

ICANN
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group
Tuesday, 14 October 2014

Part IV

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.

Keith Drazek: Okay welcome back from the technical break. So we will - so (Jonathan) back over to you for some wrap up remarks on the GNSO council agenda and then we'll move to the NTAG update.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Keith and thanks Edmon I think it was and (Rubens) who gave that input. That was useful to hear. I guess what I would - what would be helpful (unintelligible). Oh and (Maxim) wants to say something. So let me just hold for that. Make your comment and then I'll try and pick it up.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Short notice it would be good idea to request the full report when it's like safe from security side of things because currently ICANN has that - there is some information in this full report which might be helpful for some particular set of devices. But actually they might be overextension of what I can deep based on the report in comparison to what is inside the report.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks (Maxim). So what I've done is I've sent to the list the PDF document which is a sort of summary of or a related document to that which Francisco presented to us. Essentially the question is twofold really right now. Any input that you've given now I wouldn't mind a kind of summary to the list addressed to the registry councilors. And ideally that should come to the council via either Ching or Brett as the two sort of operative councilors. Of course I'm also a councilor but I've got another job to do on the council. So it would be great to get any points you want made in that discussion through

onto the council via the councilors. Once we've done that we've got a little time to then say well do we want to convert any of that into a form of motion for the council.

Now the motion could be review existing expired names policy. No need to take any action in respect to officer called name collision or you may think there's one or more policy, you know, you might want to motivate for an issues report and put a motion in for that. So that's - I mean we need to sort of use the mechanisms available to us. So but first of all and just in the short term for tomorrow's meeting it would be great to get any sort of email content from Edmon, (Maxim), (Rubens) any of you and just address it to the Brett, Ching and myself and say look here's some info for the discussion that you might want to raise for the group. Yes well I mean but (Donna)'s not on for the functional part of the council meeting tomorrow. So for the purposes of tomorrow that's okay.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Jonathan) and we should probably take this moment actually - I don't know if Ching is in the room. I don't think he is right now but he has served the registry stakeholder group exceedingly well on the council, on the GNSO council for several years now. And this will be his last official meeting on the council before Donna takes over. So we should be making sure that we thank Ching for his hard work and excellent representation of our interests in the group often at odd hours of the morning or evening or whatever time he was dialing into various council calls. So we should make a note. I wish he were here for it but I think we should all give him a round of applause and thank him personally.

Okay so with that let us move now to (Steve) for an MTAG update and (Steve) over to you.

Steve Machin: Thanks Keith. Excuse me. Not a usually lengthy update from the NTAG. The focus really seems to be on the future very much, the future of the NTAG, the future rounds discussion. That the kind of event horizon of things that are

being considered seems to have moved out considerably away from the kind of immediate challenges that the NTAG's faced in the preceding 12 months. Specifically the discussions recently have focused around auctions. Auctions now have moved into an operating mode with a lot of the challenges around auctions were resolved. We had some very good dialogue with staff, very responsive, helped us work through that - those issues.

The contentious topic around auctions is now use of funds of the proceeds which again for the record is something that I know that this group and the NTAG feels very strongly about and it's been raised at a number of meetings internally and with staff this week. The ExCom staff meeting on Sunday just again to restate this there's definitely a sense that the board intends to put at least some guidance around the process that will be in place before Marrakesh. There was some talk about the clearly the use of the funds being different based on the amount that there ends up being.

There's some clarity around the number of auctions that are being participated in for the ICANN process being significantly lower than those scheduled and that the amount of funds that will be available is highly unpredictable at this point but the sense I think from all of us is that the process really just needs to be really defined now. And there was a commitment to defining that process and involving the community in that process was my understanding from the discussions that I've seen. So I'm very pleased about that.

The other contentious issue is indirect contention and there's a separate working session planned later this afternoon and another one tomorrow. It's been a little bit ad hoc to pull that together. It's a very, very complex issue and some of the rules need to be worked through by those applicants expected and staff are working I'd say pretty - well reasonably diligently on getting those resolved. So that's good.

Community priority evaluation there was obviously some announcements last week and they're being worked through and there are a number of priority applications that are yet to be called. That process is really just ongoing. And then really the future of the NTAG was another topic for discussion with really the hot topic actually about how we should go ahead with maintaining or not maintaining a differential voice within the registry group for UCLBs. And I don't get the sense that that's resolved right now. It's something that's definitely going to be on future agendas for discussion. So look forward to reporting back on that. And there will be XCOM elections for the NTAG in November. That's pretty much the update from the NTAG...

Keith Drazek: Excellent. Thanks very much (Steve). Any questions? Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Steve). The, you know, more I think about it I made this comment just before we broke I think to go meet with the board. The more I think about it I really dislike the idea of letting the board take the lead on the process for deciding what to do with auction funds. We're going to be in the same boat we were with the IANA transition and ICANN accountability. And this is an GNSO issue. If they do it everybody in the community will have equal say and I don't think everybody in the community should have equal say. It think they should have input but I think it should be a GNSO process and GNSO processes are open to everybody. But to make that happen the GNSO council's going to have to have a motion for I guess an issues report on that would be the first step. Somebody correct me if you think there's another way.

And I think that is going to need to happen very soon after this meeting. It can't happen this week because we're way past the deadline for motions for the council. But if we have time Keith I think, you know, five, ten minutes of discussion on that to see if other people are thinking the same way I am on this. It's not that we don't want other people to be involved but the bottom line this is a GNSO issue. And we should take the lead on it. If we wait for the board we know what will happen and we'll be in the same boat we've been in

the last few weeks on these other issues. Now we came - we've made some significant improvements on those other issues but why even let this get to that point on this particular topic.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Chuck. Sounds like it's something we probably should talk about but let me just take a moment to thank (Steve) for the NTAG update. And I wanted to note a couple of things before we come back to that discussion. You know, the question perfectly understandable and legitimate question about, you know, sort of the future of NTAG, the future of a possible interest group within the registry stakeholder group for new TLD applicants. I've had conversations here this week that I believe that the GO TLDs may be looking to form an interest group within the registry stakeholder group. Obviously we've heard from the brand registries that they're interested in having some sort of, you know, structure.

