Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires RrSG Session I

Tuesday 23 June 2015

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

Michele Neylon: Okay, everybody, if you could please take your seats. If you could please take your seats. This is the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We are meeting with Akram Atallah and Cyrus Namazi to get some updates on GDD. Recordings and AV things that you could please get started. Perfect, thank you.

So I'm going to -- thank you Cyrus and Akram or Akram and Cyrus. And just before we go to you I'm going to hand over to Paul Goldstone just to update on how we're going to handle the queue during this session and moving forward just to make things a little bit cleaner. Over to you Paul.

Paul Goldstone: So if anyone has a question please jump on Adobe Connect and raise your hands and I'll put you in the queue. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay so Akram and Cyrus, gentlemen, over to you.

Akram Atallah: Thank you. Good morning everyone. Thank you for having us. It's amazing, I think we have more staff people on the table that we have registrars. We are here to actually, you know, go over some updates but also to listen to your concerns and feedback and anything that you would like to see from GDD that we can do to support you that we're not doing or that we can do better please do not hesitate to use this opportunity to also share that with us and we will do our best so thank you. Who is going to give that? Mike?

Mike Zupke: Would you like me to talk? Yeah, okay. I'll point it in the right way. Okay, thank you. So this is Mike Zupke again. So I gave a little bit of an update to the joint Registry and Registrar ExComm as they met on Sunday so I thought I'd maybe kind of share that information with the bigger group and if there are any questions I'm happy to answer. And of course can always play stump the chump, you know, with Akram and Cyrus, we love that game.

                  So if you of the things that we talked about at the last meeting I just wanted to give you some updates on. One of them was the Registrar training program. So as you probably know we developed a pretty rigorous training program that's online for the 2009 RAA and we've recently gone through the process of updating that for the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement.

                  And so that is just about ready to go live. We have it on a staging site right now and we're just doing our final review of all content. And one of the things that we're also talking about doing is maybe trying to make the content more broadly available than in the past so it can be on YouTube or on a public site like learn.ICANN.org so anybody can come and take the courses. There might be information that is interesting to registrants or other Internet users. It might be something that registrars might like to refer their employees to do as part of their own training and orientation. So that's coming very shortly.

Another thing that's been going on is something that's our Compliance team has done, and I'll let them talk about this more in their own session. But one of the things some registrars ask for is a way to get a view of their compliance tickets on some periodic basis so that they know what's still open, what needs action, what's recently been closed. And so now beginning about next week registrars will be able to sign-up for this and every I believe Monday morning they'll get a report from our Compliance team that shows all their open and recently closed tickets.

And we've had some of the members of the ExComm here have been beta testers on that. So if you're unhappy with it you can either blame us or you can blame your leaders.

So those are I think a couple of the big things. We have some sessions coming up tomorrow that I want to just flag for you. We have a session with the Registrar Stakeholder Group and staff, 9:00 am tomorrow in Retiro C.

((Crosstalk))

Mike Zupke: So we'll be discussing the review of the 2013 RAA Whois accuracy specification. There is another session later in the day that's a public session with registrars and law enforcement having a similar discussion. We were hoping to have a discussion of the public comments that we've received however, today nine have been received so I suspect people are waiting until after the ICANN meeting to get their comments together. But I would really encourage everybody to make sure to try and attend those two sessions. The second one is that 1:30 in (Alitorio).

We've got the GDD industry Summit coming up. I won't talk too much about that because we have a session tomorrow at 3:00 pm in this room, Retiro B, to

discuss that. And then at five o'clock in (Alitorio), there will be the Whois accuracy reporting system. There will be a discussion of what's happening with that so I've got a really busy day tomorrow so be nice to me. And even feel free to follow me around from session to session. That's pretty much my day.

So that's kind of a highlights. I also want to mention a couple of staffing changes. Steve Miller has joined our team, he's right there with his hand up. He's currently in our DC office but will be moving to Los Angeles around the end of the year. And Danielle Andela, I'm very sad to report, as I think most of you already know, is leaving us at the end of this month to pursue something that she's very passionate about so we're happy for her but also sad that she's leaving.

So with that I think I'll open up the floor here for discussion with my bosses unless there are questions from you of course.

Volker Greimann: Yes just to reiterate, we raised this already yesterday but the replacement for the registrar liaison in Europe would face the difficulty of being hired in Istanbul, please also consider hiring them in another location that is available in Europe for ICANN that has been used for a long time.

Paul Goldstone: Question from (unintelligible) asking, "was like saying that we are getting - we will be getting an email about the new system for handling our ICANN complaints."

Mike Zupke: This is Mike again. So I think the question is how will we announce this new service to registrars. And so I think what we'll do is when we've got the training program ready to go and that's compliance reporting system ready will send an email to all registrars announcing how to take part in both.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: Hi. So quickly and I'm not disagreeing with Volker, but I do ask that for those seeking for additional staff - GDD staff in the EU it might be helpful if you can explain why the Istanbul office and the US office and the Singapore office are not meeting your needs specifically, is that the time zone, is a language support or is it just we're in the EU and ICANN should be here too?

Volker Greimann: Having the Istanbul office, to my knowledge, it restricts hiring capabilities i.e., limits the number of candidates that are available either for a willingness to move to Istanbul or even to get a work permit for Istanbul because the work permit rules are very strict in that location meaning that we will have to hire five local people for one foreign person which is of course a very limiting factor to the quality of the potential applicants as well.

Paul Goldstone: Michele.

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record. There's also another issue as well that several of the European registrars have raised which is with respect to the transfer of data. Transferring data to another EU member state is far less problematic than transferring it outside the EU. So in case of, let's say, dealing with sensitive personal identifiable information, etcetera to transfer it from say France to Belgium or Germany to Luxembourg or whatever it is far less complicated than doing so outside the EU because Turkey is not a member of the EU. I don't know if any of the European lawyers have any comments.

James Bladel: A question. If I can asking you to transfer personal data to -- are they storing EU customer data in Istanbul or Brussels currently? I mean, I'm not poking

holes, Michele, I just want to understand that concern. Are they currently asking you to transfer that information anywhere besides Los Angeles?

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. Personally I can't really speak to that it's just based on what some of the European registrars have been saying. I know that there was -- if you saw the I think what was -- was it an advisory from Allan Grogan a couple of weeks ago, I can't remember what way that document was worded, it was in relation to the data, extra data that ICANN might be requiring to investigate complaints request or something. Somebody please help me out.

