

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
GNSO Meeting with the Board  
Sunday 23 March 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://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar>

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

(Jonathan): Hi everyone. Welcome. It's five past the hour so I suggest we get the show on the road for this afternoon.

Welcome everyone. Welcome GNSO Councils Welcome ICANN board. It's great to have you with us and welcome to everyone in the room, participants.

We've had a notably full room throughout the weekend sessions which has been great to see, had active and thorough participation throughout so that's what the purpose of these weekend sessions is and it's great to see everyone here. And so let's move on with the session.

(Steve) I don't know if you want to say anything before we kick things off.

(Steve): Yes echo (Jonathan)'s welcome to everybody. From the board's perspective we welcome these interactions. We view this as coming to here, what you have on your mind and to engage in a substantive and sometimes quite pointed interaction.

There's no point in using the - having the time here and not using it usefully. So we'll dispense with courtesies. We'll be courteous but we'll dispense with the formalities and dive right in so over to you (Jonathan).

(Jonathan): Thanks (Steve). We'll go right on with it then. There's - if Lars if you could move things through then.

So (Steve) and I met approximately a week ago. And I know he - I understand that he has shared the structure on these lines with the board and the council's also seen something along these lines.

We've split the meeting approximately 50/50 a brief update from the council. I know you had a policy briefing this morning so we're not going to drag you through all sorts of detail.

And then we really want to get on to what - from our point of view is the substance that's the current challenges and really have a set of specific questions that we'd like to pose and discuss with you and then move on to the second half of the agenda which as (Steve) will lead us through so next slide please Lars.

So from our point of view we feel we're making good progress and we'd like to just highlight that very briefly to you and just talk through a couple of points there.

As you know and we've spoken about this on two or three previous meetings we've instituted a culture of dynamic and continuous improvement in the work we're doing.

We ran a very successful and first indication and development session at the meeting in Buenos Aires. So what we did for efficiency point of view we tacked on if you like a Friday daylong meeting where we've seated the new council on a Thursday and then we brought the new council together in a full day session which both inducted the new councilists and sort of got everyone on the same page for want of a less - for economic expression.

This is the first time we've ever done something like that. Typically the council's been seated in the past and then in a sense gone off into no man's land before meeting again on the first telephonic meeting.

So we're able to get around the table, sit together, meet and set out some form of baseline.

We've got an ongoing plan to improve the work we do on the PDP. And we're very conscious of the need to knit that into and recognize the outputs from the ATRT 2 process which we obviously participated in. And we're grateful for the opportunity to participate in.

And of course more recently there's been the work of the multi-Stakehold Innovation Panel which whilst we've had some concerns with we feel we will embrace to the best of our ability and knit that into any thinking that we are doing in terms of improvements in the way we work.

We have our own standing committee which sits out - sits alongside the council and looks at particular areas of improvement where we can actively improve work we're doing.

And we've been for actively engaged with the Structured Improvements Committee in tracking and keeping up to date with their thinking on the GNSO review.

And I trust or hope you'll be aware that we've also been in active dialogue for some months now with the GAC through eh GAC GNSO Consultation Group.

So there's a number of initiatives that fit under broad banner of dynamic and continuous improvement. Next slide please Lars.

And then just one of the slides really highlighting some of the outputs from that induction session. And I think this - it's important to highlight these points to you because it shows some of the thinking.

And one of the key outputs was to ensure that there is an acknowledgement and respect for the work of the GNSO. And whilst we realize that goes both ways we have to earn the respect of the community including the board.

We also want to make sure that we highlight and make you aware that this is an important parameter of success for us and to - and then a few other points. Ensuring we demonstrate the ongoing efficiency and effectiveness of the council, the successful working relationship with the GAC.

Many of you will be aware that an output from the original from the first ATRT and it comes through in much of what we do is a realization that for the multi-stakeholder model to exist successfully it's key components must be able to work together and interact not only with the strict structural ways in which it's set up but to find other and innovative mechanisms by which we can collaborate.

It's an ongoing issue for us to ensure we attract new volunteers and continue to build capacity and of course to engage in continuous substantive activities such that we're actually producing a relevant policy which is really the core mandate of the council within the GNSO. So next slide please.

And then we just we're going to highlight three very briefly three examples of success as we see it from three of our around the table. And then we're done with the presentation so I know you've had a more thorough and comprehensive policy update today.

So I'll hand this over on a per bullet basis to relevant councilors. So (Thomas) maybe you could speak very briefly to the first bullet?

(Thomas): Yes and I'll keep this very brief. But one of the recent examples of success for GNSO policy-making is the IGO INGO PDP Working Group where the council or the Working Group dealt with an extremely complex matter both sexual as well as legally and came up with some policy recommendations in a little bit over a year's time which ended in the motion that was brought before council and that was unanimously adopted which we think is a good sign of sufficient community collaboration.

And I would like to highlight that this motion was not only adopted by the required majority but that it was unanimously adopted.

And even those that didn't like the outcome of what the results of this process were went on record stating that they respect the process which I think is an important factor in there.

So I think we evidence with that that we can efficiently work in a foreseeable timespan and come up with excellent results. Thank you.

(Jonathan): And you'll notice in the bullet then - well thanks (Thomas). (Thomas) chaired that working group that did the work. And in the bullet it specifically highlights underlines the all gTLDs.

And I think it's just important that we remind ourselves that these consensus policy recommendations are applicable and ultimately should they be not the specific ones but any consensus recommendations binding on all gTLDs.

So Thick Whois Mikey you'll say a couple of words.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks all for being here. This is my first council session with the board. It's an honor to be here with you.

