, the response capabilities that ICANN is putting together, et cetera.

But I wanted to just take a quick moment to brief you on our project make you aware. If you were not at the session on Monday, then I'd like to invite questions.

So the string collision as you know has been getting a lot of attention, you know, over the last couple of months and couple of years depending. And where we are right now with that project is the formation of a framework to close the issue and bring closure, bring resolution to the string collisions with respect to the current - currently applied for at registries.

The project is split up into three chunks. The SLD block list approach, which I'm sure you're all familiar with now at that point, is the approach that allows a registry to move forward while we're waiting for the other phases of the project.

Where we are working right now is the second piece, which is the formation of the framework. The framework will allow the - a set of mitigations to be applied for each application - each applied for TLD to allow the applicants to move forward, manage down the risks associated with the end state's collisions and get off of the block listing strategy if they should so choose.

The timeline for this project through our part will be going out for public comments in January. And ICANN is expecting to be able to, you know,

announce the broader package and the broader timelines and the broader resolution that the Singapore meeting or thereabouts.

Our approach between now and then is to, you know, work as collaboratively and openly as we can with the community. There's been a lot of great research, a lot of great ideas, a lot of great papers and a lot of great data contributed by, you know, all parties.

We want to continue that approach. We were - we will be reviewing the data that has been put out to date and it includes everything provided by vendors, the diddle data, other sorts of datasets.

We will be monitoring the DNS-OARC collisions list. So if you're not familiar with that list and you're interested in the collisions issue, that's where we're going to be - we're going to be monitoring that list and continuing our active participation.

If anybody wants to provide additional feedback to the process, feel free to - you can reach us there or reach us individually. Again, we really want to make sure that folks have a mechanism to participate before we get to the comment period.

To that end, in order to close the - or tighten up the feedback cycle, as we complete, you know, significant, you know, kind of parts of the report, we will be blogging on domain insight to get the information out there, invite commentary. We'll be monitoring and participating in the comments. So I would invite you to watch for those as well.

My objective is to make sure that, you know, when our report comes out for public comment it's not full of surprises. Everybody should pretty much know what's it in and had an opportunity to comment well before the comment period.

We are asking a couple of very specific things of the community. Firstly we are actively soliciting key studies. Anybody that has experience with a DNA namespace collision, knows anybody that had experience with a namespace collision, that's heard a rumor of somebody with experience with a namespace collision, we would like to know about it.

One of the things that we really need to get a grasp of in this project are the consequences. There's been a lot of work on frequency of potential collisions but not a lot of work on what the damage could actually be - the consequences. So one of the ways that we want to get a better grasp of that is by looking for experiences.

The second piece that we're asking for assistance with is a survey. Again, the blogging, the feedback outside of the ICANN sphere, the broader IT operational sphere. We will be inviting people to participate and also forward on to your circles a survey to gather information about this issue as well.

So please keep - if you have ideas, concerns, questions, please feel free to reach us in any way. And keep your eye on the collisions list and domain insights to track the project as it moves along. Any questions?

Man: Thanks. Jeff, I've got a couple of questions. But you mentioned there were three elements and I think you only talked about two. You talked about block list and framework.

Jeff Schmidt: Oh. Thank you. The third is applying the framework to the individual strings. So the objective is to wind up, you know, the applicant for .Jeff will have a very specific, very implementable plan to manage down the risk of collisions in. Jeff, which will probably be different than the person that applied for .abc.

Man: Okay. (Unintelligible).

Man: Building case studies seems like it would generate a lot of actionable intelligence that we use for people when they encounter problems on down the road. Is any point - is any part of your work designed around providing tools to network sys admins in order to identify and mitigate problems when they arise?

Jeff Schmidt: So good question. So I would encourage you to look at the slides from Monday because it actually shows - there's actually a lot going on on this. ICANN has an outreach campaign. They have a documentation and kind of self-help campaign designed for admins and, you know, try to educate on the issues and such.

So it directs part of our remit is not creating that but certainly we will be feeding information to these other pieces. So, you know, if we come across a common, you know, failure modality, right, you know, where we've seen now, you know, five admins that have basically made this class of mistake, right.

Of course we're going to make sure that that gets wrapped into these other efforts so that everybody gets better. Yeah.

Man: But one of our concerns Jeff is that we keep hearing, you know, these other elements of this. But what you got here is group (advice space). None of that's been shared with us at all. And we've got some real concerns over that. Certainly would have liked to have been involved in that (unintelligible) a side of it.

But a question back to you is you mentioned you'd be looking at other data. What data are you looking at outside of the diddle data?