But I know that that came from in part issues that several of the European registrars raised while discussing the data waiver requirements. They raised concerns about having to transfer data from a European country to a non-European country. Also there's been some backwards and forwards as well around the data escrow that's been concerned about, well, ICANN's ability to protect personal data because ICANN has had a couple of issues in that area.

So there's been some discussion around that. It's not -- I think some of the registrars are more concerned about it than others. I've just been channeling what I've been hearing from various quarters. I don't know if anybody else wishes to speak to that. Thanks.

Paul Goldstone: Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you. Cyrus Namazi. Let me maybe address this from a different angle. Our first objective, first and foremost, is to obviously have our engagement manager, which until recently and I guess for that short period of time, will be handled by Danielle, it's a rather large shoes to fill. She has done a fantastic job for us. The search is already underway for her replacement.

Our first choice of location is of course in our Istanbul office because that's where ICANN has decided to sort of have a hub. But we're not going to let that get in the way. We actually have a couple of good candidates in the pipeline already. But if it turns out that the process is going to be lengthy we're not going to let that get in the way of having a replacement for Danielle for us.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele, just going back on that. The other thing of course from several of the registrars have been making sure that the replacement is found as quickly as possible. So I think we do - I mean, we had a meeting between be -- our ExComm and GDD staff on Sunday evening where we raised this. And it was actually one of the less conflictual meetings that we've had.

Cyrus Namazi: If I may one more comment. Cyrus Namazi for the record. In fact if you guys know of a qualified candidates please send them to myself or to Mike but we're in that phase. So Cyrus Namazi again. This has nothing to do with the day-to-day operations but really sharing the observation with you from our perspective. I shared it with I think Michele and a couple of other people.

I've observed sort of a deteriorating level of participation by our registrar partners on an ongoing basis. And it's raising a concern from our part because we felt your active participation. A lot of the programs, services, other tools that we need to put in place, a lot of the projects that are ongoing obviously can't be done effectively, efficiently and the way they're intended to be in a multi-stakeholder model.

So I'm not sure if there is a systematic issue involved or if there is the fact that this IANA stewardship transition has really sucked a lot of oxygen out of the room and just people don't have the bandwidth. I don't know what it is, I don't know if we want to spend a few minutes talking about what we can do to

address it, but we can do to help address obviously the stakeholder group. I don't want to call it an issue, maybe it's not an issue from your part but from our perspective it appears to be dwindling and maybe we should collectively put some thought into what can be done to address it.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. It's Michele for the record. Cyrus and I did have a chat briefly about this at the cocktail on Sunday evening wasn't it. I mean, I'm not sure what the short answer to this one is but it's something that several of us have been discussing over the last couple of days, the number of registrars who are able to attend and are able to actively engage isn't growing and probably is falling.

The workload has increased substantially between the IANA transition and various other things that have been going on plus trying to onboard lots of different registries and dealing with other complications. We've also seen several companies being acquired by other companies which means that the number of overall companies that we are dealing with has been reduced.

But I don't know, I mean, is there something - do any of you have any thoughts on this? I mean, is it something that we're all doing fundamentally wrong? Is it a stakeholder group problem? Is it an ICANN problem? If that problem with I don't know, what is a problem with? Given a language problem? Is it a time -- Elliott.

Elliot Noss: Michele, you and I were informed that you'd talk about this informally a couple of days ago. And I've been thinking about it since. And I think all we are really seeing here is, you know, that this is a relatively maturing - it's a mature and maturing space. You're seeing some consolidation, you know, as you talked about. You're seeing consolidation across companies. I think you're also seeing at a market share level some consolidation around registrars, you know, sort of within sort of the market share to and fro.

But I think perhaps most importantly -- maturing of the industry, you know, what we're seeing is a really positive sign which, you know, has two important implications. So first let me describe it. I think that's, you know, what you're seeing is a recognition that what we do here around domain registration solely is a very thin function.

And so now a lot of the companies that have come into let me call it broadly the Web services space in the last five years that are doing new and innovative things are rightly recognizing that registrar is a thin administrative function that they don't need to perform varied. And their outsourcing back to wholesale registrars and two others.

When you have that happening you're naturally going to have less of a pure registrar growth and function. And, you know, I think that that's important first of all for us to recognize. We should embrace that. I think it's a good thing because we should only be doing what we need to be doing.

And second, you know, I think that does speak to something we hear regularly in the community which is a call for greater support for registrars in the developing world. I will tell you, you know, and we can share some data, the developing world is growing at a domain registration level significantly faster than the developed world.

And they're doing that with no need to be registrars. That's a sign of a good healthy industry where the proper functions are living in the proper places. So I don't think we need to see this as any sort of problem. It's instead a quite natural function of things settling in the direction where they should go. And I'm happy to take any questions on that if that was to okay or -- thank you.

Volker Greimann: James.

James Bladel: Oh yeah, I mostly agree with Elliot and his thoughts on this. I think that to some extent we are also a victim of our own success. I think that the action has moved on down the road a little bit, you know, a kind of moved -- when I first got here eight years ago it was here and now it's kind of moved on down to the registry side of the house and then, you know, who knows they might move somewhere else.

I think that it's getting harder and harder to draw a straight line between domain name functions and what people want to do on the Internet whether that's just purely a Web services play or social network so I think it's changing in that regard.

But I do think that - so I think that that is correct that I don't necessarily agree with you, Elliot, that it's not a danger because I think that there are still folks that believe that this is the choke point right here in this room and that if we don't have enough, you know, people demand the watchtowers, you know, that we could - this could be where the action comes again very quickly and we could be, you know, overwhelmed by the interests that come bearing down on us.

I agree -- I think I agree with the causes but I don't necessarily agree that we can say that that's a good sign for the future. I think that that is maybe -- keeps me awake at night that folks might say well this is the weak link in the chain, let's go after that.

Elliot Noss: May I respond to it? Yeah, this is Elliot. You know, James I want you to hear me describing it more as natural than good. And I think it's, you know, it's environmental and, you know, it's kind of like the rain, you know, where the

sun. You know, it's happening - you know, you've added another important factor right, you know, the growth in mobile and what's happening outside of the DNS in terms of Internet usage, you know, again especially in the developing world.

If you look at device penetration in the developing world I mean the ratio of mobile to PC in terms of accessing the Internet is staggeringly high relative to the developed world. So I think all of that's okay.