I was the chair of the Thick Whois Working Group and this is another thing that the GNSO does really well is sort of a security stability resiliency kinds of things.

There's been a really long series of PDPs about the inner registrar transfer policy.

And one of the things that came out of that process was the need to get registries and registrars on the same data structure if you will.

And the Thick Whois policy was all about that. And it was great work by a great group, full consensus at the end came through us, came to you unanimously approved and makes a huge change underneath the underpinnings of DNS. And really proud.

(Jonathan): Thanks Mikey. And then finally the third example (James) if you could speak briefly.

(James): Yes thanks (Jonathan). So the privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Working Group is just now getting underway a little earlier this year.

We have a chair and two vice chairs. We're getting organized to address a number of the issues that have been percolating around this topic for several years.

And I think that it's encouraging the way that that group has come together to address some of the early substantial questions that would form the basis of a new accreditation program and the result of which would be a new kind of contracted party within ICANN potentially and would presumably address some of the concerns both from the operators of these services as well as the consumers of them that how those practices are implemented in the real world.

So we're very excited about the work that's currently getting underway. This is some of these issues may seem intractable in years past. But I think that the GNSO in particular is making real progress on this front.

(Jonathan): Thanks (James). So while clearly the substance of this meeting with you is an opportunity to begun to (unintelligible). And as you said (Steve) have some proper conversation. We felt it was important to set the scene a little. And I just highlight some of the perspective and the work that's been done so far and the spirit and approach that's being taken.

So if I could have the next slide please Lars?

So really now we move into talking to you about some of the current challenges and specific questions we'd like to dig into a little bit.

I mean I think there's some just to set the scene in one final way I think there's some overarching issues that I'm certainly picking up on and you will undoubtedly be aware of some of which we've even talked about before.

And certainly the sort of themes are in and around the volume of work and pace of change. There's no doubt that that's something that's concerning all of us and it's a theme that comes through.

There's certainly a concern over a perception of whether - however you express it whether it's in a sense top down, whether it's insufficient bottom up whether we - we're taking the time to brew things properly through the multi-stakeholder process and really some sort of guarantee of ongoing preservation of the bottom-up consensus based multi-stakeholder system which we hold, you know, so close to all of our hearts.

So that's really those are some arch- overarching sort of themes that seem to have been percolating through the weekend sessions.

But thinking about some very specific questions and issues that we wanted to pick up with you, I mean certainly one of the first is we received as you'll be aware the beginning of the weekend a letter from the new gTLDs program committee in and around the work of the IGO INGO PDP. And (Thomas) maybe you want to pick up on that and kick off on that?

(Thomas): Yes and it sort of seems to link into what I've said earlier, i.e., that the community came up with recommendations that were adopted unanimously by the council and that with this letter we now see at least a danger of the board not abiding by or not adopting the policy recommendations that we made.

And we think that there is an issue with this and that is two-fold one of which is that I think there might be frustration with the community putting an awful lot of work into this PDP we had two hours calls.

So we worked very hard to make the aggressive timelines to be ready at the point in time when the new gTLDs are actually being launched so that we can - that far-reaching protections can be granted.

We feel that volunteers looking at this might see that - might come to the conclusion that it's a moot effort to put time and resources into such PDP work when ultimately the results are not being adopted.

The second area is that with the latest announcement of the US government I think we need to be very careful to actually have the organization work in a bottom-up multi-stakeholder consensus driven fashion.

And we do see the danger that when a community comes up with a consensus position and the board doesn't fully digest that that the US government when looking at how ICANN operates actually will look at those aspects as well.

And we see certainly that the board is under pressure with GAC advice that has - that is in place for this particular subject so we do see that.

But at the same time we do think that it is inevitable for us to enter into a consultative process or to a dialogue where we just don't get letter that sort of informs us that our advice might be - or our policy recommendations might be rejected without double checking with us what the implications are for what we did whether the subjects that you are deliberating on potentially having dealt with in the course of the Working Group.

But I think there is a lack of potentially appreciation for the work of the volunteers in this.

(James): So (Shareen) how badly did you screw this up?

(Shareen): So let me respond to that by saying some general points. And then (Chris) will specifically talk about the IGO NGO protection where we are on this and purpose a way forward.

First of all let me start by saying that the NGPC does recognize that the GNSO has provided consensus recommendation to the ICANN board on this issue.

And with that I'm certain obligations under the ICANN bylaws for us to provide a comprehensive response to the GNSO on a timely manner. And this we will do.

Now in working towards a comprehensive response let me highlight kind of three things just to bear in mind.

The first thing is that there are specific GNSO policy recommendation in relation to the IGO NGO protection that differ from the proposal to implement the GAC advice.

The second point is the temporary protections currently in place for the IGOs run contrary to the GNSO recommendation that would prohibit reservation for IGO acronyms at the second level and that the third thing is that the NGPC is aware of the GNSO preliminary issue report addressing access by IGOs and NGOs to the UDRP and the URS.

So before we get into detail I just want to say that we fully respect and fully appreciate the work done by the GNSO and the PDP process. We appreciate the effort and the time spent in developing recommendation to the board.

We know there's a process. We are committed to the bottom-up approach and we will follow the process. So you have our absolute commitment to doing so.

Now it may not appear so by the letter we sent you but as you realize nothing is set in concrete. We are just trying to formulate our response to you by trying to find some cohesive response.

So I pass on to (Chris) who will then talk about this and propose a way forward (Chris)?

