

**Transcription ICANN London
ISPCP
Tuesday 14 October 2014**

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://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#oct>

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

Tony Holmes: Where's the mic? Welcome, everybody, to the ISP Connectivity Providers Constituency meeting. I know we're a few people light that will be joining us. Some of our members aren't here. But I'd like to start the recording and for us to move ahead specifically to welcome everybody here. I think it would be helpful if we just do really have a very quick run through of who's here. And there will be a list circulated for people to sign up too.

I'm Tony Holmes. I represent BT here and I currently chair this constituency. (Christian), if we could go around that way please.

Christian Dawson: My name is (Christian Dawson) and I am from the (I2) Coalition.

Man: (Unintelligible):

Man: Say it.

Oswaldo Novoa: Oswaldo Novoa from (Monterey) Uruguay.

Izumi Okutani: Izumi Okutani from JPNIC.

Alain Bidron: Alain Bidron from (Orange).

(Kital Arcano): (Kital Arcano) from Cabase Argentina also an ICANN fellow.

Olivier Muron: Olivier Muron from (Orange).

(Chris Boyer): (Chris Boyer) from AT&T.

(Steve Mace): (Steve Mace) from the National Cable and Telecommunications Association.

(Peter Hergopian): (Peter Hergopian) from Comcast.

Paul Ebersman: Paul Ebersman from Comcast.

Eduardo Parajo: Eduardo Parajo from (Aubernet) Brazil.

Akinori Maemura: Akinori Maemura, JPNIC, Japan Information Center.

Malcolm Hutty: Malcolm Hutty, the London Internet Exchange.

Jennifer Taylor-Hodges: Jennifer Taylor-Hodges, BT.

Oliver Süme: Oliver Süme from ECO and EuroISPA.

(Julian Mark): (Julian Mark), ICANN fellow.

(Osana Kameem):Hello (Osana Kameem), ICANN fellow from Palestine.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris from (Cabase) Argentina.

Jim Baskin: Jim Baskin, visitor. (Jim Baskin), just visiting for the moment from Verizon.

Larisa Gurnick: Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff.

Tony Holmes: Thank you very much and you're really welcome to (unintelligible). Apologies thank you. If we could stop on - (Christian). Yes update on a few constituency issues, where we are with this, just a few words about a few things here. We've really struggled. In fact we've struggled with all of the rest of the commercial stakeholder group in the past for secretariat support from ICANN.

And I'm really pleased to be able to say that we now do actually have a secretary provided by ICANN, (Brenda Brook). And she's unfortunately can't be with us today, but we are now working with her avidly to try and get the additional layer of support and help us through running of the constituency, some of the constitutional things we have to do that we've really struggled with and takes a lot of time. So I'm very pleased that we're actually in a situation where we can now give you good news on that.

We've also undertaken some really focused outreach activities across the last few months. And from that we've got some feedback that really is pretty positive in terms of increasing engagement. And we've also realized that there are some challenges there with a way of doing things that we need to think about and engage in some of the technical folks in a slightly different way.

But what I would do at this stage is initially hand over to (Christian) who's done a lot of work in that area and really led the charge and did a brilliant job for us as well. But also I know - assume he wants to contribute to this discussion and inform me of some of the things we're going to change. And (Jen Taylor) was also part of the outreach activities, along with Tony Harris who was...

Man: Here a moment ago.

Tony Holmes: Just disappeared. And he'll probably have a few words to say when he gets back. So, (Christian), over to you.

Christian Dawson: Thank you very much. We've been doing - we've been working with an outreach team to try and build a strategy around building the ISPCP into a constituency with players from greater - more around the world with increasing our efforts to try and build our membership into a greater voice. And we worked to put together a way to explain what makes the ISPCP special, what makes the ISPCP unique, into a slide deck and a presentation that we can carry around the world to try and spread our message and get more players involved.

I'm going to relay the story of the first two times we have attempted to use the materials that we put together in order to spread the news about the ISPCP and garner up engagement. The first is a positive story and the second is a negative story, and we - no, neither is a negative story. But we gained a tremendous amount of feedback in the second - when we were not as well received as we were in the first location.

Tony Harris and I went down to Guadalajara to speak at the World Conference on Internet Technology or the World Conference on...

Man: (Unintelligible) WICT. It's the WICT World Conference on Information Technology.

Christian Dawson: Information Technology. I knew it wasn't Internet technology, sorry. And Tony and I gave a presentation to a group of ISP or ISP-related figures that had come to that location and most of them were executive level individuals and they received our message very well. A couple of them have put in membership requests already, and we saw it as a very positive experience.

The next outreach experience that we had was at NANOG. NANOG, as you may know, is the North American Network Operators Group, an area where we really wanted to make an impact because it is the network operators groups that can really bring the insight that we need to act on being a unique

and special voice within the ICANN community on issues that matter to ISPs around some of the things that are on our agenda today, such as universal access, such as name collisions. And we wanted to get more technical voices in the mix and more resources in the door so that we could make a better impact there.

A lot of what we received when we stood up to give our presentation were messages from people who had attempted to engage in ICANN in the past or attempted to engage in the ISPCP in the past and had had very difficult time doing. They said when you come into this arena you spend so much time talking about process, so much time talking about Whois and what board seats, about what needs to happen around transparency. I'm a technical guy, I want to focus on technical issues and I don't have a unique venue for being able to do that.

So we spent some time as a group trying to figure out how we can address that because we do need those voices. Our goal has been to take the feedback that we receive from NANOG and create an action plan to make sure that we can pull in voices like that and go back to the NOG community, go back to the technical operators community, bring them on board and say we've got a different path for you. So, Izumi, do you want to talk a little bit about how we're going to try and change our strategy in order to engage them better?

Izumi Okutani: Sure, (Christian). So this is Izumi. I was listening to the NANOG update remotely so I really got the sentiment as well. And I also talked to (Paul) from Comcast who is on the NANOG committee on how we can actually think about it, the agenda that might interest the technical community once we set up the mailing list. Because it's very important that we let the others know and then get them engaged.

And so we just did some brainstorming. I'm not going to list them all but to give you some examples of, you know, the ideas that we discuss, some of

the SSAC reports that might be relevant in sharing or I think ICANN staff is asking some questions about what we're going to do about the name collisions in the long term, what were the measures that we need. That might be useful to ask of the technical community. The general Whois review. That's going to impact not just the registries and registrars but then the general users of the general operators who use Whois in terms of troubleshooting in the network.

So there are actually quite a number of technically relevant topics that's being discussed in ICANN but that - we have to be the one who pick what's relevant and then be the translator in letting the operators know hey this is what's happening and please give us the feedback. So I think as a next step once we have the separate mailing list for the technical operators it would be good if we could discuss what would be the topics that's good to be shared and hopefully have some kind of moderator who can keep them seeing what's relevant so that, you know, we don't just do it at this moment and keep on doing it in the long term. That's basically my input from my casual discussions. And if there's anything that you would like to add (Paul), then please feel free.

Tony Holmes: Okay. The floor is open. Please?

(Paul Horseman): Yes other than that a couple of the others thing I think we talked about, one of them was IDN, dealing with that, configuring that. And yes actually you covered Whois. I think that was that pretty much the list. The other thing I'd mention is that for participation here, making sure the remote participation is two way, that there's a way for them to ask questions and participate, much like is done with the NANOG's, the ITFs, and having a published agenda, which includes the technical items for this, in advance so that they know oh this sounds interesting, I should really participate.

And then utilizing the other mailings lists for folks who are not necessarily on that where we can publish that agenda going to the (Ripe) and the NANOG

and the ITF and the ISOC mailing list to again spread the news of what is going to be discussed.

Tony Holmes: (Christian)?

Christian Dawson: So at the end of the day, we are going to move forward with the creation of this technical only list. This will be a list that we can publish to NOG groups, try to get them to sign up for, and like Izumi said, we're still finding the right ways to moderate those discussions and make sure that they are relevant. We definitely need help within this group, within this community. Your insights, your ability to step up and be a leader in this effort, we could use that.

There are other organizations that we have seen that have taken a look at the power of the NOG communities, NANOG as being one, but also (Ripe) and - exactly, these communities. And they have emissaries that they send to those communities. We are not at the stage right now where we have that, but we have gotten the support of ICANN, their willingness through the crop program to send geographically, what is it, within region, they will send individuals from ISPCP to engage the NOG communities in those areas. So we have the support of ICANN to go talk to these people.

Tony Holmes: That's right. So I think with those two things, those two approaches -- and thank you very much for your help with that -- with those two approaches I think we actually fill a niche requirement here. And your remarks about the agenda, I think it would also be helpful if maybe we can keep to a specific part of the agenda, just focus it down on those issues at a specific time, but we'll certainly look to do that at our next meeting. So thanks to everyone for all the efforts on that. Thanks particularly to (Christian), Izumi, (Jen) and for Tony as well.

Man: (Christian)?

Tony Holmes: Yes?

Man: I have a comment. I'm with NCTA and our - we're the trade association for the cable operators in the United States, which Comcast of course is our largest members, and, you know, I'm certainly willing to take upon that role of being the liaison with the cable companies in the U.S. I was at the London meeting. I probably won't be at the Marrakesh meeting but I will be at the other two meetings coming up next year, and so I can work with (Christian).

We've talked a little bit before, but we needed to hook up more - a little more specifically. But I'm absolutely willing to do that and I've already talked to my supervisors and they're very positive about that as well, so we can do that if that works.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Well it certainly does work and thank you, very appreciative of that. That would be a great help, so. I assume you two have contacts already and...

Man: Got a business card in London and we will make sure to follow up after this.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. And I would also appreciate some time with you as well to make sure that we make that work in a better way. So thank you very much for that, much appreciated.

(Chris Boyer): (Chris Boyer) from AT&T. I'm also new to the group but if you're looking to recruit technical members, is there a way that they can sign up for the list serve or the emailing list? Is there...?

Christian Dawson: We're in the process of developing that. There will be - and we will be sourcing this information to our private list within the next two weeks, which we should get you on. And so that information will be available once the list has actually been created.

(Chris Boyer): Okay. And I was just going to mention that I also serve as the co-chair of the policy committee at MAWG, if you're familiar with MAWG. It's the Message Anti-Abuse Working Group. I would be - and I host a session at every MAWG meeting three times a year, so I'd be happy to mention at the MAWG sessions the need for technical experts for the ISP constituency group here at ICANN. There's probably 50, 60 people at my sessions so I might be able to help a little bit recruiting there.

Man: My association has a contingency of five people that are going to Boston at your next MAWG meeting, so we should talk afterwards. I'd love to figure out a way to build synergies there as well.

(Chris Boyer): Okay absolutely.

Tony Holmes: Great stuff, very positive. Thank you very much, and that's going to be a tremendous help moving forward. I think it's a help for this community and hopefully we can reciprocate and provide some benefit for the other communities that we link with as well. So that's excellent.

I'm going to have to rearrange the agenda slightly here because we're having a presentation on GNSO reform. We haven't got a lot of time to devote to this, and it was on our agenda under AOB, but I believe it fits with the time scale better to have that now. So I think there's a presentation, (Christian).

Christian Dawson: That was just e-mailed to me?

Tony Holmes: Can you help us with that?

Man: Yes.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

Colin Jackson: I'm happy to start when you're ready for me.

Tony Holmes: I'm ready for you now. Thank you very much. Certainly, it's all yours.

Colin Jackson: I'll just - I'll try not to pull the table to pieces in the process. Hello, everybody. Thank you for making time for me. My name is Colin Jackson. I'm part of the Westlake governance team. We are here as part of the GNSO review, not reform, let's say...

Tony Holmes: Reform is what we would probably like but review is more...

Colin Jackson: Review is what you're going to get. We'll worry about reform perhaps later. Well no let's leave that there. Now there - we've done a number of these reviews before. We tend to come to a meeting like this, get in as many people's faces as possible, ask you some serious interview questions. I think that has happened. Well I know that's happened for at least one person around the table, and it will happen to others. And we will almost certainly follow some of you up by e-mail and Skype, and we do hope that you will talk to us when we ask. It's an important part of the input for the review that we're undertaking.

But there is another just as important part for this input and that is a 360 survey. This is a SurveyMonkey survey. It asks quantitative and qualitative questions about the GNSO, about this constituency and about other parts of it as well. We would ask you to fill this in please. You can do it ten minutes. You can spend three-quarters of an hour if you want to. I would ask very much that you do do this. It's a vital part of the input.

To date, the survey's been open for quite a number of weeks. To date there have been 134 completed. There have been 14 of which I believe are from this constituency. These numbers seem a little low would be a polite way of saying it. I would hope for more than this. I do think that people who are associated with the GNSO should actually take the time to contribute to this so that your voices are heard in the review process. That's both from the

perspective that we can get better quantitative information but also that we can actually hear your ideas in the qualitative sections.