So I think all of those conversations are actually very healthy and we ought to have those conversations and it's one of the reasons that we have an evolution working group. So again I'm plugging the evolution working group for anybody that wants to participate. But our registry stakeholder group, our stakeholder group structure allows for interest groups. And we would as a stakeholder group welcome the formation of groups of individual registries or groups of registries that want to self-identify around a particular interest. And that's part of our process. So I think nobody should be worried about taking that step.

So with that thank you (Steve) and let's go ahead and Chuck to answer your question we do have five or ten minutes to talk that through. So let's go ahead and do it. Anybody want to jump in? (Jonathan) I saw your hand go up a minute ago.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Sorry Edmon. Go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So I do think that, you know, what Chuck just mentioned I think it is the right approach for the GNSO to take a lead on it and we should be proactive on it too. As the board or staff is procrastinating on the issue we should better, you know, get it started. The question is - the first process I guess is get an issues report and perhaps that goes to the council. One thing though that I would add is that, you know, this is going to be a likely an issue that many would want to weigh in. So I guess in the political atmosphere of things we need to be careful of how it's being viewed as well. I do believe that GNSO should take a lead but, you know, we don't want to make - we want to make very sure that it is, you know, others are, you know, invited to participate as well. So but Chuck already mentioned that. But I just want to emphasize that a little bit because it will be viewed as a highly interested matter I guess.

Chuck Gomes: If I can just -- this is Chuck -- respond very quickly. Everybody else in the community really likes spending money that the GNSO generates.

Keith Drazek: And that's been true for a long, long time. So I guess my initial reaction was I have to admit that I think I was approaching this thinking more in terms of the community as a whole having input into the process. I completely understand why we might want to consider, you know, the GNSO taking the lead. I think there are arguments for that but I - my just my gut reaction is I wonder whether we're creating enemies to what we ultimately want which is community based recommendations and decision making on the disposition of those funds. Are we creating divisions within the community that are unnecessary?

And do we risk putting it back into the hands of the board and the staff by creating divisions in the community? For example if we don't have ALAC standing next to us, if we don't have others standing next to us to figure out how to best spend these proceeds consistent with ICANN's narrow technical remit and mission and scope and focus, you know, do we risk sort of not

getting to where we want to be. So just a question. I haven't made certainly any decisions in my own mind on it.

Chuck Gomes: Keith this is Chuck again. If I can respond. First of all your first part is right and I'm fully aware of that as you can tell by my comments that we've got to approach this smartly and make it clear that all - that everyone is welcome to participate in the GNSO process and probably reemphasize that over and over again. But the second risk is not a risk at all. The board's going to do it if we don't. So we're not - there's no risk in us doing this in terms of the board taking it over because they - that's the plan right now anyway.

Keith Drazek: So my - what I was thinking Chuck was not an issues report coming from the GNSO moving towards a PDP. What I was thinking was - about was a cross community working group that involves everybody but is a community based bottom up consensus process not in the hands of the board or staff. So that's the angle that I was taking. I understand that what you're suggesting is maybe it shouldn't be a cross community working group involving SSAC and GAC and, you know, ALAC and ccNSO. Rather controlled by the - controlled or at least initiated by the GNSO And I think that's what we need to decide. So when I say I see a potential risk it's alienating all those other community groups thinking the GNSO is making a power play for that money.

Chuck Gomes: Yes Chuck again and I agree. That I thought was the first part of your point. The risk of the board doing it instead of us I mean that's going to happen if we do nothing. So that's what I was saying. But if let's understand. If we do a cross community working group based on the historical model that we've been following then all of the participating SOs and ACs will have to approve the charter. They will have to approve the final recommendations and granted they probably wouldn't be too fond of it but I'm not sure that they should have approval rights.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Reasonable topic for discussion obviously. So I got Ken and Edmon. Who else? Ken go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes. I'm a firm believer that we need to get out in front of it and frankly I think your - the proposal or the thoughts you've been floating Keith make a lot of sense. In the long run if we don't get out in front of it first of all we know what the risks are in getting out in front of it. Chuck's outlined them as well. Wouldn't you rather have a situation where you had to get by the conflicts and the controversies and angst that you're going to have in a cross community working group and arrive at a product at least you can point to and say this was our product as opposed to living with whatever the board decides to do. I believe that it only adds more credibility to the process in doing it this way and we all know that everybody's going to have a dog in the hunt.

So I'd rather do it that way than to sit around and try to do it let's say in the GNSO or something like that where I think you're going to run into a real problem and I would completely agree that there will be communities that will feel that they were marginalized in a deal like that. So using the model that we used in response recently to me makes a lot more sense.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Ken. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Edmon here. So I - on this particular topic actually I'm a big fan of cross community working group as most people probably know. But this particular issue I think it should be a GNSO PDP. We can make it clear on the outset to invite the others and we can even go so far as to invite others to adopt the same charter or co-work into the future but ultimately if this group is created as a cross community working group I worry that, you know, the GNSO will have to challenge it later to say that we - wait we still need to do our PDP anyway. Right because this is relevant to the GNSO. So rather than doing that I think, you know, we can. My feeling is that probably better for GNSO to step in and say, you know, we're starting this and we'd like to invite all the others to do it as well either participate in the working group or even making it a joint charter as we move along. But that's, you know, I guess that's my feel.

Ken Stubbs: Can I respond?

Keith Drazek: Sure. Ken go ahead. Then (Reg).

Ken Stubbs: Just a very quick response. I see the only argument for saying it's within the purview of the GNSO is why not. It's our money because in the long run that's how people are going to perceive it. And if we try to capture that part of a process there - I just think you take a real risk. Either that or the board is just going to step in and say you're wrong from the very beginning. We said this, this, this and this. This is not within the purview of the GNSO so you can do whatever you're going to do. Remember we're giving advice to the board even on a PDP that they can override.

Keith Drazek: So I think we'll probably have to go back and look at the specific language in the applicant guidebook or wherever the board resolution or decision was constituted to make sure that we understand the language. You know, is it - did it say that it would be a GNSO decision? Did it say it would be a community decision or input or this or that? So we need to go back to that language I think. But this is obviously a really important issue and a topic in terms of strategy and approach. And obviously there's a couple of different perspectives here but I think both are valid. (Reg) go ahead.