(Chris): Thank you (Shareen) and hi everyone. Just I want to echo what (Shareen) said about through the policy development process and the respect to that. I mean it's not all of you, most of you know ICANN from the ccTLD world where the policy development is held in very high regard. And I don't think there's any difference with the gTLD policy.

And I want to talk about some practicalities and explain to you why we're in the situation that we're in so that you're clear A that - A, what the current situation is and B that we're not in danger of breaching the process.

So it will take me about - take me a few minutes and I hope you'll bear with me. But where we sit right now is as follows.

We have a piece of GAC advice that in paraphrase basically says reserve or acronyms of the IGOs.

We have come back to the GAC and said that is troublesome and difficult to implement but we haven't rejected it.

We have temporarily reserved the acronyms as well as the names. And we've been working with the IGOs to find an acceptable way that will enable us to say to the GAC we accept your advice. This is how we are going to implement it. So that's what we've been working on with the IGOs.

At the same time you've been running your policy development process. And again I know this is very short hand but in effect your policy development, the result of your policy development process is that the acronym should be placed in the TMCH for 90 days.

And you have also acknowledge or you guys have said that there is some work that needs to be done on mechanisms so that the IGOs have some way of dealing with disputes because currently they don't.

And you've launched or you are about to launch another policy development process on the URS and UDRP okay?

So where we sit right now is that we have a conflict between the GAC advice which is to put the - to reserve the acronyms and your advice or your policy recommendation rather which is in respect to the TMCH.

And leaving everything else aside if we just looked purely at process and nothing else we have only got two alternatives.

One is that we accept the GAC advice, reject your advice. There's a process, reject your advice. That's one. And that effectively means that names will be reserved.

The other alternative is to accept your policy recommendation to reject the GAC advice which means that there is a bylaw process that is triggered which by our estimation with the GAC which by our estimations with the best within the world will take at least six months.

And the names will remain reserved during that six month a period while we go through that process for rejecting their advice.

Now ultimately it may be that we actually have to do one of those two things. But for now we're trying to do neither of those two things.

However having said that let me be very clear. We - the board has not yet formally considered, formally considered your policy recommendations okay?

The purpose of sending you the letter was to say to you look, this is where we got to in our discussions with the IGOs.

It seems to us that if we do the following things in the interim we may be able to get somewhere. And those things are to take your TMCH advice and remove the 90 thing, just say stick them in the TMCH so that they get notified if someone registers one of their acronyms.

Secondly that is irrespective of whether we follow your advice for 90 days or we take the 90 days out.

It's useless to the IGOs unless they have some mechanisms by which they can actually do something if somebody does register their acronym.

So whilst you're working on that which you've acknowledged by saying you're going to a PDP whilst you're working on that we will put in place some interim initiatives that will enable the IGOs to have access to the URS and some kind of a DRP.

And in the draft document it says very clearly that that stuff is interim and it will be dependent and in the end is dependent on what happens with the GNSO policy development or process.

Now that is not set - that hasn't been agreed. That is a suggestion that in fact at 2 o'clock I'm going to go to with us to a small meeting with the IGOs and the GAC chair to talk about.

And what we thought we would do is to send you a note which I accept could probably have been better expressed to say look this is what's on the table.

Now if you want to just sticking to the practicalities and I've nearly finished I would have thought that if you are looking at DRP and URS as a possible mechanisms it would be quite useful for you to have the staff going through the processes of figuring out the legalities of that for our interim stuff because that will help you in trying to work out what you can and can't do in respect to your policy development process.

And the final point is if we do this interim measure there is I would argue a significant benefit for the gTLD community or GNSO community because what it means is that the acronyms are freed up and no longer reserved. They are freed up.

And they are subject to the mechanisms that we put in place. So that's the practicalities of it, just end by saying once again all of which is fine and dandy as long as we continue to respect the policy process and we certainly do that. Thank you.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Chris) because I think that's given a good overview of your perspective.

I just want to come back to (Thomas) with really a quest from you or a question from you. How would you like to handle the process going forward?

Because as I see it we've got a board committee that has come up with a potential solution of which they have talked to the IGOs or are talking to the IGOs about that.

Now how would you see us - what's the best way for you to engage is really - how would you like to engage? I think that's what I'd like to hear.

(Thomas): I guess the way forward would be to stay in contact and discuss and not be informed that something's will be done in certain ways because I think that is - the discussion's always a good starting point to avoid duplication of efforts because I think what the - the thought that the NGCP might have may have in part or in total already have been discussed during the PDP Working Group.

So I think that we have knowledge that you should try to tap on. And that's not just me but that's the whole group and also to protect the integrity of the process and avoid frustration with the community.

So I think as I said we do acknowledge that you have GAC advice that you need to deal with. But at the same time I think we should avoid the impression, jointly avoid the impression for the outside community that whatever we do we're just being told that something else is being done.

And I think that there are procedural ways to deal with this so we have the option of actually come up with supplemental or amended recommendations. I can't remember the exact terminology. But there is a process for this which I think we should use in order to bridge the gap between what is currently on

the table from the GNSO and what you have to deal with from the side of the GAC.

Man: You would want us to keep the GAC equally informed I would imagine.

(Thomas): I'm all for transparency with this. I think it's, you know, if you take multi-stakeholder in the true sense of the (unintelligible) work there are part of this ecosystem.

(Chris): Sure.

(Thomas): So I'm all for being transparent with this. I can say also that the IGOs are now being offered something but they have plans they rejected during the PDP work. So I think we - this is something that we should together over have a telephone conference or, you know, use other or deploy other mechanisms of communication in order to see how best result is and yet not neglect or ignore what the community came up with.