Jeff Schmidt: So if you're not familiar, the diddle data is the DNS-OARC datasets. They collect 50 hours worth of network captures for most of the root servers once a year.

The diddle data is very interesting. It has a lot of very useful properties not the least of which is it's available to anybody that wants to join DNS-OARC and so the research is repeatable and such.

But it does have limitations. In particular once a name gets - or a TLD rather gets delegated, you know, then we lost visibility in the diddle data. So in order to get better visibility we are asking folks that have larger cursive resolvers if they're able to provide us data.

So that would be, you know, something for this group in the event that you have data you're willing to share. We can work out some kind of an agreement, (monomize) or do whatever we need to do to get access to that data.

One of the other things in terms of specific datasets would be more current datasets from root operators. So, you know, currency is a double-edged sword because strings are out there now and so there's a lot of Heisenberg going on. But getting a better sense, you know, the most recent diddle data we have now is March of '13.

So getting a better sense of what's happening now and what the trends have been would be interesting. So we're talking to the root operators as well about some ways to get additional visibility.

Man: Just a follow on question to that. Do you not expect some difficulty getting that additional data because you're very much going cap in hand to these folks running these cursive resolvers asking for their help?

And with some aspects around that you probably going to have problems with data privacy and with those restrictions that are places on that type of data. Isn't there not a real danger here that you're going to get very limited set or amount of information out of that approach?

Jeff Schmidt: Yes and that's certainly a risk. The - honestly the response so far from the large - the cursives - the folks that have our differences has been very positive. There is actually more practical concerns just with things like volume and, you know, if you look at logs from DNS servers they get very voluminous very quickly.

And so, you know, we are going down a path with a couple folks where, you know, we're asking them questions, right. And they go and look at their data and find the answer or write a paper on the answer or something like that.

So we're open to whatever we can make work. We have time constraints. We, you know, if we do need to, you know, sign an MDA or get anonymized data or something like that, we'll work on that. We'll work with people in any way that we can.

Man: Okay. (Christian), go ahead.

(Christian): When you go back and talk to the people that make up the ecosystem of groups that are working on the things that were in the slide deck. We are in the process of trying to develop as many outreach tools as we can.

And the less we have to duplicate work, the less we have to, you know, do the same thing over and over again not knowing what everybody else is doing, the better off we are. So glad to hear from you - hear from everybody who is working on the other aspect.

What is the outreach method if you do have interest in - not either a recursive DNS, providing data or at least getting the information about how we can do it ourselves and take a look at that data ourselves?

Jeff Schmidt: Sure. So namespace study at JAS Advisors is in the PowerPoint. You can use that. You know email me directly. I'm jschmidt@jasadvisors. You can find

us on the DNS-OARC collisions list. That's another, you know, great spot to, you know, act. We'll talk anyway you want to talk.

With respect to kind of the broader piece of this, you know, I would encourage you to talk to John Crane and Dave Piscitello from ICANN who are from the outreach side of things.

Man: Okay. One follow on question. I don't know whether you were in the session this morning when the multi stakeholder group met with the Board. But one of the issues that was raised there is that one of the mitigation strategies is trials.

Many, many questions around trials as to how you can conduct them. What is the focus of the trial or the information you extract, evaluation: All of those things that haven't been addressed. But I gather that isn't on your particular work plan at the moment. Is that correct?

Jeff Schmidt: So I'm not sure where that vicious rumor is coming from. I absolutely consider if trial delegations are one of the, you know, mitigation packages that appears in our report, then, you know, gosh darn it, we actually have to define it.

So that is - I mean all - trial delegations have been talked about in, you know, SSAC report in three flavors and in a number of other places. There's also other ideas out there. There's the Internet draft, you know, using (admin that) works together data about DNS behavior.

There's a lot of great ideas and a lot of science out there and a lot of data. A lot of smart people looking at this. And all of that is within our - and we have to look at all of it. We have to look at all of it.

If a trial delegation, you know, did appear as a part of our mitigation strategy for some class of strings, you know, then we would have to dig into the, you know, how does that actually work. You know, who does it? What records?

What logs are being kept? How do you look at the logs after how long?
What's good? What's bad? That's all within the scope of the mitigation plan.

I think - I mean our objective is to bring closure to this issue. You know, to bring a deterministic end. As somebody said earlier, you know, there's been a lot of ping ponging on this and I find myself without a paddle at this point. I don't think - I don't think I have a paddle to ping. We have to - we have to bring this issue to rest.