Reg Levy: Thanks Keith. I think you're absolutely right that we need to start at the AGB level and see what it actually said about it but based on what we find there I think we should put it up for a public comment and say hey this is coming up. The board is not doing anything. We the community are doing something and we welcome everybody's comments on based on this language from the AGB how do you think we should proceed and then of course there is again the GNSO and whomever can submit a comment and then from there when the board makes a decision on what they're going to do about it they'll have the communities input already.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Reg). I've got (Stephanie) and then (Donna) and then Edmon.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I was able to pull the language in the guidebook. I don't know if we want to go through this now or if you want me to circulate it to the list based on how we're doing for time.

Keith Drazek: So why don't you - I don't know how long it is but...

Stephanie Duchesneau: It's not too long.

Keith Drazek: You want to read it and then send it? Thanks.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes sure. The purpose of an auction is resolve contention in a clear objective manner. It's a plan that all costs of a new GLTD program will be offset by fees so any funds coming in from a last resort contention resolution mechanisms such as an auction would result after paying for the auction process in additional funding. Any proceeds from auctions will be reserved and earmarked until the uses of funds are determined. Funds must be used in a manner that supports directly ICANN's mission and core values and also allows ICANN to maintain its not for profit status.

Possible uses of auction funds include formation of a foundation with a clear mission and a transparent way to allocate funds to projects that are of interest to the greater internet community such as grants to support new GTLD applications or registry operators from communities in subsequent GTLD rounds, the creation of an ICANN administered community based fund for specific projects for the benefit of the internet community, the creation of a registry continuity fund for the protection of registrants ensuring that funds would be in place to support the operation of a GTLD registry until a successor could be found or the establishment of a security fund to expand use of secure protocols, conduct research and support standards development organizations in accordance with ICANN security and stability mission.

Keith Drazek: So that's actually a lot more explicit than I recalled and it didn't say anything about - I didn't hear the word community in there. I didn't hear the word GNSO certainly. So anyway sorry. So I've got a queue. Who - I lost the queue. Where was I? I know (Jonathan) had his hand up. All right so (Jonathan), (Donna), Edmon, no sorry (Jonathan). Two (Jonathan)s.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes so thanks. It's (Jonathan). I think it's very helpful to get that input because that's the first thing I would have said we need as well. I was going to support that point. Having got that and listened to it careful it strikes me that it's explicit and doesn't define who should do that. I think we as a community broadly beyond the GNSO are in a very powerful position right now to seize this initiative. I think the risk and I think this is the risk you were trying to articulate Keith is that if we hold onto it - if we take a lead at the GNSO the risk is that the board finds within that wording the ability to hold onto the control of it.

Whereas if we deal with it more broadly than the GNSO I think the board will find it much more difficult to hold onto it given the current dynamic. So that's the balancing act. I mean we would perhaps gain more control as the GNSO but a greater degree of risk that we wouldn't get hold of it - the issues properly. If we had it as a cross community working group the risk is that we have less control but that cross community group would almost certainly be able to hold onto it. So I think that feels to me like the balance. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Jonathan). (Donna)?

Donna Austin: Thanks (Donna Austin). I wonder if there's some valuing kind of taking a lesson from the ICT of that community. So perhaps it's worth our thinking about the GNSO decides what they want to do it. The ccNSO gives some thought to it. The ALAC gives some thought to it. The GAC gives some thought to it. And then perhaps there's a moderating of those considerations because I think the reality is is that this is going to get pretty contentious

because they all have their different interest groups and things that they want to kind of throw money at. So maybe it's worthwhile doing it separately but there's some kind of coordination level across that work that has a moderation of some sort. I think it's worth thinking about.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Donna. Hold on a second Ken. I've got Edmon, then (Jonathan) and then Ken.

Edmon Chung: So agree with the cross community working group. I changed my mind. No not really changed but I think we - I still think we need a kind of an issues report of sort because we need to go back to some historical stuff. And it's not just the AGB. It's the JAS, the other JAS, the joint applicant support group also discussed about the use of option funds. And that report finally was adopted by the board. So there are multiple, you know, at least there are these two areas that we need to look into and that's why I guess we should start the work is really what the point is.

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks Edmon. (Jonathan) then Ken.

Jonathan Frost: In my participation in the policy and implementation working group the general feeling is that and - is that the GNSO has the right to interpret its own policies and clarify its own policies. Now I mean I don't think that's - I don't think what we just read is quite as specific. I mean it was created pursuant to a GNSO policy. It's not quite as specific because it doesn't say it's going to be - if I remember right not going to spend - be spent on one of these things. It's for example it could be spent on something like this. So it still leaves it open. I mean so as a matter of strategy I'm not offering an opinion one way or the other but I think that we would be within our right to handle it as a GNSO matter and think of it as interpreting a pre-existing policy which we have a right to do.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Yes. Fair point. Ken then Brett.

Ken Stubbs: Well just taking a look at human behavior and ICANN history if this thing gets too contentious ICANN's going to take the easiest way out. And the easiest way out is to give it to a foundation and let the foundation take the heat as to where it's going to go. And it resolves all the conflicts and it's not ICANN's issue anymore. It's a foundation. That was actually if you go back far enough in the history that's what they originally talked about. Is we're going to set up a foundation and there were actually just off the side there were actually side deals made as to who was going to administer it at one time. But the point is that that would be the most logical thing to do if I was the directors. I'd say the hell with it. I don't need this crap. I'm not going to have everybody mad at me because I didn't give them the money. I'm going to find like they've done before. What did they do? They passed everything off to consultants and outsiders so they can point at them and say well wait a minute. It's not our decision. We're doing it that way. You know, I don't think they want the money. That's the attitude I also get from the directors. None of the directors want to deal with this crap. They all know what's going to happen.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Ken. Brett?