You know, I think what I want to take away from your comments, which, you know, would sort of connected to the pressure that comes in through the system is back again I think that's part of the education and awareness that we need to do and that we've talked about in our private session. You know, we have I think three very substantial steps that we're taking down that road. And I think all of them, you know, should go towards what you're saying. Thanks.

Volker Greimann: (Fredrick) then Michele.

(Fredrick): I was just also wondering if one of the reasons is we spent two years like working for -- thinking together on new TLDs and so on. So maybe one part of the people who usually go -- come here maybe then that would just be at home and trying to make them work and make the system work. So maybe once the launches are finished then they will be able to come back and have some time to do particularly political things.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Goldstone: Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you. Cyrus Namazi. I think all these comments are quite valid and perhaps some of what we see is as a result of the natural evolution of the ecosystem at the registrar level. But I will share two data points with you that might be relevant I supposed to the thinking and to the discussion.

One is that I think -- not I think I know, but we have the highest number of accredited registrars today than we've had at any given point in time. We've actually had a massive number of applications coming in for accreditation that are going through the system and have gone through the system. We're up to 1500...

((Crosstalk))

Cyrus Namazi: Over 1500 accredited registrars. And I think once you peel back one more layer and in particular from the engagements that our engagement managers in Asia Pacific based in Singapore are having, there is a fresh pool of registrars in particular in China and surrounding region that are eager, their new players, they want to get into the new G-space.

I don't know because of cultural reasons or because of, you know, lack of knowledge it could be a series of things that they're not plugged into our sort of - the stakeholder group here. And I think there can and should be some thinking done to figure out how we can tap into that fresh pool of talent. There's cultural issues I think, you know, of course that come to mind. There is language barriers. But I don't think we should sit back and say this is a natural course of things to go and perhaps not address it head-on and proactively is sort of my take on it. Thanks.

Paul Goldstone: Michele then Jen.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. And thanks Cyrus. I mean, I think it's somewhere in the middle I think personally I think you've got, you know, you've got people who are focusing on just doing stuff I mean actually selling domains, selling hostings, selling services. You've got the evolution, like, I mean, as Elliot says, a lot of people are building up nice businesses without actually being registrars.

But I think it doesn't actually answer the question you originally asked which is addressing the underlying problem which is there are a lot of policy development processes and other initiatives going on in this space where the registrars and other contracted parties need to engage. And if we don't engage then others are going to engage for us or our voice will be heard.

I mean, but, you know, if we're going to pose that question I suppose at a higher level, you know, it is, you know, if you look at a lot of the policy development processes within ICANN it's a little bubble. I mean there's in very small number of vocal and activated people who turn up in general. It doesn't matter which group, which stakeholder group you look at it the same across all of them.

I mean, you see groups turning up that ICANN meetings purporting to represent I don't know say representing so users, I mean, do they really represent the users? You see people turning up saying they represent the ISPs but which ISPs do they represent?

I mean, if you look at those of us around the table representing registrars you notice that it's a very white looking table. I have to be careful about getting into issues with the ombudsman about bringing up certain things but...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: What did he say? I didn't hear him. I don't know, I mean, I don't know if this -
- maybe it is an evolution, I don't know. And I don't know what the answer is.
I don't know how to get more people involved but the language barrier is a
problem definitely, definitely the problem.

Jennifer Standiford: Jennifer Standiford, web.com. Is it me or can you actually pinpoint the
areas where you're concerned about registrar involvement? I think by having
more concrete information it'll help us. So I'm asking for my personal
standpoint but also from the registrars.

And if that is the case, not thing that is not the case, perhaps we could look at
formulating further outreach to those registrars that are not participating as
frequently and is often and seek your assistance on that perhaps rather than the
ones that you see around the table which you see at every ICANN event or
majority of ICANN events.

Mike Zupke: So this is Mike Zupke again. So that was actually a comment I sort of wanted
to raise and that's I think there's an area where maybe registrars tend to
overlook the importance of their role and that's in the implementation of
policies. So the really glamorous stuff happens in the GNSO and in the PDP
process and then it gets approved by the GNSO and the board and then it
becomes really staff's job to implement it.

What we're finding, and Kaitlin could attest to this, and that's, you know,
there's a lot of cases where the working group says we choose to leave this for
staff and the implementation review team to work out the details and some of
those details are pretty substantial. And so in the case of the IRTP-C working
group's recommendations we're seeing that.

We posted something for public comment and I think there were a lot of people who were a bit surprised to see how many implementation details were left for implementation. And so what we generally find on these IRTs, unless it's really the topic of the day there's not a lot of participation. We find most of the people who joined these calls don't actually attend the calls. We have I would say on Kaitlin's IRT, most people participate maybe every other or every third meeting and so we spend a lot of time not getting things done.

But not only that but we do a lot of trying to read what people who aren't in the rooms mind might be. And it's not just a registrar thing, it's a communitywide thing. And so this isn't just for registrars but in particular in that area if we could have stronger community participation in the IRTs.

Or alternatively, I mean, if the GNSO said we're going to spell out more details that means there is less of the, you know, implementation. But that's kind of a place where I would start of personally make a plea for more active involvement. Where we have staff are not looking to be criticized for creating policy and sometimes that's what happens because we're left with sort of this very blank page and not a lot of support, you know, from people saying okay here's the authoritative way to do it.

For example, in the implementation review team that we're doing we have a few registrars to show up, we have a registry who shows up pretty regularly but there's not a lot of other, you know, people from the original working group or from other sorts of voice in the community there to say wait, that's not what we meant - you know, and so, I mean, you know, thank goodness for the public comment period.

But that's a place where I think if I were a registrar I would be worried about changes being made that affect me. And so while I'm sympathetic to the

points that Elliott made about, you know, this is sort of the progression of things, these things will really affect your business and in a way that's not supposed to be a big part of your business. As I interpret, you know, Elliot's comments.

So, you know, don't let this little thing sort of overtake your lives because they policy change happened that wasn't expected or anticipated or as desired or that could have been influenced so, sorry that was a really long answer - but - and I totally agree about outreach and that sort of why we're here because even a lot of people in this room don't participate in the IRTs.

And it's intended as an open and inclusive process. You don't have to be a member of the GNSO. You don't have to be a member of the original working group, anybody can do it. And so that's my pitch.

Paul Goldstone: Jen then Michele.