The final page of the survey I would - the survey comprises three or four pages upfront of questions about the GNSO in general and then questions about the various subcomponents of the GNSO which you can skip if you don't belong to that subcomponent or don't know much about it. So you might not want to answer questions about the intellectual property constituency, but I would hope that everybody here would answer the page about the ISP constituency.

There is a final page of the survey which has three large text boxes on it, and that's where you give us your essay or your thoughts or anything you think we should have asked you and we didn't ask. We'd very much appreciate that please. Shall I get to the end and then take questions, is that acceptable?

Tony Holmes: Sure.

Colin Jackson: I'm leaving the link - there's the link. I would encourage you to write it down, or even better, key into your browser right now. A couple of other points to make. The survey is available in all the six UN languages. We have yet to receive any contributions in a language other than English, but please make our day. We would hope so.

Can we move onto the next slide, please? What have we got? Yes that's covered. That's covered. That's all the sort of things you'd expect us to be doing. I won't waste your time reading it out. Next, please. This is actually about a day old. It shows the distribution, the self-identification of people who have gone onto the survey and completed it or maybe just started it, depending on the incomplete and complete. And that was about 24 hours ago. The numbers are slightly higher now, though 134 have completed as of 15 minutes ago. Marvelous science, isn't it?

As you can see we got quite a few GNSO people but given the number of people associated with the GNSO, that still seems quite light, and we are - rest assured we are following up on the parts of ICANN at the moment. Next slide, please. This is the timeline of the review. Again I won't read this out. You're welcome to read it on here. As you can see there is final report delivered in April.

Can we go onto the next slide, please? I'm going to keep banging away about that link. Please copy it down or put it into your browser, okay? I'll say it several times. Can we go to the last slide, one more slide? The only reason - the reason I do that is not to show you my picture because you can see me here anyway, the picture's frankly kind to me, but so that you see Richard Westlake's picture who's my partner in this little enterprise.

And either of us are available for the next day or so here to talk to you, and we can be waylaid in the hallways, we can be e-mailed or texted. And by the way, we would really like you to do the survey. I know I keep saying it, but that's my key message and I'm going to repeat it until somebody shuts me up.

Finally I will mention that the survey closes on Friday. It closes on Friday at one minute to midnight UTC. So that's five pm Pacific Time. We would like to - we will have to close it off then. There will be a week's respite and then we will send out a survey about working groups. Those who have been involved in working groups in the GNSO will be encouraged to fill - that will be a much quicker survey, and you'll be encouraged to fill those in for each working group you've participated in.

Thank you and I'm happy to take any questions.

Tony Holmes: Okay well firstly, Colin, I'd like to say thank you. And I'm not going to be the guy to shut you up because I want to make the same plea as well. I think it's incredibly important that these surveys are completed. So I preach the same

song. The other thing that I hadn't been aware of until I came here was that you can actually have interviews after the ICANN meeting.

Colin Jackson: Yes you can.

Tony Holmes: That's very helpful because I think for a number of us here we would liked to have done that but pressures on time make that really difficult.

Colin Jackson: If that is something that you would like, and I would urge you to, the e-mail address is colin@westlakegovernance.com or richard@westlakegovernance.com. Just drop us a note. Easily done and we will think something up over the next week or so. But time is growing short. We can't go out much more than the next week or two for that because we really need to start work on our analysis for the first draft. As with most of these things, you don't like to start your analysis until you've got all the input you're going to get because of confirmation bias and all those things you want to avoid.

Tony Holmes: Okay thank you. (Jim)?

(Jim): Thanks. If I understood from some previous things I've heard about the 360, it was specifically written not to ask questions about restructuring or - it really didn't focus on that and if that's the case or even if people don't think that it covers enough of that, that's the purpose of the final open boxes that you can if you thought that something wasn't covered as you said make sure you tell in response to the survey what you really wanted to talk about that didn't get covered in the rest of the survey.

Colin Jackson: That is very, very true. I wouldn't say though that it wasn't - it was specifically designed not to discuss restructuring. I would suggest that restructuring is a potential outworking of what people think about the existing system, and it asks questions about the existing system. That, by the way, is not to

foreshadow restructuring, it's simply to say that possibly that's something to get recommended, possibly not.

Tony Holmes: Okay thanks. Any other questions? Tony?

Tony Harris: Yes my name is Tony Harris. Well first of all I would say that the last time we had an experience with GNSO review with Tony here, some very nice young man from the London School of Economics interviewed us, asked us a lot of questions about, you know, what we do and why we should be on the GNSO and everything. And the result was an absolute disaster for us, so I'm a little bit concerned. When we are doing a survey now - it's a Monkey survey right?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Tony Harris: Which is fine. Is this going to sort of become something like a poll and you get so many voices saying civil society should rule and that will be the tendency or will there will be some consideration afterwards? Will sectors be looked as - for their worth? Because the infrastructure and ISP sector -- and here I will blow our horn -- you cannot have Internet without us. You can have Internet without users, we can have networks that work between us without users, but users cannot exist in the Internet without the infrastructure and ISPs.

So I think we have a certain basic stake in this which in the last review was absolutely overlooked, and I do hope that in your excellent work in whatever you're chartered to do the question on sectors does come in and not just the personal opinions. Thank you.

Colin Jackson: May I respond?

Tony Holmes: Please do.

Colin Jackson: Thank you. Your - I can't claim to be a member of an august institution such as the London School of Economics, what I can tell you is that I have a very long and extensive background in the Internet and in ICANN. I was president of a ccTLD for a number of years, so I do actually have a bit of a clue on how the thing works. And I'll just leave that with you and say apart from that we will be professional about our work.

Tony Harris: I wouldn't say you wouldn't be professional. Don't misunderstand.

Colin Jackson: That's all right.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Yes, please?

Larisa Gurnick: Hello. Larisa Gurnick, ICANN staff, to add to Colin's point too. I wanted all of you to be aware of the process, which was reflected on the timeline. All the data collection that's underway right now, the 360, the interviews and the extensive desk review that Westlake is conducting will result in the first draft of the report.

That draft then will be presented to the GNSO review working party, which was a group that was appointed by the GNSO council to be the liaison between Westlake staff and the board. And they'll have the opportunity to do an early review and provide the Westlake team with clarifications, corrections, supplemental information or point anything out that may have been missed or misconstrued through the process.

After that there will be a second draft of the report and then that will be posted for public comment, and that will go through the normal public comment process which will give everybody a change to provide feedback. Then based on that, the Westlake team will make the necessary revisions, and only then the final report will be issued. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

Man: One very short question. What is the rough timeline for the final report?

Larisa Gurnick: We anticipate the final report being issued by the end of April.

Tony Holmes: Thank you very much. That's very helpful. Once again I would encourage everyone please if you're a member of the ISP, complete that survey. It's a really important thing for us. And I think that was emphasized in the meeting we had earlier today in the OCSG session we had with the board. So please try to complete. Thank you very much.

Colin Jackson: Thank you very much indeed, everybody.

Tony Holmes: Moving on with our agenda, one thing I hadn't spoken about that was on the previous slide was an intercessional meeting that's taking place with the commercial stakeholders and the non-commercial stakeholders. I don't intend now with the constraints on our time to go into that. We will do that offline for members. So I'd like to move on if we can, (Christian), to the issue of IANA stewardship.

Wolf-Ulrich, this is your slot. Okay.

Christian Dawson: We're not going to have that on the...no.

Tony Holmes: On the Adobe?

Christian Dawson: We're not going to have that on the Adobe?

Tony Holmes: No. I don't.

Christian Dawson: It doesn't fit to my computer here.

Tony Holmes: Yes if you unplug it, it should work.

Christian Dawson: If you e-mail the presentation, I can get it up on the Adobe Connect as well.
(Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: I wasn't aware you were going to have a presentation. Okay. Just bear with us for a moment please.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes, yes.

Christian Dawson: While we are waiting for this presentation to come up, I received a note from - to pick up on recent conversation with a list of - a link to a list of the NOG communities and a suggestion that we start with NANOG, (Ripe) and (Apricot), which are areas in which I think we have - are engaged in. Thank you for that feedback.

Tony Holmes: Once you've sent this maybe you can start speaking whilst it's uploading. Go on.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: For those who don't know me, I'm Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm the vice chair of the ISPCP and I'm a member of the so-called ISCG, the IANA Stewardship coordination group for the - on behalf of the commercial stakeholder group. I'm a member of that. So we have in total four members from the GNSO represented on this committee.

I - if I may I would like to go through and take a presentation which is going to be done also be Elisa -- is it Cooper -- yes, Cooper, who is the chair of this group on Thursday because this stewardship coordination group is going to have a meeting with the community, with the overall community on Friday - on Thursday morning in the big hall here.

So just skipping - is that - okay going to the presentation. Okay good. Okay this is just the background of which may be known for most of you that the IDNS decided to decision the IANA stewardship and then the ICANN policy has started to do that job, and it turned out difficult. Next slide, please.

Okay these are all the hardworking ants in the groups. The - in total we are 30 members representing 13 structures of the community, and most of them are related to ICANN directly. There are others as well. On the right-hand side you can see the IATF, ISOC and - who is not directly connected - or the others are also connected, ICC basis, so International Chamber of Commerce, which is not directly related.

So what is the ISCG doing? As the name is telling you it's a coordination group. We don't do the work. We coordinate the work, which means we - you can see the last sentence here, no proposal development. So we are not the one who develops a proposal which is submitted then to the NDAA, for the transition, so we try to figure out the conditions under which those proposals have to be developed, and that's what we put out already to the community in order to achieve our goals.

So the most work to be done is sharing our information with the community. (Christian), could you - okay. So sharing our information with the community and doing outreach and looking forward that the proposals who shall come in, who are expected to come in, are consistent, let me say, to form a common proposal.

Where are we, which is the - yes okay. The focus of the transition and what the proposal should be done is it's done in - that's right, in three lines. As you may know that the IANA function aligned in those matters for protocol perimeters in registry management to IANA's own management and a number of registry management as well. So see what we are not doing and what the proposal should not be about is the policy development aspect, which is in the community. It's not our task to revise that.

Next slide, please. Okay here are the very, very hardworking people. You see three groups. Naming, which is related to the ccNSO and the GNSO as well. They created a cross-community working group for providing their proposal. Then we have for the numbering part the (IRRs) which are forming - also have their own working group and they're providing a proposal from their point of view. And the ITF community which is supposed to provide something. This relates to the technical part, the technical perimeters, which IANA is taking care of.

Next slide, please. So the elements of the request for proposal which was sent out by the ISCG in order to solicit the proposals from the various communities, the main elements are here. So well it is about the - which community is - it's related to which IANA functions to know about that, which is - are the existing arrangements these communities are faced with between the IANA services, IANA functions, and the related community in regard of the policy, the oversight and the accountability. The accountability will be - come later as well, a separate point. And then okay to have a look to find out from this community what is your plan, what is your perception with regards to the post transition oversight and accountability.

And what are the implications to your work, to your arrangements in relation to the operational requirements and from a legal framework which maybe tasked with regards to existing contact you may have? And what is very, very important is the expected timeline with regards to the transition.

Christian Dawson: I'm going to ask for a technical pause while we very quickly try to deal with the fact that the slide show isn't streaming. I'm sorry about that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay no problem.

Christian Dawson: I'll be very quick about it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So the group itself, the coordination group, is then looking at how these communities and several proposals have been solicited, have been worked out and how the NTIA criteria, which was set out in the NTIA letter in March this year, have been met. And then community proposal - yes okay. Let's go to the...

Christian Dawson: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I would like just to go to the timeline now. The request for proposal is out. It was sent out here in September, September this year. We have a deadline sent for mid of January. That's where we expect the proposal, the incoming proposal from the three operational communities to say. And then we should start with the communication so related to the proposals themselves. It doesn't mean that in between until January 15 there will be no communication between the ICG and the communities, it even more important to have as much as possible coordination on that. And in exchange in order to avoid misunderstandings and in order to really get in line, the communities with regards to the expected timeline here.

So this timeline was developed under the assumption that the existing IANA contact with the NTIA is coming to an end by September 15. And the assumption was that then the transition should take place by that time, so and then was counted back. However, as you could see during that meeting already and this meeting for the coordination group for example, they are working hard on their own timelines and they are faced with several problems regarding - which counts down to at the end of days, you know, allocating days to some activities which these coordination groups have to do.

So it is very essential for this coordination group to know from the various communities what is their timeline, under which assumptions they are working and how could all of this be coordinated. Next slide, please. Okay then it's the - when the proposals come in so it's clear these are the overall criteria where the coordination group is checking against, so its

completeness, its - the question it is consistent for clarity, are the NTIA criteria met and under which conditions, is consensus level achieved.