Brett Fausett: Thanks. I think the point that we ought to deal with is now is well taken and I think we as your councilors need to figure out the best way to tee that up. The one thing that worries me a little bit is characterizing this as our money, as GNSO money. I worry that it's not really that different than our registry fees that we pay to ICANN. I mean it's revenue into ICANN. It would be the same as us trying to take control of ICANN's entire budget because most of the money comes from us. I guess just because it comes from us I wouldn't call it our money. So the GNSO may well decide that it wants to do something on its own and we may decide as your councilors with your advice that that's the best way to do it as a GNSO activity. But let's just be careful as to how we characterize it along the way.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Agreed. Absolutely agreed. Okay any further discussion on this topic before we move on? Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Just one point. What I was going to suggest earlier was that we could consider raising this. I mean it's the GNSO council open meeting tomorrow. I'm not sure we've got a well - having heard the discussion now I'm not sure we've got a well enough formed view to do anything at this stage. So it's probably and putting it out there in the open like that might risk it getting out of control too early. So but that was what I - that was the option I was going to offer.

Man: Yes quick point of order to our GNSO chair here. If we want to ask for an issue report does that require a motion or can we - it does require a motion. So we can't do it tomorrow. Okay. All right. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. Yes so (Jonathan) my response - my initial reaction is I don't think there's anything wrong with teeing up the discussion, sort of laying the groundwork for the future saying look this is something the community needs to lead and that we need to start talking about it or considering it. But I think getting into the level of detail that we just did I think would be premature. I don't think we have a, you know, well enough formed opinion or position to be able to go to that, you know, to those depths.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry a very brief response then. I wonder - so my question then really is do we retain the element of surprise - be an option. We could raise it with the council and thereby the community or we could just hold off until we were - had thought about it more. My concern is that it puts it in play at that point when perhaps we might want to think about it some more. So, you know, that's - I'm open minded but that's the balancing fact I think. So anyone who thinks that they - that it could be raised in the open meeting we could have a discussion as I say to kick it off. But the risk is that we put it in play even as far as the board is concerned, not that they'll be paying too much attention to what's going on tomorrow.

Keith Drazek: Yes but thanks (Jonathan). And again I think my reaction is I think this topic of auction proceeds and we can extend it to also the excess application fees has been on the table. It's been discussed this week already. So I think teeing it up for consideration or saying hey this is something we're going to need to think about and maybe sooner rather than later wouldn't be a surprise to anybody. It wouldn't be giving anything away and we don't have to say - you don't have to couch it in a way that says, you know, the GNSO council needs to decide whether we're going to ask for an issues report. You can just hey look as a whole community or as the GNSO we need to start thinking about this. But I think I'd be okay with holding off if you felt more comfortable doing that too.

Jonathan Robinson: And so on the basis of that argument I'm happy but it would be - I mean I could raise it myself under any other business but I'd be very open to anyone speak - standing up in the public mike and just saying look have you guys thought about this and what do you want to do about it. So that's something to think about.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks (Jonathan). All right so let's draw a line under that one. And with that we will move on to stakeholder group business and I'm going to hand it over to Paul Diaz, our alternate chair for wrapping up this part of the meeting. Thanks Paul.

Paul Diaz: Sure. Thanks Keith and we're doing well time-wise folks so if we can keep it going we might even get out a little early. Quick update on evolution working group and we did touch on it just a little while ago. Remember that we coined the name of the group because this is the group that looked at our charter and we're evolving. We're bringing it up to date. There are a number of issues that are in the charter currently that need to be updated, clarifications made. The first iteration of the working group produced those recommendations. We circulated on the list.

In the interim - so we did that the beginning of June. In the interim a couple of other issues have come forward. And because the charter changed once we agree to it, we approve, we vote, it's all great, well there's still an ICANN approval process that we have to go through and that's going to be time consuming. Conservatively it'll take six months. It could take longer. So the idea is measure twice, cut once. We really want to make sure that we've addressed all the things that are pressing in front of us. So we reconstituted the group and again for everybody these various issues that are out there and things that we're hearing now perhaps the future of NTAG what interest group means. If you look at the charter and don't think it fully addresses your views or your positions by all means join the group.

We had a call last week. We started the process. We initially looked at issues like election terms for officers. There's others out there about selection of the board council seat, (Bruce Tonkin)'s seat. A question about perhaps adding another officer position, a secretary position. So we'd have four elected officers. There's more still to do. We're going to work hard to get through the issues as quickly as we can so we can come back to the full - to the group with a marked up very easy to understand and see the changes proposal for the full slate of recommended changes to our charter. Put it to the vote and then initiate the ICANN approval process.

But for any of these issues again we have a working group. We have a mailing list. If you're interested please see me. See Cherie. We'll get you added to the list and as we continue to move forward and make progress we'll provide updates to everybody but we are going to try and drive hard to get through the review process and get the recommendations out in front of everybody to digest, to think about and then put to a vote.

Keith Drazek: All right questions about Evo? Okay. Feng are you here? Here we go. Very good. Do you need to project your slides? Do you just want to speak to it? You shared them on the list. Do you want to go through the - let me rephrase that. There's a lot of slides. It might be difficult to go through the whole thing

but at least if you want to highlight certain ones. Okay then we yield the floor.
It's yours.

Feng Guo: (Unintelligible) a chance to give this presentation. And there are several slides. The first one just to see the number is good for us and we are number in China. But unfortunately the number is good for market people and for (unintelligible) a technical guy the most thing we face is challenges and the new requirement. As the hardest program for us is (unintelligible). Our company has several years to managing the - but, you know, in China the INSAC deployment is kind of slow and otherwise the top few (unintelligible). So we didn't have (unintelligible). Especially we also do not have the manufacturing to provide (unintelligible). So we get some problems and as you know several (unintelligible). And the reason is (unintelligible).

So the point here is that according to the I documents there are things that service has done. We have two (unintelligible) but some according to advisor know the (unintelligible) of ICANN is that only if we update the (unintelligible) call to ICANN it can (unintelligible) 24 hours. There - obviously we are taking steps. And if we normally when the NSAC service is crushed and we need to join the key and submit (unintelligible). So if ICANN can only (unintelligible) we can cover our services. I think this is a problem for us.

And also (unintelligible) I referred to ICANN architecture and that we also have research that we think update efficiency matching is very high. There is some informants can be done for the (unintelligible) so different. So this is the first challenge. And the second one is service pick up. It means that if our service is cross and it cannot be currently in (unintelligible) it means our server needs to be transfer to another one. Currently we only back half of the (unintelligible) and we just do data. No key. No case. So we are wondering if we transfer our service to another third party without key he cannot update their own. They cannot resign their (unintelligible). So it's a problem. I don't know their procedures currently. There are no detailed supplement to tell us how this process will be performed.