Jennifer Standiford: Thanks, Mike. Jennifer Standiford, web.com for the record. I'd like to come back to the point and, you know, we all talk about awareness and outreach but I propose from a registrar standpoint I think it's about participation and it's also about communication. Right?

So if there is a way that we could work together to be, you know, communicating more effectively to the stakeholder group on a monthly basis, we could get together and formulate a monthly call with registrars, the stakeholder team to discuss those items that are considered hot topics are open for review or maybe impactful to registrars outside of the comment period I believe that would be really helpful.

And so obviously I know a lot of us have other day jobs to so if we could just, you know, put together an hour on the calendar each month or every other month ad hoc as needed, invite the stakeholder group so that we're aware of the gaps for instance, would be helpful.

Mike Zupke: Thanks. I think that's a great suggestion and we're happy to do it.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. I think I was next in the queue. Just for those of you in the room here, I mean, how many of you have never participated in a workgroup? I mean, is there -- are you - I don't know is it that you don't have the time or you're not interested or you're scared of it or I don't know, I mean, is there, you know, is very particular reason? I mean, and maybe the thing is not to answer that but, you know, and then how many of you have participated in more than two work groups? Okay.

I don't know what the answer is but I mean it may be something that your team can help us with, Mike, I mean, maybe you can help activate people. Back to you, Paul.

Paul Goldstone: Marika and then James.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So just to tie it back as well to the conversation you had earlier today on the items that are up on the agenda for the GNSO Council to vote on, so one is the report, the final report of the Policy and Implementation Working Group. And that report actually includes a set of principles and requirements for implementation review teams.

And to Mike's point, because that was one of the things that came up as well in a conversation that indeed typically in implementation review teams it's a smaller set of people that comes. And from the staff side we've identified as

well in certain instances the specific expertise is needed. So I think it foresees a specific measures to first of all I think encourage expert participation where staff can go out to specific groups and ask for their input.

But I think also it basically notes that an IRT doesn't stop working just because people do not show up. I think there's a kind of assumption that if, you know, if no one comes and there's no pushback well then we're probably on the right direction.

I mean, it is tied in as well to making sure that information is publicly posted, that there is a website. And I think that there may already be live or is about to go live that has the status update for each of the implementation projects so people can go and see that.

We do include as well a status update in the GNSO project list which is updated prior to every GNSO Council meeting. So maybe it's worth as well, you know, discussing within your group, you know, is there anything further needed for you to stay up to date? But again, you know, maybe passing on as well that sentiment but I think we at least I think comes across as well in the report is that if there is no, you know, if people don't show up and don't respond in public comments we're just assuming that what is being done is in line with the intent of the policy recommendations.

But as said we're trying to -- or the report tries to build some more structure around those groups because, you know, they have been done in a relatively ad hoc manner to date if the report is adopted they will become a requirement so the standard around how those groups are expected to operate.

The report also sets out the phases of implementation because I think that was another, you know, feedback we've received from the community that there

wasn't a whole lot of transparency around how implementation was actually done. And staff would sometimes just come back with some language but it wasn't really clear how that was developed or circulated.

So hopefully that effort will really help as well towards some of the points that Mike has raised but as well I think some of the comments and concerns that have been expressed, you know, not only by your group but as well other groups in the community.

Paul Goldstone: James then Cyrus.

James Bladel: Hi thanks. James speaking. So one of the side effects I think of all of us being competitors is that we have this uneven participation. So for example in PPSAI we had, I don't know, how many -- not a dozen but maybe 10 registrars either participating or monitoring that group. And meanwhile we have other groups that are going on with no registrars varied

So it seems like -- and I think there's a concern that you know, if Registrar A is participating on a group Registrar B feels like they don't necessarily agree with Registrar A they they've got to participate in a group as well. And I think we saw this would transfer working groups and we also thought with the post-expiry working group where everybody had a different spin on that.

And so I guess the question is how can we better coordinate - divide and conquer so we have some coverage of all the working groups rather than having, you know, this mad rush to one working group and then all these other working groups are effectively underrepresented by registrars. I think that's possibly one way that we can coordinate a little bit better as a constituency.

Paul Goldstone: Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you. I must be going to another meeting for which I'm late but I wanted to just share my observations with you perhaps from this I think very good conversation that we just had for the 20 minutes or so. So one appears to me to be more of a short-term issue that perhaps could be fixed with having more hands on deck, more volunteers and just sort of recognizing the impact of not participating in some of the stuff that's going on in terms of its impact to obviously your business.

And the second one is more of a longer-term issue. And I don't have a suggestion on how to fix it end of the sentence and that's bringing in a fresh pool of talent and perhaps being able to tap into these other regions that may not be culturally and linguistically a complete fit to what has sort of evolved into this working group. That may be one way to look at it is for you guys to perhaps come up with a communication outreach plan that we can work with you together and perhaps maybe some of the funds from the auctions can be dedicated.

I'm not speaking on behalf of ICANN here, I mean, GDD is not even involved in that process of what to do with the auction funds but these are some of the out-of-the-box thinking perhaps that comes at least to my mind from my perspective that unless we address it now I think this sort of, for lack of a better term, the inbred sort of system that has existed here is going to continue to be more calcified and not be inclusive with other people. Just sharing my comments with you. And I apologize, I have to run unless there's anything else for me.

Always enjoy spending time obviously with the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Cyrus. If anybody has any other questions for Cyrus before he runs out the door? No. Okay thanks Cyrus and we look forward to seeing you again in Dublin.

Okay we now have another slot which is kind of open for any discussion on any topic. So if there's anything in particular people want to raise we have a slot now. I think, John, you wanted to talk about the NomComm? So I pass it over to you.

John Berryhill: Yeah, the registrar officer elections are up but also coming up is the Nominating Committee slot for the registrars. The Nominating Committee cycle starts -- will start in October. And I've been saying for two years that I'm finished with it -- I'm finished with it now. And I've been saying for two years if there is someone you don't like and I can put them on the Nominating Committee because you will disappear. People thought I stopped coming to ICANN meetings because it's a lot of work.

This year we had some 85 candidates for the various positions that we fill. The Nominating Committee fills several ICANN board positions and it fills positions throughout the GNSO and the ALAC and some other positions. And these are critical positions within the ICANN structure.

It is not - it is a tremendous amount of work but it is very gratifying. You do get unfortunately much of the deliberations and work for the Nominating Committee is confidential so to those who will be voting for the Nominating Committee consider carefully the integrity and balance of the candidates that come forward. If you are considering being a candidate I'd very much like to talk to you and help you because what happens is is because it's a two-year -- there are two-year limits to the Nominating Committee and traditionally the

registrars have elected someone for one year and then reelected that person for the second year.