And again this - these were not recommendations that have been - that have just passed the required majority level but that has been unanimous.

And again those - I think it was Claus who explicitly went on record. He said while we don't like the outcome of this PDP but we respect the process. And I think that we should turn that clear message around by, you know, having this by a top down type approach which I think you are not intending to take but I think that we need to be very careful with this particularly since we're now under a new type of scrutiny given the NTI discussions.

(Steve): Anybody else want to add anything to this? (Chris)?

(Chris): Thank you and I just wanted to say two things. One again it isn't top down. It isn't intended to be top down and I can't really stress that enough.

But I did want to pick up on what (Thomas) said about there is a process for this going forward so that it's a little heavyweight but it exists. And so it would - and if we - what I don't want to - what we don't want to do is to trigger that process until we know we have a trigger to trigger that process. And the only way we're going to know we have a reason to trigger that process is if we have got a - an indication from the IGOs that they will go for something. And then we can trigger the process.

So and there's a timeframe on that. I think (Jonathan)'s got to be - there is a fixed time but it - best efforts but within a reasonable period of time.

So I think that that's exactly what we should be doing. But if like if we can't reach any sort of agreement with them then it's a different response rather than that response.

(Jonathan): Right. I've got a couple of questions coming up from the council that let me go to (David) and then Brett.

(David): Yes for just - I mean I'm - first I want to say I mean the council very much appreciates that you have been put in a difficult position. And we are, you know, working - some of us are working quite hard at the moment to ensure that in the future the GAC and the GNSO can have their arguments before it reaches council.

Expecting us to always agree will be too much but at least to have the - have had the arguments well and truly about before they hit council would - I see the board would be - I appreciate a great improvement.

But I think ignoring the details of the procedure which I realize is not very helpful to the board we're very focused on the exact procedure.

What we really I think is a lot of us are thinking is we understand there has to be we have to cross the - we understand the board very much wants to

compromise here. We understand the board is trying hard to create one. We understand the board position but really we very much welcome board efforts to facilitate a compromise but we don't want the board to craft one. We want the - you know, if there's a compromise to be crafted the GNSO should be riding their as, you know, as the people who credit the policy credit the - so and we need to be very much involved in that.

And I want to stress this is, you know, this was consensus GNSO policy. It was fully agreed to by the whole council. We can't be more, you know, there's not a lot of wiggle room on our point. This is consensus policy. We were very clear on it and we rejected quite a lot of non-consensus policy at the same time.

So we yes, we understand it's a difficult position. Please involve us ongoing in the exact details of what, the solution.

Man: So thank you. First of all there's no mistake in your message. And so that's quite clear.

I don't want to add anymore to what's been said already but I think when there is perhaps at least one clear part of what we hear is that there could be better communication on our part. And I empathize very much with the - your notion (David) that - and (James) - sorry, (Thomas) you said basically the same thing that we shouldn't be involved in any of this discussion.

And so we're - we and generally - not generally, we always do not want to be in the position of trying to craft our own policy decision out of something. And so and yet we're stuck in this bind where we're getting contrary advice from sources that feel very strongly that they've going through their processes and have spoken and so that's the end of it from that perspective.

It's probably best, I mean I think the messages are clear and best pursued in another setting and probably best use of time to move on to the next issue.

Brett Fausett: I'll be brief. I just had one follow-up on this. And it goes back to (Chris)'s point about process. Brett Fausett for the record by the way representing the Registry Constituency.

As I understand the process and going back to the bylaws any PDP recommendation approved by a GNSO super majority vote -- and this one was anonymous shall be adopted by the board. It's not discretionary unless 2/3 of the board votes that it's not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

So I don't know that the board has discretion to do anything with the GNSO's recommendation other than adopt it unless you had a vote by 2/3 majority that you think it's not in the best interest of ICANN.

Man: So we haven't had that vote given forceful advice from the GAC. We're not going to take that vote until we've satisfied ourselves that we understand what the issues are and attempted to bring things into as much of a compromise or a coordinated position as possible.

We do not like at all to say no to a policy that's been developed up through the GAC whether it's unanimous or a bare majority or whatever.

But as you read the mechanisms exists for us to be able to do that.

It would be a very uncomfortable and carefully taken decision if we did that. I will tell you that and I'm sure you recognize the dynamics that if we got to the point where we felt that we had to say no we would do so with a pretty strong majority. I don't think there'll be any problem reaching the 2/3. I mean I don't think it would be a close lead. We - if it was a close vote we would know that we weren't going to do that.

But typically we'll have a rather full discussion and dig into it. So we'll be quite deliberate about it.

Man: Yes I just wanted to pick up with (Mike) (unintelligible) said. But (Jonathan) would - or (Thomas), there is a way of us coming back to you and saying supplement, coming up with supplementary look at it again isn't there?

(Jonathan): I think you're referring to it sounds like Brett might even have the bylaws in front of him. But it's in the event that you reject it there's a...

Man: All right we have...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...rejection.

(Jonathan): There'd be a mechanism of them...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): ...sort of revising to the issue. So as I said earlier on it's a sledgehammer. It would be nice to be able to not have to use the sledgehammer.

But if we did have to use the sledgehammer we should only be using it because we've all agreed that's what we have to do. When I say we all I mean we all...

Man: Yes.

(Jonathan): ...have agreed to that's what we have to do yes.

So I'm conscious that we've got a few other questions and issues that we want to deal with. So but I'm seeing a couple of hands come up from (James) and Oswaldo so we - would you like to take more time on this?