I think that's a big issue because from my own experience in this group I know that people have in mind - different people have in mind different kinds of perception of what is consensus, what does it mean at the end. So it's - it is important to know from the communities in which kind and how they have achieved consensus, what - are there minority views on that and to what extent.

So okay, next slide, please. Then the three proposals shall be put together in one proposal. What the IDG is not doing is going into those proposals and then just - and modify them, discuss them and modify them. The content is to be done provided by the communities and so we are just adapting that to a consistent. If we there are inconsistencies, we will go back to the communities and ask them some question in order to get it done in a consistent way.

Next slide, please. Well then as usual with ICANN and other who posted, you will have public comments. This is also in the timeline here. And this will also influence - impact the proposal. Next slide. Okay next slide. This is just references of where we are.

So this slide addresses the two streams we are now faced with. So the right one in place. It's the IANA stewardship transition which is coordination group and the three lines, so that is place. On the left-hand side you can see in parallel see accountability stream, and I tried just from the modification and the announcement which was recently done from ICANN to put that into a chart here.

We are now at the situation that there shall be at the time being one group regarding and dealing with the accountability aspects but with two working streams, two work streams. One work stream is directly related to the IANA

stewardship decision and all the aspects, the accountability aspects, to that part. And the other one is beyond, so it may affect any kind of accountability items related to ICANN in general.

How that work shall be organized, this work in the future, well it's just under construction. So the - this working group on the left-hand side, or let me say the draft working or how you can tell it had the first meeting yesterday and is trying now to work out how to organize its work. It may come out. There's two different groups on the different streams here - it may be - it may come out that the first stream is taken over by the existing cross-coordination working group on IANA transition. I don't know, so both is possible.

Anyway, important for the ITC, the IANA transition coordination group, is what is the impact of accountability on their work and how these two streams are separated to each other. It is the time being it's not clear. It has to be filled up with items which are related, one to the stream one, and then to the other to the stream two. And it may be then separated to each other.

So what we can say from the IDG point of view at the time being is only what is on the next slide. So very, very general the ITC has in this charter some - a reference made so that means it is some items maintaining the accountability of Internet identifier governance essential to the transition process. It's very general. So it is taken into consideration there.

We have also in the RFP asked the operator communities to consider oversight and accountability in their proposals, and these should be - these accountability aspects which should be dealt with from within the communities should naturally be related to the IANA transition process. So what we have also in the RFP is or in our working plan is when the consensus proposals come in, so from January of next year, so the IDG will conduct an analysis and assessment of their implication of the proposal implications for the ICANN accountability.

So the question is always how to discuss it and under which criteria and how shall that be done. And this is covered here more or less in point four. We will have a meeting of the IDG on Friday of this week and there's a slot also provided for this part. So to discuss how to determine the accountability aspects related to the IANA concession and what shall be the impact on the ICG's work then. To this is on the discussion still.

May I conclude these at so I wanted to point out as well this morning in the CSG session, it would be very helpful if at least from the ISG - from the CSG level, you know, combining all these three constituencies.

I could go on Friday to that meeting, in the ICG meeting and come up with a set of, let me say, items we see here which should really be covered in that process, in the transition process regarding the Accountability. To tell the ICG, okay, this is a condition sine qua non or this is something which could be dealt with a little bit later, or which should be which should be concluded in the proposal itself, or it should be done before the transition is to be implemented.

So if there are some sets, and I heard from the BC that they have already elaborated on those issues - I didn't see that - that would be helpful.

So thank you so much and I'm open for questions.

Man: Okay, before we take questions - Wolf-Ulrich, and thanks for that - I'd like to welcome Theresa Swinehart. I don't know whether there's anything you wanted to add to that. Obviously, part of Wolf-Ulrich's presentation touched on the issues of accountability.

Is there something you'd like to say before we open it up for questions from that?

Theresa Swinehart: I think the only aspect is that in the cross-community and the Names Cross-Community Working Group, their charter has nicely outlined, within the scope, the areas of accountability in the context of the naming community specifically as an operational point to the IANA functions and that's part of what they need to prepare in their proposal going into the ICG.

So their scope for that specific area of work you had nicely outlined in our prior slide, the three groupings that are doing work. It is - I don't know if you can go back.

So the first one, the Cross-Community Working Group, the top one for the Names-related proposals, they've put very clearly into their charter the scope around accountability that they need to look at specifically with regards to the naming community and their relationship with the IANA function. Similarly of course how the IETF or the RERs might look at it in the context of their relationship and the context of the IANA function, IETF perhaps through SLAs and their contracts through various things like that.

So I just wanted to highlight that point, that the scope of their charter is very well written on that. Thank you.

Man: Okay, so let's open it up for questions. (Christian).

Christian Dawson: Thank you very much for your work on this Wolf-Ulrich, very much appreciated.

I have been an observer in your group but I haven't been preview to all the actions of the group. So I wanted to talk specifically about the last two SSAC reports that have come out.

One has been focused on the technical aspects of the IANA function. The other more recent document that has just come out a few days ago focuses on the contract and the contractual issues around the IANA function.

And the reason that I think that those are really useful tools for us is that they are created from our technical community. And the ISPs here need to make sure that as we choose a path forward, we do so in a way that maintains the security disability of the global route. That's exactly what it is they're trying to show us how to do in those documents.

So is there an extent to which you are - your work is being informed by the work being brought to you by the SSAC in these documents.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well the SSAC is providing that document also for reference to that group - the group - well, as you know, if they accepted it, they didn't discuss it. You know, not yet. So the SSAC 68, I didn't really note that because it just came up. And the other one was seen as being very helpful and informative to the group.

So I think that the members of the group take that into consideration. However we don't do that or discuss, not yet.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I had a question as well if a may at this stage Wolf-Ulrich.

If you look at your diagram on the right-hand side, I think the bottom two boxes are probably more advanced in terms of getting to what any form of delivery whatsoever than the top one - the Names one.

So if you accept that that is the way it's headed, then I think there's an easier possibility for them to look at the accountability issues in the way that Theresa said related to those particular functions. The fact that they've done considerable amount of work, that fits.

But if we could now go back to your timeline slide.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: This one?

Tony Holmes: That one. What we're really asking to happen is a catch-up phase I assume on the naming side. Because the work looking at accountability almost needs to map on to this timeline. Is that a correct understanding of this?

So we're at the stage where hopefully there's some work on the first box with communities starting to develop proposals - and I'm only referring to the name industry here. But there's been no real progress that I can see on that in terms of actually put at this stage - concrete things that have come in to your group. And now we're asking the Accountability stuff to be laid on top of that as well.

And I find this really hard to imagine how it's going to work because when you designed this timeline, so it's obviously been done with a view to build in some form of flexibility. But we get to the stage where you've got that box at the bottom that says NTIA Review. And that starts even before we've had the final response review to the proposals.

So I assume these are very, very flexible time elements. Is that a fair...

Theresa Swinehart: Assume.

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Theresa Swinehart: Sorry. So the time elements of the ICG are working with an assumption that one wants to achieve a final proposal including submission to NTIA, their review obviously against the criteria they set prior to the lapsing or the contract ending September 15th.

So the September 15th date is when the IANA Contract would either have the opportunity to lapse or for a renewal or an extension, because there's an amendment opportunity for it there. So that's why there's that September 15th date.

Working backwards, obviously then yes, there's community development and proposals. I think one thing that's important on the Accountability aspect in relation to the changing of the historical relationship with the USG, so namely the Work Stream 1, that's really to come along side the ICG Proposal that gets submitted. The ICG Proposal gets submitted, you know, gets transmitted to ICANN, it transmits it over to NTIA.

But alongside of that as we've heard Larry and NTIA also state yesterday, it's expected that the Accountability aspect in relation to the changing relationship would be provided.

Now the timing of that depending up what issues are identified as relevant to that could be substantially different or it could be similar. For example, if there's a working group, cross-community working group, has a proposal with recommendations and want to go out to community consultation, obviously get the community input, and then identify the timeline for implementation, so it will be to look at that.

So it will be either the same timeline or a similar timeline depending upon what issues are identified. But it comes along side what submitted by the ICG.

Does that answer your question?

Tony Holmes: It answers part of it.

The other follow-on from that is the submission by ICG has to be a complete submission, in other words the whole thing. And I don't mean by that just the transition proposal - if I can call it that - and the accountability, but all three elements of that as well.

Theresa Swinehart: Correct, yes, yes.

Tony Holmes: Because there seems to have been some confusion as to whether that would be the case if there developed at different speeds. But that isn't on the table.

Theresa Swinehart: No. The ICG is responsible for a proposal on the transition of NTIA stewardship role in the IANA functions. So that is - since the IANA functions are comprised of protocols, names and numbers, it would need to be from those three.

Tony Holmes: That's useful clarification, thank you. (Olivier).

(Olivier): Yes, I have a question to Theresa concerning the accountability streams on the left side because I assuming that the borderline between the two streams is a bit further. Because if I heard right yesterday, our history team mentioned as one of the topic that could be addressed in the work stream, one was the board member recall.

And if you look at this description of board member recall. It looks to me that it's an accountability question that's much larger and much concerning the ICANN in general, and that's specifically the IANA function. So the border isn't very clear to me, I don't know - I would not, so.

Theresa Swinehart: Yes, so the topic areas that fall within Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2, it's going to require some dialogue in order to identify that, right. And that's a dialogue that the community should be having in its work.

You know, as has been noted up here, there's been some areas that have been identified that might more appropriately belong in Work Stream 2, and some of them already have existing mechanisms for implementation.

So I think part of the discussion that will be useful for the community to have is what does it see as the US role being in the context of accountability for ICANN? How can that be phrased, how is that identified? And then what are

the elements that should be addressed, or may not need to be addressed depending on what these elements are, in the context of the historical/contractual relationship no longer existing?

So I think that might be a useful way of framing to look at what the issues may be and what the issues may not be. And what the issues are, so it depends upon what it is, what the community identifies.

Another thing I would point and remind everybody of is that in the first round of comments, as we were working together to prepare the Accountability process, but also then in this more recent round of comments, but in particular in the first round of comments there was a very, very large number of issues that were identified, and also proposed solutions.

And those were just not summarized, but they were just captured in two documents that are on the Web site, and I'll make sure that those can get recirculated.

That might be a very useful basis to take a look at because it's a compilation of community input on issues and proposed solutions, and perhaps pull out what issues the community might feel are specifically related to, you know, a change in relationship and what issues might not be directly relevant but nice to look at at a later stage. And potentially even look at the solutions and see whether any of those might be good solutions.

The reason I phrase this is that while we've had a lot of community dialogue, and you know, good discussions and sometimes hard discussions to reach a process direction, a very large of substantive work and input from the community is already there.

And so as soon as the process is in place, I think there's a lot of substantive stuff already there that community may want to be pulling together or if they

would like Staff to help, you know, at your instructions on how you would like that pulled together for you, but it's already out there.

Tony Holmes: Izumi.

Izumi Okutani: Thank you Theresa. I was exactly going to ask the exact question about whether there are some from straw man ideas on what would be the kind of issues that people have on the table so that we can identify which would be the borderline issues instead of thinking some things from scratch. So helpful to have that.

And I think as ISPCP, if we can see that list, and consider and share opinions about which would be the ones that we think is borderline, and you know, totally irrelevant, I think that would help in moving the discussions forward.

And something else that I want to point out is regarding the distinction between Work Session 1 and 2, I think there seems to be three categories of Accountability related issues. One is nothing to do with the US Government, it's just the ICANN Accountability in general

Second is the US Government role in relations to more general AOC, so not direct relationship with the IANA. And then another one is the one related to the IANA.

And my personal opinion, we want to focus for Session 1 on what's relevant with the IANA and not just broader US Government's role with IANA. But that's something I want to share is this is something, an opinion, that's shared with others, and then move on to identify the issues of borderline based on this kind of common understanding. So just my suggestion in moving the discussions within ISPCP forward.

Tony Holmes: I think that's an interesting discussion we're going to have as well to start with. Certainly that list would be very helpful.

Theresa Swinehart: It's actually on the - I can pull it up and we can circulate it.

Woman: I can send you the (Unintelligible).

Theresa Swinehart: We can pull it up if you'd like. It's under the Comments, under the Summary and Analysis and what was put out on the 14th of August.

Tony Holmes: Right.

Theresa Swinehart: So it's with that material there.

Tony Holmes: So while (Christian) is looking for that phase, (Malcolm), could I hand over to you?

(Malcolm): Thank you. Yes, I would like to come in with a perspective as to what really - I would like to suggest is the appropriate kind of thing for that Work Stream 1. And it's the things are essentially fundamental to the question.

The US, in placing the IANA contract, fundamentally decides that ICANN is an appropriate organization to be the policymaker in this space. It decides fundamentally that it's an acceptable kind of organization.

But acceptable in what way? What kind of things does it consider to be fundamental? Well, I think the US has identified the key areas in its transition announcement because it says what things need to be addressed by us, by the community, so as to ensure that when it no longer has that role, these things have been addressed by some other means.