And I would -- if you're considering a position please consider it to be a two-year commitment. Because of the structure of the Nominating Committee there is always a group of people who have the previous years' experience and a group of new people at the table. And the way that things work there is a lot of sort of talking about process for the first part of the cycle from October really through May because that's when the application window closes for the NomComm appointed positions.

And then between May and the middle of June, this week is the week the Nominating Committee is making the final selections for several board positions and GNSO positions. So you only really have access to candidate information for a very short window of time. And it's a very concentrated piece of work.

So if you can't do, I mean, we are going 9-to-5, you know, all week long. This is our only day off. If you can do a couple of 9-to-5 ICANN weeks then, you know, it's just not something you can do, you know, sort of on a part-time oh I'll drop in, you have to be engaged at every moment, you have to be aware of, you know, what the other people in the room are thinking about, the various candidates at the same time.

That said, it's an extremely rewarding and gratifying position to be in. I hope when you see our results you'll like them. But I do want you know, anyone in the room that's interested please feel free to talk to me about it because it's a tremendously important position. And I'm looking forward to getting back into some of the working groups and other ICANN activities.

But, you know, if you're going to do one thing at ICANN the Nominating Committee is going to be the one thing you're going to do, you're not going to do anything else, you're not going to be on any other working groups or anything like that because the calls, you know, happen when they happen and you have to be on them every time.

Paul Goldstone: James.

James Bladel: Thanks. James speaking. And a couple questions for John. And thanks for that overview. So the questions are -- and I know you can't really cares any confidential discussions that occur on NomComm so I won't ask you to go there. But I guess there's a concern that I have is that do you feel like we're getting a good fresh crop of candidates every time or is it the same pool of folks that are recycled year after year?

And I don't know if you can comment on that without giving anything away. And it's not just the candidates that are being submitted to NomComm but also the NomComm itself. I know you commented on how we send people on a yearly basis that do other organizations send people for longer terms or have no term limits or - because it seems like I also see a lot of the same faces and names moving in and out of leadership divisions within NomComm.

And our other groups doing things differently with respect to their NomComm representatives? Because, you know, just so everybody in the room understands, these folks pick half the board. So when you say okay - in the board and you say okay, that guy is from the registrars and that gal is from, you know, intellectual property and then you got this whole group of people like I don't know where that person came from. NomComm. So it's probably where they came from.

So can you speak to like -- I'm just looking for whether or not this is truly serving it's, in your opinion, because this is your last ride on the merry-go-round, right, in your opinion into doing what it's supposed to do and bringing in all kinds of, you know, fresh meat for the grinder here or is it just the same folks that is just going around and around?

John Berryhill: Okay yeah, I'll take your second one first. As far as the term go - there are some organizations that have a nonvoting member on the Nominating Committee like the RSAC, for example which is I think for eight years running sent the same person because a nonvoting member is not term limited. They got a different person this year who didn't show up for half the year and then they sent back their same nonvoting member.

But even as a nonvoting member of the Nominating Committee you have a lot of influence. The leadership of the Nominating Committee consists of three people. There's the current chair who is selected by the board, the previous year's chair and next year's chair so that leadership rotates through.

But the leadership committee does not participate in any of the candidate evaluations or any of that. It's strictly administrative and in fact our current chair Stéphane Van Gelder, hasn't even read any of the candidate profiles.

As far as good we look at, where did they come from. We spend the first half of the year really soliciting people, going out and getting them on. And I think having been on the NomComm you probably spend a lot more of your ICANN experience into future telling people to get their names in for these positions.

It's a really good mix. There is also in addition to the Nominating Committee and the people that throw their names then, there is also a professional

recruiting firm that is contracted to ICANN that also seeks people but throws them into the same application process so we don't know, you know, who was brought in by the recruiting firm and who was nominated, you know, through ICANN outreach.

You'd be surprised - you think there were people in the ICANN Board that sort of throw their name in every time. You'd be surprised at who is not there. You'd be surprised at who is there. But it is a really good mix and I think this year in particular we had some very outstanding candidates from outside the ICANN orbit.

You know, we made our selections yet. And again, you know, some are going to be in and some are not going to be in because since it is half the board, you know, board terms expire and you can look at, you know, what board terms are expiring. You can also look at sort of the ICANN bylaws and what their geographical restrictions are on what the board composition has to be carried and we have to fill according to those geographical restrictions.

But I wouldn't say it's dominated by the same old faces. It is a good mix and this year I think we had like 85 candidates for various positions. And it's not a matter of weeding it out and saying, you know, a well this is the only one left that's marginally decent for this position; you do really get some good high-caliber people in there.

Paul Goldstone: Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, John. I mean, just a couple of things. You said that they use a - the NomComm uses a recruitment agency to get candidates, is that for all positions or just for the board once?

John Berryhill: It is for I believe all positions. We wouldn't know because they candidates get thrown into the NomComm candidate cycle. It's not as if they come in with a tattoo on their neck, you know, that says I was recruited. And then when that committee narrows down selections this human resources firm - it's OB, (Ogers Bernstein) or something like that, they should be on the Website - but they then do some professional evaluations, you know, of the various candidates and give them a scorecard which, you know, is on a take it or leave it proposition for anybody on the committee.

Michele Neylon: Thanks John. Okay, we've got a couple more minutes left just before we meet with Xavier from ICANN Finance. Any other issues anybody wants to raise? Just in terms of the -- the we've got the NomComm, we have to put somebody on for NomComm. So that's a horrible sentence.

                  We also have one seat on the GNSO which is up for election in - the Dublin meeting or after the Dublin meeting?

James Bladel: Well I thought it was -- and maybe Paul can speak to this, I think it's before the Dublin meeting in the August September time frame.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...at the Dublin meeting.

Michele Neylon: So there's seats at the beginning...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: They're seated at the end of the Dublin meeting that the election would have to be concluded sometime in the fall prior to that.

Michele Neylon: Okay and so just so we're clear because this always seems to cause confusion and we all get confused about how we phrase this. So that's seat is -- ideally the person cannot be from North America or Europe because both those seats are still occupied so they can be from Latin America, Africa, Asia, what other regions?