Man: So that would then inherently include a decision tree of some sort that if during the trial you reach this threshold there'll be certain actions pinned to that, which you would specify as part of your report including possible calling delegations.

Jeff Schmidt: Right. So the - sorry, I was stuck with a (yell). The, you know, trials are an interesting thing because you have to go to the end, then what? Right. And the end, then what in a trial is the really hard part.

So, you know, what data needs to be collected? When is it okay? When is it not okay? What does okay look like? What does not okay look like? When you're doing the trial you actually have to be concerned about things like gaming, right.

I mean I - so I'm, you know, I'm a paranoid security guy and my company's, you know, paranoid security guy company. You know, we know that any system that can be gamed will.

Even, you know, even the threat of being gameable, you know, puts applicants in a prisoner's dilemma because they have to assume that their competitors will game it and then so they have to game it. So I mean we're conscious of that and we want to make sure that, you know, that what we come up with is actually implementable and reasonable.

Man: And obviously you'll cover that totally from a technical perspective. But around that you're also get into issues of legal follow up as well, which make it - makes it - it's another dimension that makes it very complex. But I assume you would not see that as part of your arena. That's for someone else to deal with this.

Jeff Schmidt: Yeah. That's correct. We're not engaged to provide legal opinions. And of course everybody's situation varies and jurisdiction varies and (unintelligible) varies. So yeah, that has to be done individually.

Man: Okay. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: It's Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. I kind of want to start off by saying thanks for what you've done so far and joining us. I also want to say thanks for being willing to communicate in any way possible.

And I think the ask here is that if an emerging way of coalescing the concerned parties starts to gain some traction, please let us know. Please let me know so that I can yell over this group.

I'll return to the theme that I started earlier this afternoon, which was by what you said and a lot of other people, which is we have to focus on what we're going to do to mitigate this and, you know, and (Umi) and (Christian) and others have started to describe earlier in this session.

Some of us have to get underway right away because I'm in the fortunate position of being involved with an ISP that doesn't do - resolve this. For any ISP that has end customers that's using their infrastructure to reach the demands, this is an emerging possibly very bad day.

So the other thing that I want to remind you of, and I've done it three times today - I always figure three is good. Which is the point that I made in the meeting and then on video too and how here is that we really have to get

pretty good coordination between the stuff that was under John Crane's wing and the stuff that you're doing and us, you know, so that this isn't a black box that we're watching from outside.

You know, and we don't have to drive that bus but we have to be in the passenger seat so we can see what's happening as soon as you see it, so.

Jeff Schmidt: So I appreciate that. I've heard loud and clear the, you know, the need. There is a lot going on. And I believe it's, you know, fairly comprehensive. But you're absolutely right. It's not - that's not well known, well understood, maybe not well communicated.

And also echoing kind of what you said so I hear you loud and clear that there needs to be better communication of the - of all of the efforts, contact points, coordination. Lots of folks, particularly folks that support operations, right are going to, you know, want to have some visibility, provide feedback. So I'm - I heard you loud and clear. Thank you.

Man: And as part of the program I assume that one, you publish your report there'll be an opportunity for us to come back and comment on that as well.

Jeff Schmidt: Yes. Please don't wait until we publish our report. Please participate on collisions. Please participate in the domain inside blog. Please don't wait until the end.

Man: Good. Did you have a question (Marcus)? Okay. No. Any further questions for Jeff? Okay. Thank you very much...

Jeff Schmidt: Thank you very much.

Man: ...for joining us. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: So moving us on towards the last 20 minutes of our meeting, Wolf-Ulrich will start out on the other motions we need to consider prior to the Council meeting that's being held here.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Well there's only one other motion on the table. It's with regards to chartering a group. It's called cancellation consideration of Whois information or this specific part of Whois information with regards to translated in other language and then - than English and translated - transliterated and others could then (unintelligible). So that's - so there is no problem because chartering is okay. (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. Thanks. Staying on the theme of Council and activities, Mikey, working group. Anything from your side with the working group?

Mikey O'Connor: No, I'm happy to report that the one that I was chairing is done. And - no.

Man: Okay. So one of the things I wanted to mention at this stage was the issue that you raised earlier Mikey. I don't know whether you felt you completed that in totality. The issue of awareness off gTLDs getting information out there to other ISPs and the use of our Web site to do that.

Mikey O'Connor: I think what I'm going to do on that - I feel like I scanned across it enough. And what I'll do is I'll send a post to the list so that you'll have links that you can follow and a little bit of, you know, a little introductory paragraph. And I'll try and touch up that Web page, which as I looked at it today is not the clearest. So I think that's one that I can just take as a follow up action.