(James): I think mine is fairly quick because I'm going to ask a newbie question here which is when the policy I think has elements that effect all TLDs including incumbent TLDs why is this specifically the new gTLD program committee on point here versus the full board? I guess I'm not clear on that particular point.

Man: It's because - well sorry it isn't. The discussions with the IGS have up until now been in the NGPC because they arose from new gTLD discussions right?

Your policy advice would come to the full board because that's where it belongs. And that is an added extra nuance that we're going to have to try and deal with and I'm not entirely sure how we'll get through that but we'll figure it out.

(Jonathan): Okay Oswaldo?

Oswaldo Novoa: Yes Oswaldo Novoa. Just a question, two questions okay. One is the reset deadline for when the board is going to consider their policy decision. Because according to the bylaws you said the board will meet to discuss the GNSO council recommendation as soon as feasible after receipt of the board report from the staff manager.

Man: As soon as feasible is the key in that bylaw.

Man: But it does say not later than the second meeting after.

Man: Well then that answers that question. Preferably not later.

Oswaldo Novoa: No my question, the first question was if you have a schedule to when are you going to consider this (unintelligible)?

(Steve): So I apologize I don't have that specific in mine. But as a general statement we are putting a lot of effort into getting stronger and stronger control of the workflow that comes to the board and we try not to lose track of things so that questions like you're asking don't get asked very often because we stay within the schedules that we've set up.

So I apologize I don't have a specific answer. But the - but I do put a lot of weight on that class of issue. And we're - it's a slow incremental process in the - with everything else going on.

But there's a lot of effort going on to tracking and keep - and watching the clock on things and making sure that the process goes forward.

There's a hand up down there. That must be Avri? No?

Avri Doria: Thank you and thank you for including me after you had almost sort of shut the list.

I guess I have two issues on this. One is during the process and let's call it clarification discussion that one might have with IGOs, GAC and such. We're trying to figure out whether you're going to use your 2/3 sledgehammer.

It would strike me that since the IGOs did participate in this process that having the discussion without some of the leaders of the working group without the chair of the working group and others participating in that conversation allows for a process where you get arguments and round about arguments that may or may not fit the facts of what happened during the working group.

So the fact that you are having a - I don't have a problem with their being negotiations as it were prior to you taking the vote within the time limits.

But to have those with only some of the parties and not representative of all the parties seem problematic.

And I guess the other thing I want to say is that if it gets to the point that you feel you need to use your 2/3 sledgehammer then put yourself on the books as doing that and then let's have the discussions that follow that.

This sort of let's go around and let's be gentle and let's not really put ourselves on the table as saying no we think there is public interest and it was very specific not that - and kind of a problem with the GAC and the IGOs.

But if you think there's a public interest that the Working Group missed then you should use your sledgehammer and you should take us to the next step of negotiating that. So those are two points that I wanted to put into the conversation. Thank you.

(Steve): Thank you.

(Jonathan): Great. Thank you. So we have - unsurprisingly we're running a clock down here and there - when I look at my list of potential questions there are at least three areas we were hoping to cover in addition to this.

My hope probably naively that two of them could be covered relatively quickly. One might make more time. So I think I'll give you a heads up as to what those three different areas are.

One of them is in and around at least a perceived backlog in dealing with I think SSAC reports. I hope I'm getting that right and responding to SSR type issues. So that's something that Mikey wanted to raise and we come to that maybe that there's almost a yes, no answer there or a relatively short answer.

The other is that this - there's been a little bit of buzz generated in and around the council about whether or not there is some mechanism by which board appraisals have a community component to them. And that's something that John's been keen to raise up around where I see John. I don't - do I see John Berard?

John Berard: Yes.

(Jonathan): Yes okay sorry (John), you're not at the table. And then finally there's some issues in and around success or not and particular issues in around the new gTLD program.

Now I would highlight to you that we've had a comprehensive meeting with staff on this this morning. But some councilors felt quite strongly that elements of this should be if in a sense for what of a better description escalated to or discussed with the board.

So those are the three things. I suggest to you we deal rather more quickly with the board appraisal component and the SSAC and then come on to the new gTLD. So John maybe you want to - yes go ahead.

John Berard: Good evening, good afternoon, John Berard, councilor from the business constituency. Is this on? Can be heard - hear myself. Yes that's terrific.

The council list took up the cause of crowd sourcing a few weeks ago when the multi-stakeholder innovation panel brought crowd sourcing to the fore.

And it struck us as an interesting idea especially in conjunction with the way in which the community began to or had come to believe that the strategy panels and president's panels as we have previously discussed with Fadi had come to pass from a let's make it happen and see and go from there.

But why not apply the concept of crowd sourcing to a review of the performance of the CEO and the board?

So we know that Fadi's coming up on his two year anniversary. We know that there are performance reviews for both executives and for board members.

And so the thinking at the council was could we ask the board which conducts the reviews or has them conducted or a colonoscopy I guess to accommodate to create an opportunity for the community to participate in the performance reviews of the CEO and the board?

So that's the question on the table how can we make it happen? And if we can play a role we would be more than happy to help you do that.

(Steve): I've had a colonoscopy. The board reviews are more painful.

(Bruce)?

(Bruce): Thank you (Steve) and thank you for the suggestion John. Certainly we've been using 360 degrees as a concept for reviews of board members.

We have used that tool for reviews of previous CEOs in the past. And certainly I have spoken to Fadi today and he's amenable to using a 360 degree staff process for his evaluation as well.

The exact mechanism is yet to be determined. But I just want to say we're open to suggestions that you might have had or engaged the community in such a process.

John Berard: Great thank you. Anybody else want to contribute or I'll take my seat. Thank you.