James Bladel: Yeah, that's correct. It's not that there is a seats for -- it's not the Asia-Pacific seat I think is what people say as a shortcut. But since we have -- we try to balance our delegation to the GNSO, I'm from North America, Volker is from Europe, that means the third seat should ideally be not from those places. But I think that's correct for my bylaws.

Now if no one comes forward from those places and the only interest that we have is from candidates who already fit into one of the two regions that's currently represented on the GNSO then I think we're allowed to proceed we just have to kind of make an effort to have a geographically balanced delegation.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. I mean, James, the thing around the bylaws is an interesting one. I mean, the wording, I can't remember off the top of my head now but the wording we have suggests that we should give preference to the geographic regions but we aren't obliged you so if we cannot get nominations are candidates or whatever from any region that is not already represented we can put in somebody who's from that region.

James Bladel: Correct, yeah. So it's something that we should - it's aspirational, it's not necessarily a rule baked in stone. You know, so here's my thought, and I'm just putting this out as a proposal because we have a lot of challenges trying to fill the seat last time around. Unfortunately we have a difficult time coming up

with qualified candidates from those regions that we have North Americans and Europeans coming out of our ears.

So we often struggle with that last seat. And so the recommendation would be that we have some sort of a nominating -- when the time comes to start to open for nominations we see if we can get someone from that area and if either we don't get anyone in or we perhaps the candidates that we get our less experienced than we would like to at the Council level then we would say let's open it up to other European and North American. But as long as we give, you know, some first crack at that seat from non-North American, not European candidates I think we are upholding the spirit of the bylaws.

Paul Goldstone: Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I agree with James but we shouldn't wait too long for these nominations to open and close because the new GNSO member to replace the outgoing member has to be seated in Dublin that is by Wednesday of the Dublin meeting which is still a bit far away but we have our voting procedures which take their time. And as we are looking at are looking for a candidate from the region and then if there is nobody there from the region then maybe another candidate. We will probably have a lengthy process here and we should begin as soon as possible.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: Yeah, so to Volker's point, we should probably work backwards from there knowing our election process can be lengthy, work backwards on when does the votes have to be concluded and then if so when does that valid have to be posted, nominations. I would also point out that this is not just one seat, this is two seats that is open. I am also open for reelection this time around and it's

not a - I don't want to presume that I will be nominated and reelected again so there's actually two seats that are open and basically they can't be Europeans is really how we should, you know, think of this.

Michele Neylon: So I can put forward one of my staff who's got two passports then? Okay never mind. Paul.

Paul Goldstone: Just I'll send out the list also but this month we are voting for the one year ExComm positions, August we're voting for the two year GNSO -James like I said is eligible for a second and final two-year term. Also a second two-year GNSO. Yoav is no longer eligible. And also as John said the one-year NomComm member.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele for the record. Okay so on the -- so basically we have the elections for the ExComm so anybody who wants to be put forward. We had nominations which were closed and we've reopened them due to an issue with the bylaws. We will be discussing that further later today with Rob Hogarth from ICANN staff as there has been identified that there could be potential issues which impact both potential and current members of the ExComm. So we need to have that discussion.

We will also - I think we also need to open up discussions again about making further revisions to our bylaws because - well I suppose there's two parts to this. I mean, part of it is that based on what we've seen happen and some of the issues that have arisen we may need to remove or change or modify or whatever some of the language that's there. And there may be some things that people wish to have - and wish to add. I don't know it's open for -- should be opened up for discussion anyway. Does anybody have anything on that topic to add?

Paul Goldstone: Jen.

Jennifer Standiford: Thanks, Paul. Jennifer Standiford, web.com for the record. To Michele's point, we're going to talk about the bylaws but I expect there will be some activity around voting obviously for the membership dues, the bylaws perhaps, anything else related to that? Secretariat, alright that's it.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. I think we're just waiting for Xavier at this stage so rather than continue this discussion I'll give you all a couple of minutes break whilst we're waiting. If we can just - oh sorry, oh - I didn't see you there. Beg your pardon. Okay so the next session can start now if you want to - you're switching recording or whatever - no, okay. Sorry I didn't spot you there.

Okay while people are working on how to sit down so we are being joined by Xavier Calvez and Carole from the department - I keep getting wrong - from Project Management and Business Intelligence. So Xavier or Carole, who's taking the lead on this? Oh you're doing you're walking around the thing, walking around the room thing, okay. Handing over to you, Xavier.

Xavier Calvez: Okay thank you very much. Can you hear me? Thank you. Thank you for the invitation to speak in front of all of you. We have 15 minutes so we'll try to be really short. You may remember that in the past for any finance or dashboard or operational excellence related subjects we had separate presentations and we have consolidated all those different subjects under one operations update and we would like to continue using this format to communicate updates and information and receive your feedback on the operations activities.

We have also included under this heading the enterprise risk management activities that the organization is carrying out so that areas a full perspective of the operations management under that heading. So we will start with that

and Carole will present our overall management systems to explain how everything fits into the operation excellence activities of ICANN. Carole. We need the presentation to be put up.

Carole Cornell: Thank you. I wanted to kind of go over what we call the management system and it's a circular process flow. It incorporates all the things that Xavier has mentioned and it includes even a component of continuous improvement as well under organizational excellence.

If you remember the way the planning process worked is the strategic plan informs the five-year operating plan which informs the annual operating plan. And then that takes into account - okay you can just flip to - just keep going. One more. One more. That one. And then change it.

So this is the management systems approach that we are taking. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this because I'd really like you to be able to ask questions and all of that. It just shows that all of the elements are interconnected with the structure that we have used for the five-year operating plan which is the objective, the goals, portfolios, that particular structure is actually now reflected in all of the elements within the management system.

Therefore the operating plan takes on the same as well as the budgeting and the portfolio management and even the dashboards. So in Fadi's presentation he talked about the fact that the dashboard Beta version is being rolled out for the next quarterly stakeholder call and it will follow the same format and the same structure. And it is something we are actually working on. And if anybody would like to see a more detailed version we can have a one-on-one or a small meeting after and we're going to start showing more about that in the elements within it.

That this is the overall management systems that we talked about. And I'm now going to, in the spirit of time, move straight on back to Xavier to deal with the FY16 operating plan and budget document.

Xavier Calvez: Next slide please. Thank you. I'll try to do this quick that we can stop as much as the you would like with any questions. This is a very quick overview of where we are as it relates to the budget process. Right now we are hopefully a day off of the board approval tomorrow on the budget so this is really the end of the process.