And it sets them out to ensure that ICANN continues to support and enhance the multi-stakeholder model to ensure that it maintains the security, stability and resilience of the DNS, that it meets the needs and expectations of global customers and partners of the IANA services, and that it maintains the

openness of the Internet. These are the things that the NTIA has itself said are the things that must be addressed.

Now focusing exclusively - focusing on the IANA operational functions appears to be in that third bullet, Meet the Needs and Expectations of the Global Customers and Partners of IANA Services.

There are certain other things that - the other three bullet points cover a range of other things that go beyond simply the day-to-day transactional issues of the IANA services and functions.

For me, there is the basis question of the ICANN mission. ICANN has a limited mission - it has a limited scope. We expect it to maintain that way.

If ICANN were to in the future do something that is completely beyond outside what we currently would expect of it -- to develop policy maybe in the public interest, maybe a policy for the public interest for the development of the Internet and so forth, but completely outside the area of Assigned Numbers and Names, and were to use the monopoly power that it has through the RAA to impose that policy on end users and registrants -- we might well say to that, "Hold on a second. ICANN has gone outside its scope. It's gone outside its mission, it's acting out for virus."

And the accountability question then lies what will we do about that? So who would it be answerable and what mechanisms would be in place to deal with that?

Now that question seems to me to be very intimately tied with the idea of the multi-stakeholder model and with the idea of maintaining the openness of the Internet. And it might well be tied with the security, stability and resilience of the DNS as well depending on what the issues were.

So I would suggest that, in summary that the fundamental question mission, accountability to the mission, is something that must be addressed as part of Work Stream 1 type thing, as an issue that must be considered intimately tied to the transition and the transition should not occur until this has been adequately addressed.

Because the USG currently acts as the guarantor of that, to ensure that these four bullets are maintained, by the way, that ICANN happen and does at the moment. And some alternative means to ensure that must be found before USG can step aside from that. Thank you.

Man: Izumi.

Izumi Okutani: It's Izumi. So can we just, you know, go on to these points or...

Man: Yes, sure.

Izumi Okutani: Okay. So I very much see the point that you've made (Malcolm), so can't just only look at the operational perspective because even if the operation (unintelligible) it's perfect. And then it's not very testable, then, you know, that would maybe ultimately effect the operations.

But I think what I'm also interested to seeing the balance between what we should prioritize in terms of operational stabilities and security and accountabilities.

Sometimes it matches but maybe some of the plans that we think is really excellent in terms of ensuring ICANN accountability may have some risks in operational stabilities of the IANA. I mean that really depends on specific proposals, so I think it might be best to discuss this based on concrete plan rather than conceptual.

But it might be useful to get a feel within the ISPCP what would be the thing that we think is the most important, whether that's going to be the wider accountability of the ICANN itself of making sure that IANA's operational functions are stable. Just wanted to share my opinion.

Tony Holmes: This is really interesting debate because I've also heard in the hallways some of this discussion. And I'm aware, not just in our constituency of who's struggling with this, but other parts of the community seem to have a pretty firm view of this. One that we probably don't fully align with is it's a totally all embracing.

And it's going to be very interesting to see how that break between the Work Streams actually takes place.

And I believe it's correct to say at this stage that's only a proposal anyway, that we have these two separate streams. Until it's in the charter, then it's at that very difficult stage.

Theresa Swinehart: Yes, and just to be clear, the reason the two Work Streams were suggested was that one could go various directions, one could suggest creating two cross-community working groups or limit the scope to solely topics that are relevant to the contractual changing relationship with the US.

But you know, in thinking about this and looking at the comments received, it seemed one direction that ensures that there's a place for the dialogue to happen for other issues that have arisen, why they may not be immediately relevant to the transition itself, was to suggest the two work streams.

The timeline of those two work streams can be adjusted as the community wants. They can be sequential or in parallel, whatever the community thinks is best.

But instead of being limited on scope - because there had been a lot of concerns about what does that actually mean and where is that line, or creating two cross-community working groups that are operating separately to house the two work streams under and suggest that they're housed under the same cross-community working group, different people can work on different ones or they can be sequential once one feels one identified the first group and solved for that, then going to the second bucket of issues. But also to enable I think exactly these kinds of conversations.

There might be some things that, you know, shift and change once one issue has been addressed. That might have a ripple effect at helping to address other issues that then could be moved to looking at a later time or through other mechanisms.

So that was why it was suggested that two work streams be housed under the same cross-community working group.

Man: Okay, thank you.

(Malcolm): In particular and very briefly, I'd suggest that if certain things are fixed within Work Stream 1, in parallel with it, one might have confidence that even though certain things were unsatisfactory, they would be capable of being fixed with confidence on a more relaxed time scale in the other Work Stream.

Theresa Swinehart: Absolutely, yes.

(Malcolm): And that's again, why if you focus at the higher level for Work Stream 1, you make it more manageable.

Theresa Swinehart: Actually (Malcolm), you stated it very, very well. That it guarantees that it will be addressed in some manner at some point in time, yes.

Tony Holmes: This is a really interesting conversation because we had a long discussion with the Board about differences of constituencies in EWG. And certainly the views in CSG itself really, really differ here.

I think it's a dialogue we're going to have to once again, and probably any conclusion that we come to are going to be at odds I think with the other stakeholder groups.

So having heard that Theresa, that's the message that's clearly got through to Staff that we'll struggle with this if we can't have that separate form of input that we've been pushing for.

Theresa Swinehart: Again, as you're having these discussions, if there's anything that Staff can be helpful with in helping prepare anything or review any comments and pulling things out again and whatever it may be, just let us know. You know, we realize that this is a lot of work and we're all in this together in the end, so we just have different roles.

Man: Right.

Theresa Swinehart: We had put up the link for you very briefly, and we'll make sure this gets over to you Tony so that you can also share it.

This is just an example in the posting that we had done of all the excerpts from the comments that were made on issues that were identified. And it's just been categorized around Accountability or Board.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Theresa Swinehart: This was the first round of comments, yes.

There were substantive points made and issues identified in the second round of comments. We noticed that those were very largely actually repeats

of what had been done in the first set of comments. And in the 17 comments that were received in the second round, the 21-day comment period, those are fairly easy to read as one wants.

But we had 49 in the first round of comments that were received. And so we felt that pulling those out and categorizing them, again, it's just pulling out the language.

But if you'd like to see that in a different kind of format, we can prepare it that way as well.

Tony Holmes: I think we can certainly use this to start with. Thank you very much for your time.

Theresa Swinehart: Thanks for the opportunity.

Tony Holmes: Appreciate that.

So I think everyone is aware of what lies in front with this. It's a case of nobody goes on holiday for the next six months. That's a real joke, thank you.

Marcus Kumar: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Marcus, please, take the opportunity because it's a really good opportunity to do that.

We'll come back to how we take this forward at the end of the meeting. But I'd now like to introduce Marcus Kumar who most of you know I believe, and is now going to represent certainly our house on the ICANN Board. So over to you to share your words, thank you.

Marcus Kumar: Thank you and it is my pleasure to be here.

My apologies I was not able to join you in the meeting on Sunday but I had a long-standing family commitment so I arrived only yesterday but I will make sure I will be on time in Marrakesh for the next time of the formal gathering.

Having said that, I'm also ready to meet in between beyond calls or whatever, in between the meetings.

Now I know some of you but not all of you, and those who know me know that I'm a fairly open and not shy of meeting people and listening to people. And I strongly do believe in talking to people and listening maybe even more important than just talking.

And this is part of my DNA, I'd like to say, and this is also what I hope to bring to my work on the ICANN Board. And I look forward to working with you.

And as I said, please don't feel shy. Approach me when you have any concerns or whether you want me to listen to the concerns you may and I'm ready to do that.

I have been around ICANN meetings now for ten years. I was then working for the UN Working Group on Internet Governance and it was sort of a new issue in town, so I have been involved in ICANN meetings mostly in Internet Governance issues.

And I was never deeply involved in ICANN issues, ICANN policy, so I have a steep learning curve ahead of me. But I'm committed to climb that mountain and learn what I need to learn, and I'm sure I will be able to count on you to fill me in on where I have gaps.

So I think that's about all I have to say but I'm also obviously happy to answer any questions you may have.

Tony Holmes: Thank you Marcus. So I knew ICANN would catch up with you in the end and trap you some way or the other. And I'm really pleased it's done it on behalf of us.

So I've known Marcus for a number of years, and certainly you've been in some pretty hot places before so this won't be anything new for you. I think already being here over the last day or so, you've realized there's some hot buttons with this community, and I'm sure you've heard some of those messages.

But even the date we just had, there is going to be some difficult times ahead I think as a stakeholder group as a house when we're actually looking to provide the way forward is going to help save the debate on the stewardship and accountability forward.

So before Marcus leaves, any questions particularly to Marcus? If not, thank you very much and we all look forward to welcoming you and working with you.

Marcus Kumar: Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay. We're just moving down the agenda for that as well. So I think we should move down to Universal Acceptance now if we can (Kristin).

Elaine, would you like to come and sit in the hot seat here?

So this is an issue that's one of the issues that we've been certainly trying to get some added feedback and input back to the constituency when we've done our outreach activities. I know Tony, this was an issue certainly that went in to the discussions around Guadalajara.

Should I at this stage give you or (Christian) the opportunity to say anything about this or should I hand over to Elaine?

Tony Harris: Very briefly, I was made aware of some problems the registries were having with new TLDs which prompted me to ask them to come and talk about that.

And as far as the content, I think we should hear from Elaine, unless (Christian), you want to step in with anything at this time? As an introduction, a universal acceptance.

Christian Dawson: You know, I'll save my comments for after Elaine presents.

Tony Harris: Okay.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks (Malcolm).

Elaine Pruis: Thank you, thank you very much for inviting me to come and talk with you about this. I have a very brief presentation so there will be plenty of time for questions afterwards if necessary.

So I would just like to address the lack of support for TLDs in the user experience. I'm not going to touch on IDNs or the problem with IDN emails.

I think we have a common goal here, it's highlighted on the screen where we want to make sure that users and consumers have confidence in the Internet and the products they use on the Internet.

So as a TLD Registry operator, if you don't know me I work with Donuts. And yesterday, we announced that we had our millionth new topical domain registration. So there are new topical domains being registered and in the ecosystem. And so obviously, we want our customers who have spent this money for these domain names to be able to use them on the Internet so that shared goal of user and consumer confidence is there.

To prepare for this discussion, we did a little bit of digging on the Internet last week. And looking at the top 100 most frequented Web pages on the Internet, we found that 67 of the forms that you can fill in to create an account, like if you're going to set up a Skype account or a Netflix account, 67% of those would recognize a new TLD and 33% would not. So something to think about.

So scrolling down, thank you.

So here's an example from the registry operators perspective. We do, as you may know, registrars generally deal the customers directly and registry operators don't normally talk to a customer unless something is very wrong.

So here's an example of a customer who reached out to, finally, the registry operator when they couldn't get help from other places about this problem. So this customer is saying that, obviously you can tell from the language that they're tech-savvy, doesn't allow the Dot Zone top level domain in their forms. And this is a bank we're talking about here, so Bank of America and Chase both have this issue.

So on the Pitch Page and the Thank You Page they can't fill in the dots on top of the domain. And the customers asked the Customer Support at this bank to update their programs to allow for new TLDs. So if you scroll down we'll see the response.

I don't even want to read it, it breaks my heart. It says, if you're not looking at the screen, it says, "You will need to use a traditional address which is .com .net, etcetera. At this time our platform does not accept new domain addresses."

So we have one million users who couldn't possibly use this site because their attorneys are not going to work unless they buy a legacy TLD.

So a little bit further down, you can see now the customer is frustrated and has tried to get help from the supplier and has reached out to the registry operator to provide some assistance.

So this is an example of what we see. And obviously now that we're at a million registrations, we see more and more of these. And you know, we are doing what we can to elevate these issues.

But we found that Blue Host which is a hosting company, doesn't accept new TLDs. And NCMEC which is the national center for Missing and Exploited Children, obviously we care very deeply about keeping our TLDs clean and if we see some abuse we want to report it to NCMEC immediately, but we can't find the form, they don't recognize our TLDs.

So we don't get the speedy action on those abuse images that we would like to have in that instance. So there's a lot more phone calling being done than filling out the form which we're legally obligated to do because it doesn't work.

That link is just to another document which we'll look to in a couple of minutes. So their mail servers, mail clients, Web pages, Web forms, they're all having problems. And the next 15 pages are just screen shots of this over and over again, so we'll just scroll through, Nordstrom, Starbucks.

Yikes, can you believe that? Netflix, Overstock.com. I mean Overstock has been at ICANN meetings for years. You'd think they would be on top of this. Food Network, PayPal, Scene It which is a technology newspaper. Comcast, an ISP provider.