And the third one is the SRA as we call it. And I think there - for SRA it's better from no across the world. And the - we also have the - our own monetary system to test our service level. But, you know, there (unintelligible) China and all side China is not stable. There is a lot of competition modifying it. So we thinking maybe if we add model in China or in either because our (unintelligible) in China. So I think maybe we add model in China to test our services more fair.

Last one is just we think it's controversial but I also want to mention it here. ICANN collect some data from us. For example we need to provide weekly report also to involve (unintelligible) data as I mentioned. But some data is we push data to ICANN and some data ICANN just pull data from us. And as more new detail is I think it's not efficient for ICANN to get this from us. And normally when the network not good ICANN will just try maybe once and they failed and the several days recap to notify that is failed. But if we push the data we can make sure. At least that's our best to push the data to ICANN. So I think for data production the push matter is more efficient. (Unintelligible) that's all.

Paul Diaz: Okay Feng. Thank you. I have to admit that when I reviewed the slides a lot of the technical issue is not my expertise. So I'm not sure of the folks in the room but you're a registry and you've got an issue. So this is what we're here to help with. My basic question is the challenges you're facing any other colleagues in China will have a similar concern right, similar issues? It's not unique to your technology, your architecture.

Feng Guo: Yes.

Paul Diaz: This is a China - let's call it a China-related issue right? Because of the - whether it's internet connections or the other issues that you've identified in keys for DNSAC issues right?...

Feng Guo: Yes.

Paul Diaz: So I guess the next question is have you discussed or raised these issues with anybody, any other groups within ICANN or did you want to start here and then we can do introductions and work with the various groups? I mean compliance was here. There's a compliance piece to it. Certainly the GDD Akram's staff, I mean there advocates or supposed to be at least. Or go straight to the technical people both at (IANA) and elsewhere in the organization?

Feng Guo: Yes. Yesterday we discussed (unintelligible) with ICANN's I think it's the CTO.

Sophia Feng: CTO.

Feng Guo: Yes CTO. Yes so they know these issues.

Paul Diaz: David?

Feng Guo: Yes. And they know the issues. And he also agree with there is a lot of improvement can be done (unintelligible). So for - so this is not the only cross. But someone just I mentioned the monitor know that the deploy in China this may be an issue for Chinese (unintelligible) comment. And the problem he also agreed with that some parameters in the SLA should be evaluated and rechecked. And sometimes he think all thing is crazy yes.

Paul Diaz: Yes and questions and concerns about SLAs are - you've heard throughout the day today. There are a lot of related issues. There are sort of subtle agreement concerns. So I think the best thing is can we talk right after this and we'll introduce you to people on ICANN staff so we can deal with your issue. But we do want to expand this to it is going to impact anybody operating in China. And necessarily there's probably even, you know, on the registrar side some concerns especially in terms of well maybe not with data

but regardless. Can we follow up with this and go direct to - we'll get you to the people you need at ICANN to start getting these issues addressed.

Sophia Feng: Just I think to his point I think some of the issues is not specifically related to China. For example nodes that located in different countries then also need to - the detection nodes need to be spread over across globe. So not just from certain of the countries. And so the outside it looks really bad for some of the registries. So I think talking to ICANN staff is good to actually to start the conversations but I'm looking into because everything is stating RA and all the parameters is stating RA and all this change in RA also need to probably have a button up policy modification and (unintelligible) that could be generated from GNSO because it's already from the registry group. Because this is also concerning where the registry bridge of the compliance that could be a thought.

Paul Diaz: Yes. And I want to be very careful not to in any way call it a China problem. Very quick slip of the tongue but certainly we can - we will address that. And let's start while we're all here and while ICANN staff is available for face to face discussions because it's probably going to be a process that will take time but let's get it started now. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. Some questions for you. I looked at your presentation this morning and first of all a very general question. Are the problems that you're anticipating there related to DNSAC? Is that correct?

Feng Guo: Some part is. The first one...

Chuck Gomes: The first one is. So when you say the update system or root server system isn't efficient enough to make sure that DS could be updated in time do you know - I mean do you know what time it typically takes? I don't in terms of the IANA to deal with that now?

Feng Guo: Currently there is a guarantee that in 24 hours they're up and will take effect.

Chuck Gomes: And you don't think they can do that with yours, update it in 24 hours?

Feng Guo: No but in the RA document it said that we have to recover our (unintelligible) in four hours.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay. That's - obviously I'm kind of like Paul. I'm not - this isn't my area of expertise. So okay so well that's a very - that's something that's pretty clear that we could comment on. I don't know that we need to talk to any other experts if in fact there's an inconsistency there in terms of their SLA and our contractual requirement. Is that correct?

Feng Guo: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well that - Paul that's not something we need to - that's something we could actually communicate as a registry stakeholder group to them and show the disconnect there. The other thing on slide eight you said dynamic update is more efficient than generating new zone and reload. So I take it that's not necessarily related to DNSAC. That's more general of the root zone updates?

Feng Guo: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Because they happen fairly frequently, not totally dynamic but they happen several times a day right?

Feng Guo: Yes. Currently the system we just updated we published the new long test one day. So it's very unfrequently (sic).

Chuck Gomes: Unfrequently(sic)?

Feng Guo: I mean suggest happened twice one day.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so twice a day and so you're suggesting that the root server be updated like dynamically. In other words.

Feng Guo: No dynamic update is just a feature. We just - the dynamic here means that the server no need to restart. And the - and we want to put point here is that the update efficiency for the root server system just I mentioned it's only twice one day to publish the new nodes. For example if you have new data to submit to the subsystem maybe you get one day to ticket that. But if you use a dynamic update that's another week to do updates. It could be seconds or minutes. So I as we just - we guarantee our customer if hey updates maybe add one dominant it will be in minutes to take effect.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. No I appreciate that. By the way just a little historical information I go back far enough with NSI that we only did a couple of times a week. So things have changed a lot. But thanks for the clarification.