The most recent phase completed is the public comment period, the budget was -- the draft budget was submitted for public comment on March 18 until 1 May. Since May we carried a process of review of the comments and addressing the comments through answers. The board's finance committee members participated to the process of drafting and reviewing the answers to the public comments. And those answers were published on June 5 on the website for public review.

The comments led to changes to the budget, first time in recent history. We were able to take into account the comments provided and make changes to the budget as a result. Notably on policies support that was one area where several organizations commented that the resources needed increase -- to be increased and as a result we have added in the budget half a million that includes two positions as well as professional services.

And we have also added some language services, that was driven by the volume of translations that's required. And we have decreased as a result the contingency which is the unallocated part of the budgeted expenses so that we don't, as a result of increasing the spend, we don't increase the total expenses

of the organization because we wanted to make sure of course that we planned for a balanced budget not a budget with the deficit.

So we decreased the contingency which takes a little bit of a way of flexibility but we think we can manage it. There were also a lot of comments about clarifying a certain amount of information that's in the budget notably on the impact of the USG transition on the budget of ICANN. And we added comments on that subject as well as many other areas of the operating plan that have been commented upon during the public comment period.

Any questions or comments on that? I don't see any. A quick financial -- sorry.

Michele Neylon: Xavier, Michele for the record. Now just with respect to the adjustments that you made, just speaking personally, it's good to see that the money is being put into stuff that we would consider to be within ICANN's core remit. Bolstering the policy team I think as long, personally I think is long overdue and I'd like to see more of that please. Thank you.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you for that comment. The next subject is providing a view of where we are finishing the fiscal year 15. We are a few days away from the end of June which is the end of our fiscal year as you know. This information that we're using here is the result of the forecasting process that we do on a regular basis approximately on a quarterly basis. So this is not yet the full actual results of the organization because we have not yet closed the month of June. But this forecast was produced using 10 months of actual data and two months of forecast.

In substance what it says is simply that we are very close to both a revenue and expenses as budgeted originally. We are within 1% of each of the

amounts. Very slightly below the $104 million of expenses, sorry of revenue, very slightly below the $101 million of expenses budgeted which is again very close to budget overall.

The other amount that you may see their of interest is the amount of spend on the USG transition which is expected to be in the range of $7.9 million or approximately $8 million at the end of the year for an originally budgeted amount of $7 million so it's been a bit more spend on that project than the overall envelope we expected earlier in the year.

Any question on that? Next slide. So this is a more detailed information on the USG transition. I won't spend a lot of time on it. This was providing the breakdown of the actual cost at the end of May and so after 11 months of activity. By then we have already spent the $7 million, we're expecting about another $1 million for the month of June.

You can see if you're interested that most of the spend is driven by the professional services and in this case the legal fees for the independent legal advice that the CWG and the CCWG receive. That's where the larger amount of spend is. The rest of the spend was largely driven by the meetings of the various groups across the year and then the staff support.

That's it for FY 15 and FY 16. The next section is about enterprise risk management and I would like to make sure to introduce Jacks Khawaja who is our enterprise risk management director at ICANN.

Jacks Khawaja: Hello everyone. Thank you for having me. I think the last time I was here it was to present the audit program for contractual compliance if you guys recall is now the director of enterprise risk management so hopefully I don't get beat up too much this time around.

I'm actually not going to go into the model. You can clearly read that on the slide. I simply just wanted to introduce the ERM department to you because it's newly established. It was established in mid-2013. You may have seen a request from the co-chairs of the risk committee, Mike Silber and Ram Mohan requesting feedback on the key enterprise risks.

The reason that request was sent out is because we're trying to identify key risks that impact our organization to analyze them and determine how we can truly mitigate the risks that affect how we deliver our mission. And when I say we I mean I can as well as the stakeholders. How the community and all of us deliver our mission. So I'm looking at key risks.

So I don't want to get into the slides, I just wanted to encourage some feedback whenever this committee gets an opportunity to provide us some feedback on those risks. They can be anything to do with legal, financial, you know, political or strategic or reputational risks that we can - if you can help us with the identification process that would be really really helpful for us to attack those risks and work towards mitigation.

That's all I really wanted to say in the interest of time. Is there any questions?

Paul Goldstone: Michele.

Michele Neylon: I put myself in the queue, letting them do it, great. Okay with the changing of the guard with the outgoing, Fadi is leaving, how much risk are you seeing in terms of losing most of your executive staff considering that most of them are either links directly or indirectly to Fadi? So basically that's Akram, Cyrus, Maguy, Allan, Ashwin potentially and I can't remember who else - I mean, there's a bunch of them, they are all interlinked in some shape or form.

So what's -- how are you going to handle that? What if, you know, two weeks after Fadi walks out the door the entire executive team are gone or are you part of that group as well? I mean...

Jacks Khawaja: For the record I'm not. Let me address that question. Good question. It is a risk. However if the risk of any organization that loses a CEO who has brought in individuals to the organization. It's a speculative risk, it's not a guarantee that it will actually occur. However, it is a risk that some are planned for mitigation.

We already have the structure in place whether they depart or stay. And so we have that layer. And we'll continue to develop that can develop succession planning which is currently underway. It'll be noted in tomorrow's open session that we have at 9:00 am tomorrow the operations team will get into a little bit more detail on which we can address those types of things.

Paul Goldstone: James.

James Bladel: Just that I raised this similar question in the conversations with light board members. And I think that, you know, it is a vulnerability. I don't know how you fix it and it is a sensitive subject because you're talking about personnel issues for ICANN staff. But I was, let me see here, I was assured that they are aware of it and that they are looking at what steps can be taken both practical steps and then, you know, steps that don't interfere with folks.

But, you know, hey, CEOs take people with them, CEOs come in and they clean house and I think what we're saying as a community having all that going on in the backdrop of a handover of the controls, the keys to the Internet, to you guys is making people nervous.

Jacks Khawaja: Thank you for that and it's a valid point. As the board said, we're working on a contingency plan and succession planning as well in the event that those folks do leave. But again and speculative at this point.

Michele Neylon: I think you got off without being really heavily grilled. So this might be a good thing or this could be a terrible thing, it depends on which way you want to look at it but I think you might want to take it as a win. Have you got anything further that you'd like to add?

Jacks Khawaja: No, just thank you for the time. I know that we're short on time and I know that Carole is up next but, you know, if you guys have anything, if you want to bring anything to my attention I welcome it. The board risk committee welcomes it and will attack it - tackle it head-on without, you know, any fluff.