Tony Holmes: This is where we all feel guilty.

Elaine Pruis: Not trying to make you feel guilty.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Elaine Pruis: Oh yes, yes. It is, right.

So we don't have to continue this painful exercise, you can go a little faster through down to the bottom, and track that we - oh actually, would you go back up to that one a little bit more?

Here, so here's a different kind of Error Form you can see. This is Internet Explorer, okay. RetailMeNot, RetailMeNot is interesting to me because they bought - I don't know if you're familiar with RetailMeNot but it's a Web page you can go to online to get coupons for online shopping. So you get a code like if you want to buy something from Patagonia.com, you can get a 10% off coupon, RetailMeNot collects those coupons.

And RetailMeNot was one of our biggest registrants in the Dot Code TLD that we run and operate. So I wasn't very happy to see that their form doesn't accept new TLDs.

Ask.com.

Man: You must have a list somewhere of this.

Elaine Pruis: I do. Okay, I can stop here.

Man: Can you tell us how long it is?

Elaine Pruis: I will. I'm sorry, I only looked at 100, the top 100 most frequently visited sites.

Man: Right.

Elaine Pruis: So obviously we have a problem. And the more new TLDs we have in the ecosystem, the more aware we will become of those problems and where specifically they are.

So what are Donuts, what are we doing about it? What could you possibly do about it? What is the ICANN community doing about it?

We have recommendations from tech-savvy people about how to clean up the scripts so it doesn't rely on checking this as the dot whatever part of the legacy list, so just remove that requirement to check. That's one way to fix it.

So this is text that has been shared but back to the banks suggesting that they clean up their online form for account creation in this way. So we're providing technical information when we find out there's a problem.

And then we have a call from the ICANN community as well as ICANN staff to create some open source code solutions so that we can easily distribute possible fixes to this.

So one of the reasons why this is prevalent and a problem is that we have limited check resources and people - you know, if you've got 0.5% of your customers complaining about this and about 30% complaining about something else, this one is not going to get attention, right. So if we can make it very easy for them to fix this problem that will help a lot.

The other method of bringing awareness and fixing this thing is ICANN has a reporting email function where they're collecting this information. So we will forward like our customer service questions that come through to TLD dash acceptance at ICANN dot org, and I think they're creating a list of known problems and asking for people who have the skill set to help fix those problems.

Man: I have a question. Elaine, could you tell me if in this analysis you're conducting now with these problems, when you have only three characters to the right of the dot, do you have a problem or is it only when you have more than the three characters to the right of the dot? You haven't looked at that?

Elaine Pruis: I'm trying to think if I've seen any come through. Most of Donut's TLDs are more than three characters so the zone code (unintelligible).

Man: Because years ago, that was the problem when this happened in 2003.

Elaine Pruis: Yes.

Man: I was wondering if that's sort of still hanging around, the same problem, which is strange after so many years.

Elaine Pruis: Yes. I think, as you can see in this recommendation, rather than relying on a static list of these are the acceptable TLDs, they are suggesting that the script would go out and check for updates to the list of acceptable TLDs which, you know, changes everyday. Donuts has put five new TLDs into the root every week since January 29th.

Christian Dawson: I'd be happy to try and...

Man: (Christian), just a second.

Man: Have you been reaching out to some of the Web developer communities and the folks that are doing precanned Web sites? A lot of these things are the same things as this hard coding IP addresses and the rest.

So are you talking to the (June Group) and Word Press and all of the - because those are the people that don't have Web developers that even knows what this means.

Elaine Pruis: Right, right. Yes, as much as we can. I mean obviously our job isn't to sell Web page development tools so it's not our main priority to fix it.

But when we see a problem like with a bank, with Chase and Bank of America, we worked with the domain name association, the ICANN, which is an industry organization to contact connections higher up since the customer support teams at those banks were not responding. We finally found a contact at the Vice President of IT level who now has created - we have like a two-hour appt with them in a few weeks so we can show them this problem and talk to them about how to fix it.

So you know, we're doing everything we can in the ways we can to bring attention to this. But you know, my job is to roll up new TLDs not six Web forms.

Man: (Unintelligible). Did you try (unintelligible) with, for example, obviously (unintelligible).

Elaine Pruis: So legacy TLDs?

Man: Yes, as well as the other (unintelligible).

Elaine Pruis: No, I just tried the new TLDs that Donuts operates.

Man: I was just curious how (unintelligible).

Man: Good question.

Tony Holmes: (Mark)?

(Mark): A couple of things. Is there a way that I can get back to the document and scroll up to the top? There are two things that occur to me, and having been a veteran of this particularly issue.

First of all, it's very disappointing, frankly, to see that you're not looking at IDNs. IDNs are extremely important part of this. The usability applies to them

just as much. And so that's - as a title of the paper here, that's kind of - that's a disappointment.

The second thing is that if we go down to the answer that this first person gave here - I think it was Bank of America. It's right below. There's an interesting word - here we go. "Unfortunately at this time, our platform."

And I think it's very important to understand that that's what's going on here. It's that these companies have electronic commerce platforms on which they're building their electronic commerce. So that's got to be the target.

And when I look at your long list of examples, I kind of smile to myself because you take a look at things like Facebook, and I think you even had PayPal in there. And it's well known that the underlying platforms are what are causing the problems there and that's really where you have to go.

I don't think, and with all due respect, I don't think creating open source examples of solutions are going to solve that problem. And I think that - I would agree with my colleagues in the room who have already spoken up on this that is an illusionary change. And we saw that when we had Dot Travel, we saw that when we - it takes time to actually solve this problem.

I think the DNAs suggestion of not doing any white listing, I think you'll find a lot of resistance to that in the community. I really don't think that has much in the way of legs.

But on the other hand, reaching out to the people who provide electronic commerce platforms is one of the best ways to attempt to address feasibility problems.

So I would say that, again, I just - I'm sad to not see IDNs as part of your analysis. And second of all, the very answer that you got from Bank of America is very revealing about where the problem lies.

Elaine Pruis: Yes, thank you for those comments, so I appreciate you saying that. I will do what I can to figure out who those platform providers are and focus my efforts there.

So the reason why I did not include IDNs in this discussion was because there are people who are much more on top of the IDN aspect of this, and you'll hear them talk all week long about it.

So I just wanted to share what we're seeing in our TLDs. We don't have any dot IDN TLDs out there so I didn't check any of those. So it's not that I don't care, I don't think it's important, it's just this is my experience as the Donuts Registry Operator.

As far as the solution, so I heard Jordyn Buchanan from Google this morning talking to the GNSO suggesting that an open source code solution would be one way to deal with this issue. The white listing came from somebody in the tech community.

Any other way you guys know of that we can work on fixing this, please let me know. These are things that are happening now.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Elaine Pruis: Okay.

Tony Holmes: A couple of comments on this as well. First, thanks for raising this because, for ISP, because one of the things we can do is we can check our sites, so certainly do something there.

The other issue that we have is that very often, normally always when there's problems, we're the guys that get it in the neck the first time. We did last time. It was originally put forward last time they had this problem that ISPs were

blocking these things, which was soon disproved. But at the same time, it didn't solve the problem but it left us with a problem because the fact of how phones ring when this happens.

So one of the things we should do is make sure we get some information out there of our channels that this is likely to be a problem and what the problems are even though we can't particularly solve it.

The other thing I was going to suggest to Izumi is that we spoke at the beginning of this meeting about that list of technical issues and trying to get some feedback on these. I think this is a great one to go on that list.

Izumi Okutani: Izumi. I very much agree and even though ISPs can't solve the problem ourselves, if we can collaborate in a way we can point to. Okay, if you're looking for a solution contact these people or look at this website. I think that would still help the ISPs and also for you to, you know, have wider awareness on what the problems are and helping solve the problems little by little. So thank you, Tony for the suggestion. I very much agree.

Christian Dawson: Though I do want to acknowledge that if we're going after the network operators for issues that deal with network operations these are system developers and that is a different community that we're talking about.

And so I don't know how much engagement we're necessarily going to get on this particular issue unless we frame it properly. And the reason that I think it's very important that you bring up IDN variance is that there we get into areas that actually make this a security issue on our networks.

Specifically when you're talking about - let's take for example a situation where somebody has - they want to go ahead and they want to put something - put together a URL that actually uses a Cyrillic character that looks like an A and create a word that looks Bank of America and use that as a phishing exercise. ICANN has done the work to make sure that through its

IDN variant program that's not going to be an easy thing to do in the actual - base delegation.

But when it comes right down to it, when things get really complex really quickly when you're dealing with individual systems.

So we ought to make this one of the things we do outreach on in a number of different areas because it can be - not just an uptick issue and how gTLDs are able to pervade but because through the IDN program and through the way that the Internet is going to become a - used throughout the world these systems need to be developed in a way that allows us to avoid these sort of potential - well, not being able to use them is one thing but exploited for hacking and phishing and things like that.

Tony Holmes: Izumi?

Izumi Okutani: Izumi. So I very much agree with (Christian)'s point so maybe being a bit repetitive. So even though ISPs can't, you know, do something ourselves I think it's very important that ISPs know that these are the problems and who to point to or anything that can be done operationally.

So I agree with (Christian) that not all of it can be solved within the ISPs ourselves but outreach is important.

Christian Dawson: Unlike - so we're also going to be talking briefly about name collisions and there we were going to ICANN and saying, you need to do something about this particular situation. And we got to the point where it was focused on outreach.

Here ICANN has actually been stepping up - the community's stepped up and become leaders in this area. They've done something. Now we need to turn to the rest of the community and focus the attention on outreach.

Tony Holmes: It's good that you brought that up because that was going to be one of the questions as well because this constituency - we're one of those that we're basically banging on at ICANN to do something about universal acceptance for the same reason that when there's problems we're always the first ones to get hit by that, whether it's our problem or not.

But what is your view of where ICANN stand on this? Because they do have this group that are dealing now with universal acceptance. You've obviously spoken with them. Have they identified anything that they can put forward to help with this or not?

Woman: Well, I think it was maybe just two or three weeks ago that (Francisco) announced a universal acceptance - I don't know if it's framework or program or plan but it covers IDNs.

Man: Sorry.

Woman: It covers IDN acceptance, IDN emails, as well as just general recognition of new TLDs. So the ICANN proposal deals with all three issues unlike my paper here.

Normally I don't want ICANN to do more than absolutely necessary but in this case I think it would be great if there were some additional steps that are being taken in this proposal so what I recall ICANN doing is setting up this information webpage with links to more details as well as the TLD-Acceptance@ICANN.org reporting email.

What I would really love to see and the argument I've heard against this is we don't want to embarrass anybody but I'd love to see a clearinghouse, a list of here are the problems, you can look at what the problem is, do what you know how to fix or do what you can or bring attention to it, and then it goes away when it's fixed.

So we're not reporting the same problems over and over again when it's already in the work list.

Tony Holmes: I think you already had the best advice on this so all I can do, I think, is try and sort of rephrase that a little too. Because I don't - I think that time spent - whether it's - and I know you're not going to want it - I'm not intending it like this but naming and shaming particular services that aren't recognizing it or whether it's trying to reach out to a high level exec in the service.

I mean the best the guy - the old VP at Bank of America is going to be able to do, the very best he's going to be able to is see your demonstration, go yes, that's a problem, I'll tell someone to do something about fixing it.

It will then trickle down the line until it reaches the person that deals with the platform provider who will then either get a fix on the platform provider or be told we're not going to be able to fix that until the next release in - which is scheduled for however many months away, yes.

Now I understand - I understand you - there's a limit to how much anybody could reasonably hope to invest in in this. But whatever you are willing to address to this or for that matter ICANN or anyone else, I think the advice from - that you've had from similar people already and I share is that you'll get the most bang for your buck in ignoring the surfaces that are consumer facing and addressing the platforms on which they're built.

The people that write the libraries in those platforms, some of those platforms will be big proprietary ones and you'll just be able to have corporate entry to that, speak to their VP instead, you know.

And some of them will be the sort of open source sort of community based in which case you'd be wanting to identify the maintainer of the library that does email address validation checking or whatever or domain validation checking or whatever. There are people - I mean I can understand that you don't know

who these people are or how to reach them. But there are people that know how - know this, yes.

There are people - if you say - hell, if you advertise for a consultant saying I want to build a new online platform and I need someone to help - a new online service and I need someone to help me select the platform and then when they come out to help things for your business say, actually what I really want you to do is contact these people that are running these platforms and try to help them to fix that problem.

They'll know how to go about that and it probably won't be that expensive either. I think that's how you'll get the most bang for your buck.

Man: And from our perspective, I believe that - you know, we do see relevance in here, particularly because there are customers that are going to call us and say, this is a problem, help us fix it. And so I think that we can carry this forward and make this part of outreach efforts when we are talking to our communities.