Feng Guo: You're welcome.

Paul Diaz: Okay so we will continue to push this, work with you, work with staff and move forward. And then as issues that will impact the broader stakeholder group as we have our conversations this week we can report back to the group because I think Chuck's right. Some of the issues you have identified are specific to your operations and then others are things that the entire stakeholder group will be interested in pushing forward. So we'll come back to the group with that.

Feng Guo: Okay. That will be great. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay. All right Cherie or Sue we can give you a few minutes or you want to talk about outreach effort?

Cherie Stubbs: Hi this is Cherie and we won't spend much time on this. But I just wanted to first of all introduce I think this morning we neglected to introduce Sue

Schuler who came on board some months ago and has been helping with a lot of data management tasks for the registry we've grown this these past 18 months. And with that we've - I certainly and I think the membership at large has been very sensitive to the need to try and be a little more proactive and work on outreach to welcome and engage and orient all of the new registries that have - are coming online or have come online. And with that have been trying to be a little bit thoughtful about communications for one. I'm sure you all probably have seen this brochure. We put it together rather hurriedly but it's been plastered all over the building.

So it's just information, basic information doing like people to please contact us for further information about joining. As well as one thing that's ongoing and has been since first contract sign is every time a new GTLD applicant signs their contract with ICANN they're receiving a welcome letter from us along with a fact sheet trying to answer some questions. And again trying to engage them and get them some understanding as to why it would benefit them to join the registries. And they've been working with the GDD for the portal. They've been working with Ann Yamashita with the portal. We're working - Chuck and I have been working with the fellowship program about underserved regions.

And Sue and I have fortunately been able to collaborate and work on a few projects one of which is a new Web site design. And our current Web site has met a need over the years but has been rather what I consider static and not very user friendly. So with that we are - I'm going to have Sue just show you a few windows but we've also met with the ICANN IT staff who really manage all the Web sites for ICANN including the GNSO. So we are going to be linking and communicating back and forth. So the information on our Web site will be more in real time about project updates, who's on what working group, the status of GNSO issues, resolutions and likewise they will be posting information up about us for feature stories, events. So in a nutshell that's kind of what the last couple of months have been activities going on behind the

scene. And Sue if you would like to spend a couple minutes and just quickly show them some of the features.

Sue Schuler: Yes. This is Sue Schuler. I apologize to the people that are with us remotely. You will not be able to see this on the screen. But I would like to share the new Web site that I've been working on. Cherie tasked me with two things and that was to make a Web site that would be a much more useful tool for you when you're going back to look for information and something that would be attractive to a new GTLD looking for information about becoming a member.

So this is the home page. And I've already had Jordyn come in on that. The graphic yes I guess I'm a child of the 80s. But anyway I welcome any input. Obviously this was put together with my ideas but it was supposed to be a tool for you. So if something isn't working for you please just send me information and I am glad to update the Web site. You can see that I do have some buttons on the home page that will link them to probably the major or what I considered the major areas of the Web site. But and then of course across the top they can link to everything also.

The about us web page has all of your officers plus your membership roster which I update almost daily now it seems like and then your mission statement. It also has a drop down for all of your working groups. We had talked to ICANN's staff and we would like to add some links onto this to link to some of the other working groups as well.

Cherie Stubbs: And again we're trying to avoid redundancy so people have to go to many Web sites to get information and it assures that there's a continuity of communication between what's being posted out by ICANN or GNSO as - and as well as what's on our side.

Sue Schuler: Then we also have a page with your current statements and comments. I've listed it on this page by date. However, once we go to the archive it is listed

by topic. And then I also have the charter down at the bottom of that page. The events calendar then pretty self-explanatory and we had a countdown calendar to your meeting today. Yes Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes once you get this up and going are we going to have a search function for the Web site so that...

Sue Schuler: Yes I...

Ken Stubbs: You said you were listing something by topic but there may be another way it's addressed...

Sue Schuler: Yes. I met with Ken and that was the one thing he brought to the table was that he felt we needed a search and I have put a search on the site. You can see it at the top of the page here. However that is the one function I have not been able to test. It won't let me test it until it's live. So once we do go live I will test the function and if it's not working we'll find another plug in to - so that we get a very good search.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Sue Schuler: Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Sue Schuler: Oh okay. This was a new feature that you don't have on your current Web site where I put links to all of the registry members so that somebody can come in and just hit the link and it will take them right to. I've also linked to ICANN and to the generic name. But you can see all of our registries are there.

Cherie Stubbs: And when you - when a member submits an application we ask for permission. Do you want to be - do you want your registry on our Web site?

So this is a then - maybe it's somewhat of an assistance to help with communications among the various groups who are looking at information within each member group.

Sue Schuler: Yes Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes. So is that going to be ordered in some way? Because we've got a lot of registries. So is that going to be ordered in some way? Or maybe just is it searchable so that you can find one?

Sue Schuler: Are you talking about these links here? They're in alphabetical order...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Sue Schuler: I - so that was how I ordered it was basically by alphabetical order...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Sue Schuler: ...which is kind of how we do it on our pages (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: Okay well I saw ICANN first but yes now I see it yes.

Sue Schuler: Well the - everything else is alphabetic except for the ICANN yes...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: It's all right Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: All right.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Cherie Stubbs: And just so you know. Now I don't want to - I'm not stealing (Sue)'s thunder but just as we go through some of this and what our objective is is to go ahead and launch this probably by November 1st with the understanding that this is really a dynamic effort. It's - we need the feedback. We need to hear from you ultimately when it goes live what's working and suggestions like that. Is there a better way to order something, organize?

Sue Schuler: Right well and then don't be surprised if we don't send out some type of a questionnaire asking you about, you know, what things are on here that aren't even useful to you that you don't even think need to be there anymore and those kinds of things because quite honestly as I was moving the archives and going cross eyed doing it you have some documents on here that are just really old. And it's like how long does something need to be in your archive. Do you actually? Forever. Okay well that was - that answered my question. And then I do have a link at the end of the glossary and trust me the glossary was very helpful to me this week because it's like speaking Klingon most of the time around here. But I do actually have a link to the ICANN glossary as well.