Carole Cornell: If I could I'd like to go onto to two more minor subjects that's in the presentation if we could. If you could go to the next - next one more, yeah, dashboards. This is something that Fadi, as I said earlier, about at his opening that we are actually working a lot on the key performance indicators. This shows that there are different levels and the operational level and at the directional level we collected quite a few metrics to date and we're using them to manage internally but we are sharing more with how we're progressing and specifically at the strategic level the, if you will, KPI dashboard that's being rolled out 20 August.

Could you go to the next slide? This is kind of showing the progress we've been making that we have continued to align our dashboard with our operating plan and budgets. Secondly that we have various KPIs needed for various needs and that's an important piece and we are continuing to develop those.

We recognize that the first phase of the release (unintelligible) is something that's a work in progress that it will continue to evolve and change.

I mentioned also that if you'd like to have we will show you a little bit more of that data, I have a couple side of it to share here today. We just put to the next slide? This is what the dashboard initial - is going to look like. You notice we're doing the five overall objectives and what that reading would be. And you can see we started to build a scorecard that corresponds with that.

Next level. This is what the next level, we'll call level II for each one of the objectives, there are corresponding goals. If you look at the strategic operating plan we took the key success factors and built the KPIs around those. They are a work in progress but here's a couple of examples. And you can see that we're doing kind of a detailed chart for each one of those. If you go to level III - go down one more? Sorry. Yeah.

So you can see using the finance piece as one just to show because it's corresponding to other parts of the presentation you might've heard about, this is one of those charts that would be at level III. And at this one you took all the -- say there are six of them at this level which would roll up (unintelligible) into the goal and then into the objective. And that's the first thought.

We would very much like input and thoughts if we're not meeting your expectations with regards to the right key performance indicators. And we will continue to build more correspondence, you will see more about it and ask for more input on those in particular. Next please.

((Crosstalk))

Carole Cornell: Oh sure, I can take a question now. Sure.

Michele Neylon: I have questions. Yesterday evening -- this is Michele for the record. Yesterday evening there was a joint meeting between the GNSO Council and the ccNSO and they've been looking quite closely at ICANN's financials which I think they actually do a lot of which is good.

And one of the things that they've been looking at is KPIs and other tracking things around expenditures - particularly around travel support because, I mean, being kind of overly simplistic potentially, the number of demands for travel support keeps on increasing but whether or not there's any actual link between expenditure there, increased engagement, you know, the balance I suppose between bringing more people to ICANN meetings be that through fellowships, through whatever, and whether or not that's actually benefiting.

I honestly don't know how you can track all that but I'm just wondering is this something that is being tracked somewhere on your side or is that somebody else's problem? I mean, you know, I don't know.

Carole Cornell: It's really a combination. Finance has been tracking all of the travel costs and breaking them down and we actually break down the travel costs by the project and by the objectives and goals so we are able to distribute and see how those costs tied to each one of the overall ICANN missions and goals so someone is tracking those costs. I don't have the specific KPI that I can show you that I make a note of it and we will look at the appropriate KPI that supports it because everything is tied to the structure both that way and functionally so we will look at both ways. And I don't have one but it's a good point to bring up for the process.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Just quickly before we go to Volker just as the travel support reports there's a page on them on ICANN.org which has reports of to a particular date and then there is no indication of what happened for anything after that date. And if you are a very good detective you will find the more recent ones buried in community.ICANN.org, but I only discovered that after wasting an hour.

Carole Cornell: Thank you, that's very good feedback because one of the places we are hoping is on our website we have this dashboard page and we will make sure that information is more readily available to everyone at an easier place to find it. Thank you.

Paul Goldstone: Volker.

Volker Greimann: Just tagging along on this topic it might also be helpful to see if Fellowship that have been granted will result in continued participation of those fellows after the fact i.e. will these fellows be active after two years, three years, four years or will they have 50% of them dropped out, 10%, 20%. Any such numbers I think can be tracked and it would be interesting to see how these programs are meeting the goals of increasing participation from around the world.

Carole Cornell: Thank you for that feedback. I know about the Fellowship program quite a bit because Janice and I have worked quite closely and she helps run that program. There are some KPI dashboards we wrote originally was how many of those people that participated actually moved into different committees. The point of how long they stayed and what their level of participation is something that Janice is working on I know actively and you will be seeing more information in a KPI about that so thank you.

Michele Neylon: I'd like to put myself in the queue. This is Michele again for the record. It's not just the - it's not just the Fellowship, it's also, you know, is the money being spent intelligently. I mean, for example, you know, is money being allocated and not used? Our fights being booked at the appropriate time? And I don't want to beat up on the travel team I know from personal experience for one particular project where several of us were involved where the flights literally were booked until about two days before we were due to depart.

Now I know airline travel rates are, if the logic of its own, that's completely nuts. But generally speaking you find that you get a cheaper airfare if you book in advance. And the project in question was planned well in advance. So, you know, you see it and you just kind of scratch her head I mean, my staff can do that so why would yours?

Carole Cornell: It's a great comment. I happen to know because it's part of also operational excellence, an area where we are actually studying that and making a plan and making sure we know what to get in earlier and being in advance and being conscious of the cost. I would also say that Xavier has been working a little bit with the - several other stakeholders to have a cost analysis and a breakdown on return on investment of some of those. So yes, you'll be hearing more about it.

It's an evolving process so it's going to take a wild before you will see a lot of that information. But know it is make -we've made a commitment at ICANN to work on that and build that up so that there is some cost analysis planned and/or a corresponding KPI.

Michele Neylon: Thanks very much. I think we're going to close the session with you. And we know where to find you I think. Thank you for coming. Registrars, we have what is now described on our schedule as a working lunch so that means that

essentially there is food which we are paying for, in other words you are paying for but we are paying for. There are pack lunch I think there are -- either vegetarian options?

Volker Greimann: For people that requested it.

Michele Neylon: Okay there are vegetarian options for the people who requested it. If you did not request a vegetarian option and want to have a vegetarian option please wait until the people who did ask for it get one. I'm not sure how many are there. Paul can speak to that since he's the one who organized it. But please let the registrars go first since we're the ones who are actually paying for it.

If you want to leave the room and meet us later we will be starting up again at 1:00 pm local time with the Registries in their room which is (unintelligible) C so we are starting up again at 1:00 pm that we still have a working session and chat about whatever you want here. Thank you.

END