We also will engage directly with the ICANN community that's leading this. I know (Ed Lewis) is actually head of that community and he is on our Adobe Connect right now listening in. I will engage with him personally to try and figure out how to help us coordinate that into our outreach efforts.

Tony Holmes: Yes, that's helpful. And I would suggest that the broader win is about this to better because it's going to help resolve it, even to the fact that it's probably a tent full of people quite close to here that should be quite concerned about this. I mean if it doesn't work for things like IRS and other things then it needs a fix. Tony?

Tony Harris: Very briefly, I don't want to extend this too much. I'm not too sure it was when you were talking about codes - develop codes to address this situation, it

sounded like a patch to me. And I think this problem should be solved at the roots and not start putting patches in.

Because otherwise we do the same we did with IPV 6. We've got - it's never deployed because you've got patches working all over the place and that's not the future. So I definitely - personally would commit to helping on this and all organizations I can bring into it also.

Woman: Excellent. So I appreciate, again, the advice to talk to the platforms. I'd like to point out that that's one area where things are not working. Somebody mentioned the IRS and that made me remember that just the other day my accountant sent me a screen shot of the Washington State Labor and Industry webpage where we - in Washington State the employer pays a small tax to the state in case somebody gets hurt.

And part of that process is creating an account, listing your employees, and logging in every month and making sure that money is moving where it's supposed to be moving.

So I received an email yesterday saying it looks like the Washington State Labor and Industry webpage or something is wrong, they are not - I'm not getting the emails back.

So the form accepted the new TLD but when the email came from them to confirm the creation or our email back there's something at some layer, maybe it's the firewall, I don't know where it is, but it's beyond just creating an account at a webpage.

So we've got, you know, browsers are having problems, the firewalls are having problems, the platforms are having problems.

Another example of this is in Verizon in Reston, Virginia. If you put in a new TLD in the browser Verizon doesn't recognize that new TLD. Its smart search

helps you out by suggesting .com, .net, .org alternatives. So I mean this is great for people who are looking in that space but...

Tony Holmes: Okay, here's my offer, yes. If when you track down what was wrong in that Washington State thing you discover that the (unintelligible) validation code was written by Washington State and not by some other software vendor that is providing it to another - a bunch of other places, if you discover that I'll buy you dinner.

Woman: Wow, all right.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

Woman: I'm on a mission.

Man: And I'll buy the drinks before dinner because that is so - (Malcolm) and I both know that that's so unlikely, that will never - probably never have to come through on that. But I do think that what you're doing points to something really important and it's about the security and stability that's part of the mission that (Malcolm) talked about in our last agenda item.

And for people who don't know it, (Urid) has recently done - in corporation with (UNESCO) a very, very long report on - that includes a universal acceptance of IDNs. And it's - that universal acceptance talks about it on all platforms so it's not just laptops and PCs but it talks about what happens in the mobile environment. And it does identify a systemic problem.

So I think it's very important - I think you're bringing a very important problem to the table. I think the problem is larger in finding the targets. Again, I agree with (Malcolm), finding the proper targets to attack it - to attack the problem. I think that's the real difficulty.

And I completely agree with Izumi and (Christian) that one of the things we can do as part of the ISP community is build an information source, right. Say, look, when you get phone calls on this here's what the problem is and, you know, that's certainly things that we can do.

We can do that in communities where ISPs actually play a traditional role, for instance RARs, talk to those communities, IXPs, talk to those communities and so forth, network operation groups.

And so I'm willing to spread the word, especially because I believe it's a more general problem than the one that you're bringing to the table. But I do appreciate that you're - that you've come and done that.

Woman: Yes, thank you very much for giving me the time. I really appreciate - and the information share is really important to me so thank so thank you very much.

Tony Holmes: Thanks again. And we do have a plan to tackle issues like that. Your timing is great.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay, so moving on, name collisions. This is something we dealt with in the London meeting but we wanted to bring you up to date with where we are on this as well.

So (Christian), this is over to you.

Christian Dawson: Sure, just briefly, you know, we are going on - over on time so I think that we can probably make this very succinct. This week (Francisco Arias) came to

talk to us in the GNSO council meetings and first of all, does anybody need me to actually go over what the name collisions issue as at this point? Should we go ahead and give an overview.

Okay, well, (Francisco) came to us and said something very interesting, that they had caught a couple of name collisions in the wild. And it's the first that I had heard of that. And through the - through the system that was approved by the board, which was slightly different than the JAS advisory report but very close to what we saw with the JAS advisory report.

This system - it - things happened the way we expected them to. These were two systems in which the individuals that were running these systems had no idea, that these delegations had been placed into the wild and it affected their systems. They saw the .53.53 address.

They found the resources and figured out how to address the situation. It was said by somebody in the council meeting, well, that's a win. And I said, wait a second, we've got to be careful about that. You know, this severely disrupted two people's systems. However, the checks that we put in place were absolutely - things happened the way that we expected them to.

So it seems like the work that our community and other communities have been doing to try and drive things forward to contribute to the JAS reports, to contribute to making sure that this issue was addressed, it's moving things in the right direction.

The things that I want to harp on - and I'll probably harp on them for meetings to come is - are that this is an issue in which the ramifications are going to be felt over a long period of time because you don't actually see these issues arise until the second delegations come out.

The fact that we have found two things in the wild and that they haven't been catastrophic in that they worked according to plan are fantastic, that's really

good news. It doesn't mean that we don't have to be continued to focus on this issue. This issue is going to be one that's going to stick around for a long, long time.

It makes me feel as though continued calls for outreach continue to be our path forward. Those two things that were found in the wild that (Francisco) talked about, those operators didn't know that these TLDs were out there. Hopefully with future outreach efforts they can be.

So an aspect of what it is we want to talk about I want to start by saying we need to continue as a community to push for outreach efforts and to do outreach efforts ourselves.

The other thing that (Francisco) was there to talk to us about and probably something that we probably need to discuss as a community is how we will - how we should focus on name collision issues surrounding the possibility of future gTLD programs and whether we need to change what it is we've got going on there.

And Tony, you had some excellent comments to (Francisco) there as well so maybe you want to go over that or I can continue.

Tony Holmes: No, go ahead. I think where we are with this is exactly the direction that you've suggested. This is as much about outreach as anything else. And it's proven there is some success (unintelligible).

Christian Dawson: Your mic is - and so yes. The job is not done in name collisions. We need to focus on outreach but also as they are requesting information about what it is we need to do moving forward, spoke with some people in this room about (Francisco)'s questions that he presented to us and we talked about how we should probably take another look at the delegations - at whether there should be delegations excluded from future possibility.

When you take a look at the root zone file and see which ones are coming up as - what's being requested that's not coming up in the DNS root. If you take a look at that list there's one called, like, .ICE I believe. Is that what it is?

Izumi Okutani: Yes, and .Cisco, (unintelligible). So there's top ten list of the names that have many queries at the root level. And I'm not expert enough in judging if there's numbers or, like, significant enough to, you know, go as far as suggesting to stop the delegations.

I would be interested to hear more of expert analysis on whether, you know, being on the top ten list would be a big concern or - you know, that is okay or - so I would like to request ICANN for more analysis on - or maybe ask for, like, wider public comment or something like that rather than - I don't know, making a decision at this stage.

Christian Dawson: The fact of the matter is where we've ended up on this is pretty much where SSAC told us to be on this a number of years ago. Ultimately we came down to a place in which we realized that it really was the potential issue people thought it was going to be, people within our community thought it was going to be.

And what happened was people went ahead and signed - and applied for .Home, .Mail, .Corp and it became a huge mess that it didn't need to be had we done the work ahead of time. So making sure it's not a huge mess the second time around should be an important part of this process.

Tony Holmes: Let me just understand what you are asking there, Izumi. Was the point that the analysis you referred to wasn't suggesting we should just - ICANN should just act with that list. But you were suggesting there needs to be some analysis of that top ten to determine whether that action is needed on an ongoing basis.

Izumi Okutani: That's correct. So I already see the list that's based on (intercel) report I believe but it's a little bit premature at this stage to say, okay, people being on top ten shouldn't be delegated on a - should be more analysis and asking for wider comments on what would be an appropriate way of make - considering actions based on this information.

Man: Sure, (Mark)?

(Mark): So one thing to know, Izumi is the root server advisory committee has done a presentation on that so there is - there actually is data and there is analysis so that's worth looking into.

The second thing I would note is that the ISP community has sort of tried to make the ITF think a little more carefully about how they reserved top level domain names, that process right now is very poorly designed and it represents an interface between the ITF and ICANN that is not very well defined.

And like (Christian) said, I think it's an example of something that we've learned in this round that needs to be straightened out before the next round.

Tony Holmes: Let me just ask this question and I don't know whether it's appropriate or not but the further analysis that needs to be done, if you go down that path, has to have some criteria by which they're going to do it by. Would that be something we should be maybe saying to SSAC? Can you advise how you would do that?

(Mark): So my answer to that would be no because what you're talking about are queries that are going to the root, right. And so it's really the root server advisory committee that they want to talk and the root server operators.

And the fact is that at (ORARC) and other places, they've actually shown that top ten - the - for instance, those top ten queries, they actually put that in the

context of all the rest of the noise at the root zone. And it's a very, very small percentage of the actual number of queries that come to the root in error.

So if you set aside the queries that are good queries and you only look at queries that module of some definition of error are an error to be sent to the root. Those in that top ten list are actually very, very small percentage.

So - but again, I would say that that is an ongoing - the root server advisory committee I think is in a position now to take requests for further research because they have that - they have the new group that they've created. But I wouldn't go to - I think SSAC is the wrong place because SSAC would have to go to the root server operators anyway.

Tony Holmes: Well, I saw that. I mean - you know this, the root server area better than I do, (Mark). But the fact that the root server operators got the data wouldn't the research into this be done by SSAC?

They're not going to do that work in doing the analysis of whether there's a case that - or a set of criteria by which you can judge whether you need to take some effective action for this type - as a result of this type of thing.

(Mark): Well, I guess my point was they've already done that, right. They've already done an analysis first of all of what the impact is of those spurious queries that are associated with the inner aisle list. And then second of all, that a result of that analysis is that the amounts - the amount of spurious queries is very, very small from that list compared to error queries in general.

Tony Holmes: Got it. Anybody else have any...

(Mark): By saying that I'm not discouraging the ISP community to go into RSAC and saying, would you commission another piece of work here. I mean that's a perfectly reasonable thing for the ISP community to do.

Or better yet - much better yet because I think the root server - and the root server ecosystem believes that they already have that data, ask them at the Marrakesh meeting to give a presentation on that very topic. And they're in a position to do it.

Tony Holmes: That's a really good proposal. Izumi.

Izumi Okutani: Izumi so related to the point (Mark) has made I think it's nice to know the percentage of queries is relatively low, even if they're listed as top ten. And what makes me wonder is if - on what criteria did ICANN decide that .Home and .Corp is high risk for this particular round?

So we might want to confirm whoever has made the decision - I don't know if it was (intercel file) or somebody else at the ICANN. So we might want to consult some - first find out who did that judgment and analysis and probably want to do, like, a - confirm whether this matches the second round edition or possibility matches with that criteria that we had for the first round.

Tony Holmes: Right, I think it was JAS, right, (Mark)?

(Mark): So it was original inner aisle and then JAS followed up and actually did analysis on the top of that. But parallel to that in the ITF there was also analysis done for those particular names. And that's one of the things I'm pointing to here is that it's not just our community that this affects, it's also the standards community as well.

I think that Izumi's point as we have subsequent rounds that we make sure that we have this particular topic covered up in advance, I think that's a very good point. I completely agree with that. But the history of this is that it was first identified - it was first identified in the inner aisle report last October and then the JAS report in January confirmed it.

Tony Holmes: And I will follow up on that issue with the root servers for Marrakesh. Jim, you're going to tell me that you fixed the VeriSign universal acceptance problem?

Jim Baskin: I might have fixed the Verizon one but not the VeriSign one. No, this is Jim Baskin. A couple of comments on these issues we're talking about here with the collisions.

I believe that the reason that the three individual TLD strings were held back was because they were head and shoulders above the volumes of the others, like an order of magnitude at least greater in the number of hits than the others. They were substantially - significantly - statistically significant more than any of the others.

So they said, well, let's be safe, let's stop those three. But to go down further on that list, it would require a lot more review.

But (Mark), to your suggestion that the RSAC is the right place and not the SSAC, I'm still not convinced of that because the RSAC probably did their studies and I didn't look at them but I think their studies were intended to determine whether these collisions were - or the volume of these things was going to create stability issues for the root - for the root servers.

And - but I think the issue that we're really looking at is not whether the root servers are being impacted but whether users are being impacted or would be. And the RSAC is going to say, no, it's just noise in the background. But as far as - I think it's the SSAC that would want to look at the stability of the Internet in terms of the users having trouble, not the root servers.