Man: Okay. I'm now looking towards (Tony) on the outreach activities. (Tony), can you bring us up to date or everybody up to date as to where we are and what's happened since we were last together?

(Tony): Happy to do that. Well, as a summary we had some brochures printed this year. It was sent to several members who requested them by Federal Express. And I know that some members have attended RIR meetings particularly. I think (Ari) mentioned this. You're not here now. Oh yes. (Ari), do you know what happened? You made a presentation in Asia, right?

(Efamy): Oops. Sorry. Maybe I'll use this mic. Thank you. So this is (Efamy). Yeah. So he did make a presentation at the APNIC forum and some of the other RIR forum. And I think because of what was being shared was more broad of what ICANN is doing in general.

So there was no feedback in conclusion. And my observation is that it might help picking up some of the issues that are relevant to the ISP rather than just sharing what's going on in the ICANN in general because people think okay, ICANN, domain names. It doesn't really affect the operation but then this case such as name collisions or any of the other issues that might be of interest.

For example, maybe what's being discussed in the (Asia region) working group regarding Whois, things like that. I think it might help, you know, just highlighting the issues that are relevant to the ISP might help get more feedback from the operational community. That's my personal observation rather than what (unintelligible) did I should say.

Man: Thank you. (Arlin) at the IG you took some materials with you I think.

(Arlin): Yeah. I took some materials and I used - and so (unintelligible) used more for during the (right) meeting event. And then (unintelligible) went to the information (unintelligible) position explaining what (unintelligible) specifically was an then giving some brochure. And no feedback or (any, no).

(Tony): Okay. I was at the (LAC NICLAC) meeting for (unintelligible) two weeks ago with several of my colleagues here from (cavasia) were with me. And I did

make a presentation on the ISP activities and to the general audience. And we had the distribution of brochures for everybody. There were - I think there were close to 200 people there.

And we did - I did rather stress as issues the question of the new gTLDs and name collision since these would obviously be of interest to the people who were in the room.

Aside from that we might mention that in the discussions of our outreach group over the last few months, I did propose and there was some consensus, and Mikey has already mentioned what he's doing on this, that it might be in our interest to serve the ISP and connectivity provider's community to send a bulletin perhaps on a weekly basis where we notify them of all new gTLDs that go into the root.

And also if there is any alerts that we see emerging from name collision incidents or whatever, this might also be something we could flag to our ISP community.

This was suggested because, as I have explained on previous occasions, in Latin America at least many small - many medium and small ISPs register domain names for their users. They are resellers of domain names.

And it does help them perhaps in their daily activities. It should help them to know when new domains become available for purchase for their users and also to alert their customer - let's say customer service desk that, you know, they may get a complain which involves the new domain and the customer service desk may not even know it exists and throw it away.

So I think there is the opportunity here and there was consensus in this - in our discussions to take a more proactive role in the ISPCP and build a mail list, which is something I have started, not only of members who come to the

ISPCP meeting but a general mailing list of particularly associations where we know that let's say (unintelligible) it would be but example in Argentina.

If (Cavasia) receives this information it can relay it immediately to maybe 200, 300 small ISP cooperatives and small cable companies who provide Internet service. And the same can happen in many parts of the world. And association can relay this information to all its members.

And I think this would put us perhaps on the map finally as doing something useful for our community because I mean over the last few years many times I've talked to associations particularly in Europe as the classical example. I don't mean Germany. Others who the answer is always oh you're going to ICANN, fine. Let us know if anything goes wrong. And the ICANN works fine. Don't break what's working, you know. Don't fix what's working.

And the attitude is well we really don't - we're not too interested, which is understandable. But I think now we have an opportunity to perhaps interest many people who are being not too interested in what we do.

Man: Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yeah. Thanks (Tony). There was a question, which we had also discussed that (poster) is available. That would be (such a very good) off a PDF because it may be (easy) at sometimes because they have - do not have (cc) events to start right off and maybe all the ISPs got together just to put it out to ICANN from the association for example, yeah, to their members so to reach out to them maybe easier.

(Tony): May I comment on that too? I think that's a good suggestion Wolf-Ulrich. We had a rather common occurrence in Durbin where our brochures were sent by ICANN to Durbin to be printed and they assembled them - they misassembled them. So we got delivery of the brochures for Durbin but they

were all, you know, in the wrong order - the eight sheets. So that really threw things a little bit through the roof.