Cherie Stubbs: And this is something when we met with ICANN staff earlier this week we talked about the acronyms and the confusion from a new member perspective because it is like (Sue) said you might as well have gone to another planet.

Sue Schuler: Yes.

Cherie Stubbs: So they agree and they're going to work with us to again collaborate on this and really build a useful tool. Yes Ken.

Ken Stubbs: You should find out whether or not this way of getting some sort of property rights because by the time ICANN gets done working with you they may end up stealing all your ideas and taking it to their own Web site.

Cherie Stubbs: Yes that comment was made by ICANN actually.

Sue Schuler: Yes. Yes they did. You can see I also have a page there for the observers and an application right there also. The same on the membership page for them to join us we actually have an application for membership. And then just to be transparent we also have a link so they can see exactly what it would cost in dues so.

Keith Drazek: So this is Keith. Let me jump in if I may Paul...

Sue Schuler: Sure.

Keith Drazek: So first let me apologize for being remiss and not introducing you more formally earlier. So welcome (Sue). We are thrilled to have you here and working with Cherie to support us as we grow. And we've gone through some as I said earlier some dramatic expansion over the last several months, 12 months. And we really do very much appreciate your work. And the Web site looks great. So thank you so much for all the effort you put into that.

Sue Schuler: Yes it's actually - I've actually been here about a year. I know I've been kind of hidden. But I actually was brought on board to do your invoicing, your billing and so this was actually my second. Everybody just got an invoice from me. So yes. Yes my first ICANN yes. Any questions about the Web site? I mean...

Paul Diaz: I guess the question for the group I'm sure and I'll see you a sec. Yes please just a sec. Would you say your goal is to go live around the first of November. Some of us were your I guess beta testers initially. Is this going to be available to the full membership between now and going live so that you can take on board additional feedback or you'll just wait, go live and then whatever inputs come in you'll make the changes then?

Sue Schuler: I'm a little nervous to send it to a lot of people. I sent it to about six people and asked everybody to hit the preview button and somebody actually hit the publish button and the next time I went on we were actually online. So I managed to get that back offline but I guess I'll have to take my lead from you guys if that's what you want.

Cherie Stubbs: It would be - this is Sheri. It would be my suggestion that the group we polled we used - we queried members who have been in - been around for a number of years. We queried new applicant - new member observers. So we tried to look at a broad audience to get a certain level of feedback. And I think the best way to test it is just go for it but yes Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Being one of the people who tested it and there are many people in the room who at one point in time designed a Web site. She's actually - the links that she's sending us are to the design Web site. So there's a huge amount of exposure there and unfortunately we don't have the technology in our little group to be able to send it off to some server that somebody might loan us to use to let us hit that server and not the design site. So I'm inclined to back up what Sheri said. I would just go for it. I don't think that there are any really - the biggest question mark (Sue) is going to be the search function. But it can't be worse than ICANN's was when they rolled it out. It's nowhere near it.

Cherie Stubbs: But there's no proprietary information on our Web site. So I don't - I can't fathom that it would be a problem but.

Man: (Unintelligible) question?

Man: I just wonder how the IDN registry is in its order because obviously they don't use ASCII.

Woman: Yes. Yes.

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you. We need help. You talk about being out of your element.

Sue Schuler: Well obviously when I started the Web site back in oh it must have been April I only worked ten hours a week guys. So I mean I've very part time here for you. So well. And so it has taken some time to develop. But because I knew very little about the business it was more of a copy and paste and transfer and pretty up what you already had on your current Web site. So I really did not re-order or any of those kinds of things from what you already currently had out there because I really had no background of what was going to be most important to you and those kinds of things which is why I need the input.

Man: It might - given that his question might be reasonable to categorize the registries either by ASQ or IDN. And even if you have a situation where you have different languages people who are using IDN registries are going to be able to recognize their own scripts very quickly. Other than that.

Paul Diaz: Okay and important for these inputs and I'm going to bring us back to the last item on the agenda the budget we're not going to go through that but Cherie has produced a sort of an accounting where we stand. The bottom line is that we are well within the budget that was set up. And the budget does envision making sure that there are resources available to continue to update this. So the inputs that come in and whatnot this is not going to be a one off and then nothing changes for months and months and months. We will have the ability to update as needed to fix things, keep things accurate if there are inaccuracies, etcetera. All right. We largely touched on the accountability issues this morning. Keith was there anything else you wanted to address on that issue now? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. We need to make a decision and we can do this maybe via the list to see if there are any objections. But for the IANA transition cross community working group and probably it'll be the same for the accountability process it's very important that we allow non-members and non-observers to participate in our process and by that I mean GTLD registries or applicants who have not joined in any capacity at all. This goes

back clear to the Net Mundial meeting in Brazil where people were asking whether non-ICANN participants could participate in this process. And politically it's very important that we show that we're allowing non-ICANN participants to participate in this process.

Cherie can comment a little bit in terms of what she's been able to do or planning to do in terms of how we would do that but and we want to do it as simply as possible but we need to make sure that the whole membership is on board and even those that aren't members that are just observers so that we can send out an invitation to those who haven't joined us yet in any capacity, observer or member and invite them to participate with us and I'll let Cherie talk about how she's envisioning doing that. But even to the extent of measuring the level of support for any ideas that we evaluate so if we can at least make sure everybody understands what we're talking about today and then maybe - and then put it out on the list because obviously our numbers have dwindled a lot for the rest of the week.

So those of us on a small committee can also communicate emphatically that the registries have and the process is open and we're facilitating participation by those that aren't even a part of our group yet but still meet the basic criteria of being a GTLD registry or applicant. Because I'm not suggesting that we invite anybody under any category to participate with us that wouldn't make sense. We'll let the business constituency do their thing and IPC and NCSG etcetera but it's really important because we don't want to wait until this process is very far along before we send out those invitations.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Chuck and do appreciate the work that you and Cherie have already done and, you know, also to underscore that it's important that we do the right thing as a stakeholder group making that ability to participate available to somebody who's not a member or observer currently. With that said there's also not a very high likelihood we're going to have a lot of people involved. So it really is an easy thing to do doing the right thing and getting some kudos. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Cherie did you want to comment at all?