(Mark): I'm convinced by your argument, Jim.

Jim Baskin: Thanks.

(Mark): I am. I think that perhaps that argument is enough to convince me that maybe the SSAC is the place to go. The - to your first point, of course, one of the things that happened was that the technical community took a look at deployed software and it was deployed software that caused .Home and .Corp to be - as you say, head and shoulders above other names, other strings.

Tony Holmes: Okay, all right. I'm going to follow up with both. I'll follow up with (Patrick) with the SSAC and I'll follow up with the RSAC as well for Marrakesh. So thanks for that.

We need to move on. We've got one item left to get through, NOMCOM reform where you have a - quite a presentation here which we need to step through very quickly. And we are in a position with this - a little bit of history.

The proposals came out and there's a lot of misunderstanding how it came out. It came out from a group of board members. It is not a board report or a board set of recommendations, a lot of confusion over that.

And when we've queried that - at this meeting we've been told, it's just a straw man out there. It doesn't necessarily mean it's going to happen. It has considerable impacts upon this constituency. In fact, all of the commercial stakeholder group, it has a significant impact on.

We have produced a draft response on this. Alain has done the leg work on that so at this stage I think I should turn over to Alain to run us through this quickly where we are and also if I could ask you as a result of the discussions that have taken place during this meeting, which you are part of when we met with those board members, you could say what the issues were that came out of that discussion and how we need to change our report going forward.

Alain Bidron: Thank you. My name is Alain Bidron. I am the NOMCOM appointee for 2014 and we are appointed by you for 2015 (unintelligible) committee.

So I've prepared a set of slide to first explain what exactly is naming committee is. I do not want to enter into much detail but I think it's prudent to understand all the naming committee works currently and what the naming committee is.

So the naming committee is NOMCOM assures the appointment of the board members so that's quite significant. It's important task. (Unintelligible) organizations, (unintelligible) the generic names of (unintelligible) organization, five members of naming committee.

The only (unintelligible) organization to whom the NOMCOM don't appoint anyone is ISO because the registry (unintelligible) refused this option.

(Unintelligible) committee is currently composed of 14 members, three non-voting members (unintelligible) by advisory committees and three non-voting leaders on - of (unintelligible), two of them are selected by the board, the chair is selected by the board.

The chair-elect is selected by the board and associate chair is selected by the chair. And of course, the naming committee receives support from ICANN staff members.

So this is the current composition. Five members you remember from ALAC, seven members from the GNSO, one member from (ASPCP), two members from BC, one member from IPC, this is (unintelligible).

One member from the ccNSO, one member from GNSO, and one member from the EAB for the ITF.

This logic was to appoint member according to the rule of the ICANN board. The main mission of the naming committee is to select board members off of

them. So the proportion of selectees are relative to the issues the board members have to deal with during their function.

The process is left to the individual organization - asked to select representative. Normally it's an election or consensus (unintelligible) representative. And the criteria, I will not go through each but we need to have people that are neutral, and the - something very important, the rule is in the committee appointees is to act for the benefit of the overall organization, for the benefit of ICANN and not for the benefit of their single constituency or for the benefit of their country or whatever.

The ability is to act as a team to select the best people in the ICANN board, the best people in the appropriate skills to facilitate the ICANN board, that's very important.

Another important issue that was addressed by the board working group is that the naming committee adopts every year its operating procedures and its procedures are published on the ICANN website. So every year they have to reinvent normally all the procedure and that could be very painful so that's a real issue the NOMCOM has to face.

As I said, there is voting members, 15, and non-voting members within the committee. But the way currently the naming committee works is as much as possible through consensus approach. It's been that voting is not a very important part in the process. The most important part is discuss the - about the candidate.

The most important part is to reach before the application are received to their communities. The most important part is to discuss with the committees to analyze as a team those candidates and to make a decision based on consensus.

So there is no summary difference between voting members and non-voting members currently. This is an example of a timetable, the example was extracted from the report that will be published in 2014 NOMCOM. This is (unintelligible) enter into too much details.

Just to mention that it's very, very hard work when we have - we're approached to the deadline. We have biweekly phone calls of three hours long. So that's a huge task, that's a lot of work but the work is not only to select people as I said in the first phase the - candidates outreach and it's a very important part.

And it's important to have some diversity within the NOMCOM in order to be able to reach to various community, not only geographic diversity but diversity according to background and to where the NOMCOM appointees come from.

So coming to - can move, yes. Coming to the board working group and NOMCOM there was a first organizational review of the NOMCOM and a report released in 2010. And this review called for a review in three year's time and it's just pertaining to the composition, the size of the NOMCOM - of the NOMCOM and recruitment and selection functions.

So board working group was formed with four board members, (Jon Sadowsky), (Ron Moran), (Rip Orsac) and (Mike Silber). And this report was published recently, reopened for public comment (unintelligible) October 21. It was not discussed as you said Tony within the full board.

There was no decision coming from the board. It's not endorsed by the board. It is only a report coming from four individual board members opened for public comment.

Tony Holmes: Before you move on, Alain, on that particular slide, the meeting we had the other day with the board they agreed to extend that public comment period but I've seen nothing published to say that.

Alain Bidron: No, I've seen nothing published or it could be safe to be prepared to submit or come in before the 21 of October, which is the deadline for comment.
Move one slide please, yes.

So my understanding of the proposal from the board working group NOMCOM is to (redefine) NOMCOM membership for presentation (unintelligible) diversity and parity, that's what (they claim).

I think we can only agree with that. Diversity - greater (unintelligible) diversity, greater parity is a good objective in my view.

They want to extend the terms of the NOMCOM appointees to two years with nobody to serve two consecutive terms. Again, currently this is only one term. It's (unintelligible) available for one additional term but if I take the example of the present 2014 NOMCOM, all of them that were - that could be reappointed were reappointed.

So it would not be a very important change. So I think we can agree with and the sort of goal of the proposal from the (unintelligible) committee from the working group seems to be increase diversity, increase ability, (unintelligible).

Okay, we can really support that. But coming to the details, NOMCOM diversity, is it a real issue now? (Unintelligible) diversity, I checked all diverse was the (unintelligible) committee in 2013, 2014, and 2015.

My feeling is that NOMCOM currently is the most diverse body within ICANN.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: Where is the problem? Regarding gender diversity, yes. It could do better. But (unintelligible) within the proposal as a working group. Regarding stability, and I would add as a criteria efficiency within the CMZ committee. regarding

stability, there is currently two mechanisms that were put in place over the last three years.

The first mechanism is chair elect and associate chair. Currently the chair elect is the upcoming chair to the next chair and the associate chair chosen by the chair - the tradition now is to select the previous chair as chair elect - as the chair, sorry, to choose the associate chair chosen by the chair as the previous chair.

So that way we have a cycle of three years where we can create that stability which is something very important and was painful of (unintelligible) previous (unintelligible) committee.

What the board working group suggests to separate the chair elect. So this advanced mechanism, which is in place now and your answer is one of the two mechanisms providing stability. The suggestion coming from this working group is to stop that. Where are we going?

Man: The only part of ICANN that actually works that way.

Alain Bidron: Yes. Yes. The second mechanism is a possibility where (unintelligible) to - for two one years (unintelligible) on - that's something that works well (unintelligible) as I said, making that mandatory. Why not? It's a good proposal.

But (unintelligible) mechanism, the popular from the (unintelligible) group would be to stop one of them. It's good to understand.

Let's move. Detailed recommendation (still) proposal from the board working group. First proposal, currently the ISO appoint one member and the ccNSO one member, the board to have five members appointed by the ISO, five members appointed by the ccNSO so eight additional members within the NOMCOM.

To make (unintelligible) is - the role of NOMCOM is appoint board members the issues addressed as a board for a large part of the gTLD (unintelligible) policies. I'm (a mid local original) level. So where is the proposal? We understand what they are trying to do there.

Is it for trying to have geographical diversity but it's not an issue currently.
Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: Yes. Second point NOMCOM do not appoint ISO council member so where is the rationale to have five members coming from the ISO when the NOMCOM don't appoint - don't select any members - any member to the ISO council? Where is the rationale for that?

So my proposal is no support for this proposal because it could decrease - it will decrease reasonably the size of the NOMCOM and the huge GNSO which is dealing with the larger number of issues within ICANN.

Second recommendation, reduce the number of appointees from the GNSO from seven to four aligning them with the (unintelligible). It means that for IPC, IPCP, BC who are currently four appointees would have only one.

Where is the diversity is? (Unintelligible) that would be covered by board members appointed by ISO, SSAC, registrars, registries. NOMCOM recruits board member (unintelligible) of board members selected through SOs, SCs, (unintelligible) experience.

I think that the constituencies within the CSG are desperate to reach and identify those competencies. I think that regarding diversity, CSG represents a larger diversity of actors and skills with BC, IPC, and SPCP and the ASO and the GNSO obviously.

So I think we should strongly object to that proposal and I think it's a goal within the NOMCOM is to have diversity of skills. Third recommendation - can you move? Yes.

Increase GAC representation by GAC discretion up to three voting representatives. Currently they are one but this - it was never - it was a last NOMCOM the GAC appointed this single appointees. The seat is empty.

The third suggestion is to have three empty seats. Again, where is the rationale there? The GAC don't ask for that. So no support of course.

Recommendation four, technical entity remain unchanged. I think we can agree with that but it would not be unchanged because one of the proposal is to change this - representative from the technical entities from non-voting to voting. So it's a change. I think we can support that. It is a good proposal.

Tony Holmes: What we can't support is the terms issued.

Alain Bidron: But currently the term issues of the non-voting members of the (naming) committee is limited so...

Tony Holmes: It has to change.

Alain Bidron: If we change that, if we change this position from non-voting to voting, of course, that - their term should be aligned with the terms of the voting members two years.

Tony Holmes: If I can comment on that, Alain. I agree with what you said but even if we don't change that that should change. There's been people on that committee now for eight and nine years consecutive. It should stop.

Alain Bidron: Yes. Absolutely.

(Mark): Could you just explain the rationale for that?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

(Mark): So let's say that the ITF does have a representative that comes and comes for six years, non-voting member but a participant - an active participant in the NOMCOM. Can you explain what your objection is?

Tony Holmes: Yes, my objection is I think that that is - it's a sorry reflection on the committee that you just permanently have people on there who may not vote but I think you've been on the NOMCOM and I've been on the NOMCOM and they do have influence. And having people with the same views bring in the same influence for eight, nine, ten, 15, 20 years is just wrong.

(Mark): Alain actually said - you said at the outside that there's very little difference between the voting and non-voting member in practice.

Alain Bidron: There is very, very little difference in the NOMCOM between voting and non-voting members. This is why I think we - maybe we can support that non-voting become voting but with a limited term. I agree with you, Tony, that - I have an example of appointee who is serving for - was serving for his eighth term - consecutive term. And it could be captured there.

We don't have any - is a don't vote but they have a strong influence because, of course...

Tony Holmes: It's worse than that.

Alain Bidron: There is no real difference in the way the NOMCOM is working between voting and non-voting.

Tony Holmes: There's a learning curve I think, (Mark), on the NOMCOM. When you join as a new person you're very much on a learning curve for the first time, certainly in the early part of the process. And most people have undue influence on the way it goes if they've been there year after year. So I (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mark): So I'm going to just let this slide by but I think the danger is turning those into open seats that one of the things that some of those communities have is they have someone who's interested enough to be on the NOMCOM and is not term limited and so they continue to play that role.

Now when I was on the NOMCOM voting played a much bigger role than it apparently does now. We voted on everything. And so since they didn't have a vote they didn't have the influence that you're talking about. So my background on the NOMCOM is a little bit different. But since Alain's is more recent I accept that things have changed.

Alain Bidron: I think it's quite different now. As I said, in the past there was as you said a strong difference between voting and not voting. It's not anymore the case.

Man: A question (unintelligible). When you say that there was objection for dilution of GSO for example, you know, there was right, there was no support, there was actually resistance, right? What form does that say? I missed something. Is there a document or was that a vote? I just missed (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: The dilution comes with the changing in the arrangements with (unintelligible).

Man: I understand the mechanisms but what was the feedback? What form did that objection come? I understand mechanically how it works, but was that a letter, was that a vote, was that a - is there a document I could read, a document I could reference that says we hereby don't want to be diluted?

Alain Bidron: I'm not sure I understand exactly what you are asking.

Tony Holmes: Where is the document that we are producing that's (unintelligible)?

Man: What was the origin of this that the GNSO says they want to be diluted, I mean what's the?

Tony Holmes: So we don't want to be diluted on the issue but the proposal to dilute (unintelligible), so what we're doing.

Man: Somebody took a vote or somebody made a statement, or something in writing that says we don't want to be diluted?

Man: I think proposals were brought to the working group and the working group is basically voting on whether they accept the proposals or not.