And the second point was we realized that with so many brochures the weight of carrying them around for our members is not perhaps something which is very productive for them. If you're traveling on a plane, you got to take, you know, five or six or seven kilos of brochures. It's probably not something that you'd be all that happy with.

So this - having something in a digital form might seem better and it also gives us an opportunity to update it more frequently.

Man: Well, this dates back a little bit there because I don't see in any way that that would ever be a replacement for a publication. And I think that this - the way the BC Newsletter is used, I think it would be a mistake to start updating things and not having a published copy. But I do think we need to have a PDF version on our Web site and we can fix that for sure.

The other thing to say on that is that we are now certainly before we get to Singapore we need another version. We need another bulletin out there. And one of the things we need to focus on after this is actually what's going to go into that bulletin and start producing the material yet again. So by the time we get to Singapore you've actually got the other one on the table.

So we're getting towards (IOB) - (Alain).

(Alain): Yeah. If I remember well, we had a translated version...

Man: Yeah.

(Alain): ...in French, Spanish as I remember. And then (unintelligible) on the (unintelligible) Web site or not?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: They certainly need to be on the Web site. They're not currently I don't think Mikey.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: I was reading my last action item. You guys are doing it faster than I can get them into my to do list. Did we do translated versions of the actual brochures? So if we get PDFs of the...

Man: Yeah.

Mikey O'Connor: ...translated versions, then we could put them all up. That would be - I have the translated version.

Man: But that's (from you).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: No, no. I've got them. They're sitting in my unbelievably long to do list. And part of the reason that I never got around to it is because the non-PDF version of the brochure isn't very visually appealing. You know, it's not very much fun to read.

And so I really like the idea of getting back to what's in there and getting those PDFs.

Man: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: And I'll just push them up to the site. Yeah.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: So anyway, somehow or another yeah. But they're not up there right now.

Man: Okay. So I'm moving into the final item on our agenda, which is (unintelligible). I've got a few things around that to discuss. But the very first one is certainly we should record our thanks to Wolf-Ulrich for coming to the end of a very difficult time on Council. And I think you've done a really great job for the constituency. Not only for the constituency but also for the GNSO in itself Wolf-Ulrich as Vice-Chair.

And you're certainly going to be missed. I'm sure Mikey's looking forward to taking on that role.

((Crosstalk))

Man: But thank you very much. I should record our thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you.

Man: What I'd like to focus on now is just try and get some agreement when as a group we're going to have our next conference call because we've got a number of things on that agenda and I think we need to have it fairly fast.

I would propose that we need at least a couple of hours for our next call. And on that we will certainly be looking at some of the issues in more detail that are on our agenda from today.

So of course name collisions is at the top of the list. Plus the follow on action from Internet governance, the follow on actions from the outreach discussion and looking towards getting something going, something moving for our next bulletin.

I'd also want to be in a position before we get to Singapore to actually get back on track on the IDN variant work that we started to get involved in at our last meeting in Durbin. And unfortunately that's really been sidetracked because the Internet governance stuff and the name collision stuff came from upside and took away a little of our focus.

But I believe that it would be very helpful as a constituency if we could set up some form of Webinar around that before we actually get to the meeting in Singapore. And then we can organize our agenda with the JIG group and try and get a much better understanding of how that impacts ISPs. And I think we've got an education once again to do in terms of outreach and hitting some of those people once again with information around that.

So we've already got quite a lot of information that we should be sharing on the IDN variant stuff. I know Mikey's done quite a bit in that area. So could I propose maybe a call on the 10th of December for members? Can we leave here with that as an arrangement? Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: As usual. Is there - really I'm really aware that it's always the middle of the night for you guys. What sort of time is better for you? Earlier. We need to be earlier.

Man: Yes.

Man: Yeah.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: So if we made it around noon UTC is that better for you?

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay. Yes. I know that means you have to get up early Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, I get up earlier. That's not a problem. I actually like it.

Man: Around then. So let's fix that for noon on the 10th of December. Okay. Before we close, any other issues from anybody?

Man: I don't much (unintelligible) the meeting - tomorrow's meeting at least on the agenda.

Man: Tomorrow's meeting. Yes. You may note the morning meeting...

Man: Yeah.

Man: ...at 7 o'clock.

Man: Yeah.

Man: Yeah.

Man: (You've got that on there).

Man: Yeah. But it's difficult to go any further than we did with that because the structure of it and the focus is about as clear as everything is clear to me around that Brazil meeting, so difficult. Okay.

So thank you all very much for your involvement. If I could ask to make sure that the list that was circulated is returned to this table. And with that, I will declare the meeting closed. Thank you.

END