(Jonathan): Thanks John. So I suggest we move rapidly on then to this point Mikey about SSI. And I'll leave you to introduce.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Jonathan). It's Mikey O'Connor from the ISP constituency again. But this is sort of a general point. And, you know, I have sort of two themes that I beat the drum on all the time. One is working groups and the other is SSR.

And one of the things that's emerged on this new GNSO SSR list that we just started by which and by the way I invited anybody who's into SSR to join it is that there's this sort of consistent recommendation through a whole bunch of recent SSAC reports that says, you know, in the case of the DDOS using DNS infrastructure report SAC 55, 65 I think and others that sort of the first recommendation is ICANN should lead a global awareness campaign mostly with network operators and administrators about this issue.

And there are enough of those now that it seems like there's an opportunity to sort of take all that global awareness momentum and squish it together into one snowball. Because, you know, we've got the names collision issue. We've got the Route T rollover one. There are a whole bunch of them that are kind of all there that we could use this as sort of a springboard to maybe add to Sally Costerton's portfolio about global awareness where there's this terrific advice coming out of the SSAC and the technical community that we could use to do outreach around.

And so I just wanted to sort of put that in front of you on the radar. I didn't exactly know, you know, they're not necessarily GNSO issues. They're really partly GNSO issues but lots of other pieces of the puzzle too. So that was my question for the board.

(Steve): And Fadi, Mikey is making the case that SSAC is giving us a whole lot of pointed advice that could be aggregated together into a campaign.

The thing that strikes me hardest about this that we're talking about resources and people. Do you want - would you like to comment on this?

Fadi Chehade: We'll definitely take it into consideration. I think it's a good idea. And we already do quite a bit of security training. We've had a show in Africa that's gone around eight cities. We just re-upped it. So there's quite a bit going on. We could maybe look at adding some of the latest input from SSAC into that.

(Jonathan): Great. Yes.

Man: Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Really brief reply. I haven't had a lot of direct experience with those outreach efforts except in the case of a name collision issue. And I'm trying very hard today with jet lag not to be grouchy Mikey.

But the outreach effort around name collisions is pretty underwhelming. You know, it's sort of like well we count the number of tweets. We've got X tweets. We've, you know, been placed in 90 journals. It kind of - but wait we have, I don't know millions of network operators that need to know about this stuff. Can't we up our game a little bit? That's - sorry to be slightly grouchy Mikey.

Man: Thank you (Steve). Actually Mikey this morning in the board workshop this particular issue came up. And what you're really talking about is the distribution and the proliferation of the advisories themselves not checking them and packaging and making a training plan or some program out of it, actually getting the piece of paper into the guys - into the hands of an operator who may be putting it on a wall or something like that. It's - I think that's what you're after right?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and yes.

Man: Okay well the thing is that there are mechanisms and in the discussion we were having this morning about with the engagement group that came up as far as distribution mechanisms that already exist. And there may be ways of taking advantage of existing organizations to do that.

For example you could use the Offices of the Regional Registries. You could use the At Large structures because those are all local type guys. So there are a number of ways that are there that could be explored to do that distribution and do that proliferation.

So I think that we need to take time and take a look at those kinds of things and see what we can do with it.

(Ifimi): This is (Ifimi) from (Jay Prinic) and also from ISPCP. And I just want to comment on (Ray)'s comment that you've just raised.

And this is exactly what we do. We're trying to document what was released into Japanese and in discussion within our ISV community so that they know what exactly it means.

And in the Apricot conference which was held in February that's a technical conference for the network operators within Asia Pacific region.

We did like lighting talk explaining these issues that if each of these are different stakeholders involved in ICANN can help spread the word that would be maybe helpful in raising awareness.

And if there is a common material to - through this kind of thing in presentation format that might be something that's helpful as - or something additional. Just my thought in sharing my experience.

(Jonathan): Thanks. I've got (Mike Silver) next in the queue.

(Mike Silver): Thanks. I think while Mikey's point is well taken I also think there's another point in behaving like a bunch of chicken littles.

I think most (ISP)s are aware of the issue. Those who aren't obviously haven't been involved in the DNS very much given that this is not a new issue.

It's been around for a number of years since we started introducing new TLDs since we started looking at IDNs and others. So it's not unusual. Let's not get panicked about it.

Obviously we need to get the information out there. We are but just as an example I happen to be involved in the local South African ISP Association, 180 ISPs across the country, been giving the information out there. And the feedback I've got is thanks that's useful but it's nothing that we didn't know already.

So I also don't think that we need to call panic on this particular issue. But can we improve outreach? Can we do more? Absolutely? And I think those suggestions need to be taken onboard and taken forward.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Mike). I've got (Cuay) and then (Marilyn) at the microphone.

(Cuay): Yes just I like to, you know, just continue like (Ray) and also (Ifimi) is raising about actually for all the IRR every year we have two meetings and every two meetings before that we have a workshop.

In the workshop we have to have all (unintelligible) or, you know, technical issue to discuss and also do the educations.

And also (Ifimi) mentioned about, you know, (unintelligible) meeting just on February in the (Curam) Hall.

Actually we also, you know, and actually ICANN is the participant. I think this is maybe the first time in the Asia-Pacific regions the ICANN participate with the IRR (unintelligible) walk together.

You know, and hopefully this, you know, and this kind of event can grow not only for the ISP for the, you know, number community, hopefully for, you know, the domain name industry, the registry or registrar or registrant -- whatever.

And you are more than welcome to participate in the, you know, the regional (Epinical) (Epicom) meeting and come to, you know, join us so we can share - when we talked about a host, you know, there is already existing mechanisms.