Man: Okay. Okay.

Man: The working group is saying they are not accepting that proposal.

Man: Okay. I understand. Thank you.

Alain Bidron: Recommendation 5 is a very strange one in my view, organization of NOMCOM by delegations. As I said, currently the NOMCOM works as a team, as a single team. I don't know, yes, I don't know. Oh, manageable would be a NOMCOM working by delegations. I don't even understand what it means exactly. It's far away, far away, the way the NOMCOM currently works.

Man: My problem really is transparency. My problem is the candidate (unintelligible). I got shouted down (unintelligible). A candidate should be public.

Tony Holmes: I think it's very hard to do that because to be quite honest it's difficult to generate new candidates all the time to get people to apply and I think part of that is, a lot of them don't want to show their hand and they...

Man: I don't want people running that won't show their hand.

Tony Holmes: Well, running for it.

Man: I don't want them (unintelligible) if they won't show their hand. It's very simple, you know, I don't want somebody running for the president of my country who doesn't want to say what his name is (unintelligible). Do you know what I mean?

Tony Holmes: That's where a lot of them come from. Do you not accept that a lot of people in this environment would not stand if they had to do it?

Man: I don't care. They are people, they are very inferior people. They're inferior. They don't deserve it then they shouldn't be in office if they won't stand for it. I'm serious. I mean, I have very strong feelings about it.

Man: I think we are talking about the structural issues with the NOMCOM but the place where I actually agree with (Barry) is that the original NOMCOM review that was done addressed issues like that. It talked very sensibly about for instance the confidentiality provisions, right, and the fact that you basically force participants in the NOMCOM to sign nondisclosure agreements, right, which I think is just plain wrong. And I think one of the great disappointments and I hope the ISP community actually says this, one of the great disappointments is that the board took no action on the NOMCOM review's recommendations.

Man: Look I have also that the (IACS) publically listed for a couple of months, before all the candidates were publically listed and comments were invited,

okay? And the (ASOACC), all of the candidates publically listed on the website had commented or invited but it's not like it's without precedence. It's not like that's not how anybody does it. In fact, some of the board users are done publically is the way it was (unintelligible). I mean, what I'm saying is not that radical, it is the current practice it's just not always the current practice.

Tony Holmes: One of the reasons that was put forward if I remember correctly was that we, these board seats, we were in a stage in the past certainly where they weren't remunerated and what we were trying to do is to get people with independence from outside sources and if they made it public they were standing and they actually held, let's say they held board seats or senior positions in business, then the view of their companies would be and you've got time to do what?

Man: But they don't stand.

Tony Holmes: So.

Man: They don't stand. I mean, I don't know...

Alain Bidron: But this is a...

((Crosstalk))

Alain Bidron: Maybe we can discuss later, this is not part of the proposal. Or the scope.

Man: I'll explain it, that this isn't the scope, unfortunately in the scope of the working group.

Alain Bidron: Yes, it's not in the scope.

Tony Holmes: The really distinction here is between (unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: What did you do, what clearly, the (unintelligible) is clearly that understand the proposal to change that, is that all the process really in the community is public and we try to reach, to inform as much as, all the process, all the processes regarding the NOMCOM are public and we inform as much as possible the community on what we are doing, all we are doing, and when we are doing. What we must respect is strict confidentiality regarding the applicants, information regarding individuals.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: We're very much over time now so we should move to the conclusions.

Alain Bidron: Okay. So, regarding the recommendation 6, as I said the leadership position would be sent from suite two so should that position be removed? As I said, this is something I cannot understand because this widespreading stability so I suggest you object to this proposal. Recommendation 7, removal of non-voting member role, we can I think support that clearly. We can support that.

Recommendation 8, (unintelligible) voting by delegation, it would be very, very complex in my view, even difficult to understand, would not demonstrate support for (unintelligible) in any way in view. It would be counter productive with the current working matter where NOMCOM works as a single team for it can benefit as a whole on the (unintelligible) single organization.

Man: I'm very sorry, just interested in this, isn't the suggestion that the NOMCOM doesn't work by voting right now?

Tony Holmes: No the reason this was put in was because there was an accusation made that people were voting in blocks. So what they have done, they have put in a mechanism where you can't really make that work. But the rationale for that is challengeable. I don't think that's ever been the case person. They put you in blocks so that you can't actually build votes in voting blocks the same way as you can if you're totally independent.

Man: So each one of those blocks has to vote as a group?

Man: Yes.

Tony Holmes: That was my understanding, yes.

Man: That's unbelievable.

Man: Exactly.

Alain Bidron: I agree with you.

Man: I just didn't understand it. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Alain Bidron: As I said, even difficult to understand, it works.

Tony Holmes: That was a problem that doesn't exist.

Man: I'm sorry, I just didn't understand. Thanks for explaining.

Man: (Unintelligible) make from real building blocks.

Alain Bidron: Recommendation 9 we can support, recommendation 10, leadership (unintelligible) commands committee selected (unintelligible) NOMCOM. I wonder why there is not such criteria now, it's very strange. I was convinced they had some criteria, but we discovered that there is not. So we could add is that the leadership should be selected by the ICANN community and by the board. We're selecting, the NOMCOM is selecting off of the board, seeing the board selecting the chair and chair elect. In my view it's a bit strange so changing that and to others, the share selected by the admitting committee is something that could be explored in my view.

Recommendations #11, #12, implement two years' term for share under removal of shared position, I would really address that. Regularly viewed NOMCOM share governments I think, not only we can support that, but there was 360 review of the share and share elects this year that was made public and there was also a 360 review of all NOMCOM members and we accepted to make that public to the organization. It will be sent to the organization selecting those people but also we accepted to make it fully public and published on the NOMCOM website.

Man: I think that ties into the idea of the one year where you can be reelected and two years where you can't. With the 360 that they are doing, it allows the people that put them there to find out were they doing the right things? Were they cooperating? Does the 360 say they should or should not be there? And you have a chance after one year to get them out. But if you put them in for two years, you don't have anything. And history seems to show that we're doing a good job and even though, you know, the 360s are happening, people are saying it looks like they were doing a good job so let's keep them for another year.

Man: Let me ask you a question about that, (Jim), if each organization that actually puts someone on the NOMCOM has, invents its own mechanism to actually select that individual, wouldn't each organization also have a mechanism by which to remove someone? Isn't that the answer to your? If the ISP's - a concrete example is, this would never, ever happen but if the ISP's were unhappy with the Alain and that is absolutely an impossibility...

Alain Bidron: I'm not...

Man: ...but say that happened and it was in the middle of that two year term, why wouldn't the ISP's have a mechanism to remove them?

Man: Well that would depend on the terms of the new NOMCOM. If the NOMCOM says two years and you can't take them out, then you can't take them out. But

there is no rule today because they are one year right now. If they move to two years, they would have to have some rule that says how do you kick them out if you want to?

Alain Bidron: So, if I understand well, you would prefer to stick to one year?

Man: I think one year is fine.

Tony Holmes: We could do two years if you had a mechanism to achieve that problem, if you had a mechanism to review (unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: This is consistent with the 360 review. Recommendation 14, succession planning, removal of the (unintelligible) reward of delegations, I think we can support that. Existing making NOMCOM appointments that is older than the board, my comment that there will be no appointments to the ISO council (unintelligible) to extend representation from one to five, so I would suggest to stick with one but to appoint someone to the ISO council. It's the only organization...

Tony Holmes: If they have a problem with geographic diversity, they can rotate that one.

Alain Bidron: Yes, can you move? (Unintelligible), for them impact would not create any sized problem in my view, so again I think we can support that, it will not change the (unintelligible) functioning of the NOMCOM and would solve the current issue where nonimpact is not represented, there was no appointee on NOMCOM and I think it is unfair, frankly. So we can solve it very easily in my view, not changing the overall NOMCOM which is working fine.

Tony Holmes: I have one proposal on this and I think we should include in our response and that is that we should support this but the rationale we were given the other evening was that that doesn't solve the problem because there is going to be another (unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: Yes. Yes.

Tony Holmes: And our response back I think we need to add is to say that this moves it forward in a way that resolves today's situation and the broader situation that could occur with the introduction of new constituencies should be resolved with the structural changes that are needed for ICANN, not specifically for this.

Alain Bidron: Absolutely. So, (unintelligible), I think the NOMCOM may have experienced some difficulties in the past but it was improved after 2010 when the review happened. That's a major problem in my view. They are trying to fix something that doesn't exist anymore. It works. I think even if (unintelligible) proposal carries huge risks would marginalize business on GNSO first, would make the functioning of the NOMCOM incredibly complex, oversize NOMCOM with 27 appointees who are fine, 15 members would be 27, unmanageable in my view.

(Unintelligible) works. I think it was a top down approach, top down approach from three board members. It isn't needed, it is counter productive, so the proposal I have suggests the status on nonvoting members with unlimited terms to voting members and that wouldn't impact appointee first op.

Tony Holmes: Firstly, thank you very much for a great presentation and the amount of work that you've done on that. That's really impressive. In particular, pulling out that research on regional diversity, which was - with that in mind, I would certainly give my support to your proposals how we approach this. I would just add one other thing that I think we would like to submit in response on this, which is a word of regret that the time when there is so much that is so time pressing, something that was so unnecessary was forced upon us to take up so much of our time.

Man: You've done tremendous work and I completely agree with all your assessments of the situation. I wanted to quickly comment on

recommendation 2, which was firmly rejected, the one that would greatly divert, dilute our power. We have seen in the formation of many of these cross community working groups how time and time again it seems that we are being forced into trying to take the three components of our three constituencies and try to give them one vote, and it never, ever works. And so if there's a way that we can carry back a no, never, the three of us cannot stand with one vote in this process. We are too unlike. It would be tremendously helpful, I think.

Man: Well thank you (Sal). Hello. The last question I have here, I have seen the NOMCOM at the time being has - the BC have two delegations where this has come from and what is the, let me say is that a point which could be let me say taken by this (unintelligible) in order to compress it more and more? What is the rationale for that? That the BC has to...

Alain Bidron: I think my understanding that one appointee from busy from route business, just appointees from small business, and they try to make that as diverse as possible.

Man: We also have large businesses and small businesses.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: For me is one question and that is (unintelligible), you know we had it in other areas, you know, where we also we were forced to provide say a common representative from the CSG. If that comes up and what worries in the position of us to do that, the question, it says okay, let's do it that way that the CSG could delegate as many as constituencies are able, delegates but it is not a must that each constituency must delegate one. It could be also, you know, from other source. That question may arise as well.

Tony Holmes: If I can just respond on that, I think there's an issue there but only if it arises. I think we should say nothing about that currently, just leave that and if it

comes back as a result of the input they've got then we'll face it then. There are issues there that we could comment on but I don't think it's appropriate to do it outside the context of a set of proposals that we commented back on that don't include that. Tony?

Tony Harris: I, too, would like to thank Alain for I think it was a great report and I very much agree with Alain's proposals and my perception is having talked to some board members last night is it was particularly stressed by one of the board members with the background in RIR, specifically (Aaron). I think the crux of this intent to change, we are trying to empower our RIR's in the NOMCOM is absolutely inane because RIR's don't want to have anything to do with ICANN. They have set up the NRO and they want to run their own show. I mean, this is a known fact. I'm not revealing any hidden secret. And it's fine. I mean, I can't imagine why they would be interested in participating in election of board members in ICANN.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I'm sorry, where are they not independent? I mean, operational.

Tony Holmes: I would quite like to leave politics out of this if possible (unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: I know that the proposal to extend the nominees from the GAC from one to three was made without any consultation with a GAC and it was rejected by some of the GAC members correctly. I would not be surprised that a proposal to extend from one to five, the nominees coming from the original registries, I would not be surprised that it was made without any consultation with the original (unintelligible) registries communities.

Tony Holmes: Right.

Alain Bidron: I would not be surprised by that.

Tony Holmes: Yes. Me neither. Okay well, great, (Mark)?

(Mark): I just have one thing very, very quickly and that is that in the ISP's response, one of the things I would hope that you say, I don't know who is drafting it, but one of the things that would be great to say is that while we have this response to their structural reforms, it's also clear that NOMCOM has been reviewed and operational reforms were proposed and I think the ISP should point to that and say that the board should take those operational concerns, some of which (Barry) talked about into account. And I do think I actually really like the idea of expressing some regret that this top down counter productive proposal has wasted so much of our time, despite the excellent work of Alain and the remarks of Tony about the ASO which are true.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay with that, (Olivier)?

Man: I said we should waste (unintelligible), it's a very important topic so we should use as Tony always said our law in formal context because there are board members to express our views...

Tony Holmes: Certainly.

Man: ...because it's very important.

Tony Holmes: Yes, definitely. Well, thank you everyone for your participation. I apologize for running on and meeting closed. Thank you.

END