Cherie Stubbs: Just in the spirit of what has - is being done and has been requested I'm meeting with Ann Yamashita tomorrow and in trying to get them to do - I'm requesting a data dump of information so we can start the really proactive outreach of that faction and people who are waiting to sign their contracts or a part of our community. So we should know by the end of the week and then just figure out how you want to go from there.

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck again. Cherie thanks. Could you also just briefly describe how you're planning on doing it in terms? I think you're planning on creating a new list right that would include all of us that are already on the list NTAG and RySG? And then if anybody asks to participate that's not in those groups they would be added to this new list. Is that correct?

Cherie Stubbs: Yes that's correct. And again I mean if somebody wants to be excused from the new mailing list it'll be exclusive to this effort. It will not - it'll be just an information exchange for the.

Chuck Gomes: Right and we can decide this later but if we need the same thing for the accountability effort we could decide whether to use the same list for that or a separate one and like that. Now there's two categories that - of possible participants. One of them is those that have signed a registry agreement but haven't joined as an observer or a member and you have that contact information already.

Cherie Stubbs: Yes and they've all been contacted with this new member welcome. So there can be another - a use of just reaching out with another thing...

Chuck Gomes: And right. And then the group that she's trying to get the download on is the group that haven't signed an agreement. So we don't have their contact information. She's trying to get that so it's not a manual process.

Cherie Stubbs: Yes we currently have to manually extract anything out of the system and it gets a little onerous if you're looking at that. Anyway.

Paul Diaz: Ken?

Ken Stubbs: Well it's interesting because I had lunch yesterday with someone who represents 18 applications, brands primarily. And they're very interested in the registry constituency but they really don't know how to deal with it. I'm inclined to almost use what I would call a test drive us. You know, it's very hard. We have to be able to show these people that we can create. We have to create for ourselves to incentivize people to join the constituency. And I want to make sure that they really feel like they're involved. I frankly am speaking for myself. I have no problem with taking them all the way into the process to the point of literally being able to contribute in every way except vote because I think it's important for them to understand that this is a process that where there contributions can be meaningful and that they can get something material out of it.

I don't want to make it something sexy and exciting that's hidden behind a veil that, you know, they never really understand. Because that - what we need is we need that kind of support. You add 18 more new TLDs to the constituency whether whatever they may be it just adds that much more influence and credibility to this constituency. So, you know, that's why I use the test drive deal. You know, give them 120 days and at the end of 120 days they can join whatever category they would be qualified for at the time.

Paul Diaz: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes Ken I don't think that works for what we're trying to accomplish here. We can't - if they can't vote then they're going to argue that they weren't allowed to participate in the process. That's why this is a separate list, a separate issue. The perception there just won't satisfy the need that we're talking

about. This is not intended to be a membership drive although it may help us there, okay. But that's not the purpose. The purpose is to be able to open the doors for people who are not involved in our processes to participate just in right now the IANA transition process on an equal footing.

Now what does an equal footing mean? Well they as far as our voting structure, simple voting, they would just have one simple vote whether they have 1 or 13 TLDs or 100 just like we do. And if we ever went to weighted voting which is probably really unlikely in this particular scenario they would be treated as having - being in the lowest rung, number or registrations. So that part's relatively simple. But if we do this and we don't let them vote as if voting will really be that big a deal. It probably won't be but it's just going to have the wrong perception. It won't accomplish what we're trying to do.

Paul Diaz: Yes okay. There's a lot going on here and Keith wants to jump back in. I think the - to sum it up it's - we'll get the information we need from ICANN. We'll come back with a proposed way forward and again it seems like a pretty easy thing to do to do the right thing to make available what we were describing earlier. And let's keep this particular issue kind of separate from a trial run of membership. I think that's got a lot of unintended consequences.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Paul. Yes so just a couple of brief comments there. I reinforce what Chuck has said. This is important because this process on the IANA transition, the community process on IANA transition and ICANN accountability as well need to be seen and actually need to be but need to be seen as inclusive. Anybody who has a care about the operational customer relationship between a registry and IANA needs to be able to participate and contribute to that process. Anybody that has a concern about ICANN's accountability to the community needs to have the ability to participate. We fought for cross community working groups. Right? We fought for community structures. And the concern that was raised by ICANN staff and NTIA was that well how does a cross community working group in the ICANN context

allow for external inputs and others who may not be current or already part of the process or part of the community to have their voice heard.

So I think that's ultimately what we're trying to accomplish is to make sure that nobody at the end of this process can say that they didn't have the ability to participate. An example and then I'll wrap up - an example that's been used and I think we see it in the CCTLD community are CCTLD managers that are not part of the CCNSO. I mean they need the ability to be able to contribute in the process and I think that, you know, the CCNSO will be I think doing a similar thing that we are to reach out and to try to identify those and say you don't have to be part of the CCNSO but you need to come and participate in the process anyway.

An example that's been given to me is .int. Dot int is not a GTLD registry in the traditional sense. It's not a CCTLD registry in the traditional sense but they have the ability as a registry - they need the ability as a registry to be able to have input into the SLAs that come out of the IANNA transition process. So just an example that that's what we're trying to accommodate. So I reinforce what Chuck said that it's important that we do this.

Ken Stubbs: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Well I have no control over them. The person who has more influence on that is the guy sitting next to you. So I'll let him respond to what's being done in that regard. This has - I communicated this Ken in the weekend sessions. This isn't the first time it's been brought up for the others. We obviously can't determine what they do but I certainly strongly encourage them to do similar things with organizations or individuals that are - meet the - would otherwise meet the qualifications of their group. Yes.

Paul Diaz: All right folks. It's been a long day, a full day but we thank everybody. I'm assuming no other business right. No everyone wants to get out of here. You know, this overall schedule, you know, we mixed things up this time but it

seemed to work well for most. So I think we're probably going to continue at least through Marrakesh loading things up in the morning the way we did. And, you know, the other issues that are outstanding please always remember to vote. Check on the lists and be sure to weigh in issues that are of concern. And yes of course our text, the scribes, ICANN staff who is supporting thank you all. I hope you make it a good day. And with that I think we can end the recording. We're done. Oh and thank you to those who were online too.

Woman: Thank you everybody.

END