So, you know, ICANN can put a little bit on that with a new event because we look at a agenda every year right? We are very full agenda. And so it is much better if they join with the existing events and then we can share the expense. We can also, you know, much easy to, you know, put our agenda in our personals.

So I think this is one of the section. Actually if I remember actually before we have (unintelligible) meeting we're talking about this one and we all agreed upon.

So I think this is something hopefully over the, you know, GNSO people can join us in, you know, to participate those of existing events. Thanks.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Cuay). Let's hear from Marilyn and I suggest we draw a line under this topic.

Marilyn Cade: I was thinking about open introducing myself as I was introduced on Saturday on the call as Zirilian Cade. And I wanted to do that because I want to comment on something that I've been observing in the few minutes that I've

been here as a terrific gap in understanding between what I heard people say and what the response were that I heard.

And obviously on Saturday I said my name was Marilyn Cade but it was heard as Zirilian Cade. I decided to adopt Zirilian so in the future I'll be referred to as Zirilian. But I've giving it as an example of what I'm concerned about.

This morning in a meeting between the ESG constituencies and two of the board members we gave illustrations about the challenges we face in taking the complex activities at ICANN and translating them into information that is digestible by a whole new group of people who have to get on board and adapt to the rapid changes that are going on.

And I heard people in the time I've been in the room Mikey and others explaining that we need different kinds of materials and we need different approaches to communication.

And the answers I've heard so far from the board members who (unintelligible) so far. I'm not sure you're hearing the problem that we're presenting to you.

Man: (Sebastian)?

(Sebastian): Thank you Marilyn. I just would like to extend a little bit more. It's - and I'm sorry for my fellow colleagues on the board but we have to (unintelligible) the committees. They think that they don't get what they want what they need to do their work. And we need not to say yes it's already done but maybe we need to hear them and to see how we can improve our organization to answer the need of the community. That's a bottom-up process and that's a (unintelligible). Thank you.

(Steve): Next.

(Jonathan): We can go next (unintelligible) yes. So I think I mean I'm just conscious of this agenda and I've checked with (Steve) that he's comfortable with that. But he's very much the sort of council driven agenda that a series of - and yet we still have the opportunity to hear from the board some update or other issue. So we have to balance this.

But there are series of questions and issues being raised in and around the new gTLDs that the councilors felt strongly should be potentially raised in this forum.

I'm not going to do any more preamble but hit those bullets. So (Thomas) you first on my list which is name collisions (gLTDs).

(Thomas): Yes I guess the main theme is that as you know the new gTLD program will be evaluated. So we will be tested whether there is actually an improvement of consumer choice and competition.

And there are three areas which we have identified and I'm going to speak to the first of it of them where we see that this goal is potentially jeopardized.

And I'm going to speak to the issue name collisions and where this is something that effect all new gTLDs. I guess it's of particular concern for geographic TLDs that sort of live from having local content, unique content that's specific to the environment that they're for.

And what we saw is that many cities for example can't allow the registrants use names that are very relevant to the local community, i.e., names of authorities, names of cultural goods, names of local football clubs.

And there's one TLD for example that has a marketing campaign and awareness campaign and 50 of the founders and sponsors that actually help

to evangelize that there is a local name space can's use their own name such as the local bank or even public authorities.

And we think that we should reconsider the way name collisions are currently being dealt with because I would assume that most if not all of those names that have ended up on the reservation list are there because users anticipate that this new extension's going to come and they test whether it's live already.

But we do think that there might not be actual risks behind that. And if only the beneficiaries of those names, i.e., the authorities themselves, the cultural goods themselves or the sports clubs themselves or the banks themselves can use those names I guess the risks might be close to zero.

(Jonathan): So I think the point is made. I'm not sure there's any response. If it's on the record you make the point. And if it's understood I think and unless there's a specific example but you've given a pretty close generic description (Thomas).

So I think unless anyone specifically wants to respond you've highlighted the point.

Man: I can add a little bit. I understand the point that you're making. And I've watched - I haven't participated heavily but I've watched the dialogue back and forth on the collisions.

There's this gray area. There's certain names for which it's just obvious that you don't want to (unintelligible) corp and home down in the range where there's a little bit of traffic but not a terrible amount.

Then it raises the question of exactly what all that means and you're suggesting that one explanation is that they're simply testing against this ahead of time and so that it's not meaningful in terms of that.

There is a bias, very reasonable bias built into the evaluation process, the judgment process on the conservative side because and it's always possible to loosen it up later. It's never possible to tighten it up later.

And so there's a preference to proceed very cautiously. And I think that it's perfectly reasonable to ask to visit these questions more pointedly and more decisively than it has been. Look quite a lot of work has been put in. I don't want to diminish that at all.

So I don't know where all that winds up but I can appreciate that the degree of discomfort on both sides about proceeding with this whether to hold back or whether to proceed.

And Internet's a very big complicated system and it's not possible to understand everything that's going on. So that leads to a certain amount of uncertainty and hence this caution that we - that we're encountering. Anybody want to add to that? No? Thank you.

(Jonathan): So let's move on to (James) then on the point on the data retention in and around the RAA.

(James): Thank you (Jonathan). And I wasn't sure if we were going to continue with this one but we did have a fairly lengthy discussion earlier today. What's that?

(Jonathan): If you're happy it's covered elsewhere then I'm happy to - I might want to move through things quickly so if you...

(James): Yes I mean if the agenda and the timeframe is at risk here then we can move through this.

I think that we're - we've covered this fairly extensively with (Cyrus) and his team earlier today. And I think we've got some outstanding items that we need to work on later on this week so I think we're okay on that.

(Jonathan): Great. I - that's useful to me because some of these things could - it could be argued that they belong in that forum but I know there was a strong feeling from on the part of some that they needed to be raised from the board.

(Ching) I have you on universal acceptance. Is that something you'd still like to talk to?

(Ching): I'll probably pass. And I know that, understand that in this upcoming week we have a specific session...

(Jonathan): Fine.

(Ching): ...for this. These are ongoing so I'll pass.

(Jonathan): Thanks Brian on new gTLD objections?

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt, IPC. I just wanted to raise very briefly -- I know we're very behind in the schedule that obviously there was some issues around that the objection procedures.

In particular there were community and limited public interest ones that had on cap fees and very long delays that were very difficult and burdensome on concerned parties.

In addition with the string confusion objections there were some inconsistent or perceived inconsistent decisions and required some attention as well potentially before we go to next round.

Man: Well on the inconsistent determinations of the panel we have asked staff to put a paper out for us to consider alternatives. We've put that paper out to public comment.

And we have not finished with the public comment and the reply period. And we would wait for staff to compile the analysis and present it to us I think at our next new gTLD committee meeting I think is going to be in Los Angeles in (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you. Is there more?

Man: Yes (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you. As you see on the agenda there is three bullet points under ICANN Board, board update, board advisory committees and the board view on critical globalization and governance issues.

I want to cover them in reverse order. I'm not sure what will be left of board update by the time we do the other two.

When this agenda is originally put it together it was - we almost need a shorthand for before announcement versus after announcement.

But the announcement from US Department of Commerce NTIA that they intend to seek the end of the IANA contract and look for how to globalize and have - and satisfactory mechanisms for replacing NTIs role in the IANA process as really initiated a very vigorous effort which is I mean nothing I think anybody know full well, awful lot of dialogue associated with that.

It brings into pretty sharp relief that there are in effect three globalization and governance streams if you will. One is the broad transformation of ICANN itself.

And (Larry Strickland) arrives immediately exactly on time here to hear of this.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Then we'll wait for him to leave right? So one broad stream is the globalization of ICANN which has been underway for a while.

And then the - this new stream if you will is the transformation or the evaluation perhaps of the IANA process and what changes if any are needed in the - after this announcement.

And that has become of course a pretty vigorous issues. There is no firm and fast clock on this. But the natural one is related to the exploration of the existing IANA contract.

As a matter of form I'll say that that contract is a three year contract that ends September 30 2015 that is essentially 18 months from now.

However that contract has options for extensions. It has two options for extensions of two years a piece so that it could be running as long as seven years.

And speaking as just on my own as somebody who once worked for the US government and had something to do with money and contracts and so forth there's plenty of flexibility to do things other than those particular marker points.

But if one takes the September 30, 2015 next year as a kind of natural target then there's a bunch of things that have to happen pretty vigorously between now and then. And we don't have 18 months to begin thinking about things. We have less than 18 months to basically get things settled so that if that contract is going to expire and transitions are going to take place all of the -

what happens after that is well understand. And if any mechanisms have to be put in place they're up and running and tested and so forth. So that's dominating a lot of activity.

And then as another quite substantial activity is the issues of Internet governance At-Large and a Brazil meeting next month and the one net initiative are key elements of that.

All of that is supposed to be focused on things that are not specific about ICANN and the small set of issues that ICANN is focused on and is responsible for.

But that's a lot of activity. And the announcement last Friday I guess a week ago really change the tenor of everything and changed the focus.

So those activities are not only dominating a lot of the board's attention but they're dominating a lot of everyone's attention. And I'm sure the same is true here.

We very, very much want to hear - I'll finish that sentence but I'll come back and say the (unintelligible) we want to hear everyone's views on the IANA evaluation process.

But let me restate it. It isn't that we want you to tell us. We want people to be talking about it and we want people to be telling each other about it and it's not just an input into a closed decision process.

But there needs to emerge a broad understanding of what the issues are and I have to say what the issuers aren't.

I'm watching a lot of traffic that suggests that this is being used as an opportunity either to add on a whole lot of other things or is - it's evidence that people are imagining a lot of things that just aren't the case about how the

IANA function works and what doesn't and what it doesn't do. So and that's really a as I say a big change.

And meanwhile not incidentally we got all of our usual work to do, the gTLD program and, you know, support for all the different parts of the organization that each other's supporting organizations and advisory committees.

I've been spending my time as I indicated a little bit earlier on looking at some of the machinery and processes and trying to get them sorted out to be a bit more efficient and a bit more effective.

It's low key work in a way, you know, not deliberately not trying to make a big splash about things but trying to quietly as possible get things to work more and more smoothly.

We've made several accomplishments which I'm very pleased about and there'll be more to come and none of them will be headline making, at least I hope they won't.

It's slightly awkward that Fadi has left the room because with respect to the board advisory committees they were started with a certain mindset and that the context for those has really changed as a consequence of the recent activities.

And so we're in the process of actually suspending or facing down those advisory committees. Anybody...

Man: Fadi did update us a little on that. We met with Fadi yesterday and he - we - and again our discussion with him was post the formulation of this agenda. And he did update us about some of the changes and with the advisory committees.

Man: How excellent. That's great. And I don't remember whether he told us or me that he had done that but anyway that's great. And I'm sure he was more eloquent about all that than I have been and provided greater context.

So rolling back to the first bullet what elements of board update are left for us to communicate that haven't been included in what I've said before. And let me look around to see what my colleagues want to add. (Bruce)?

(Bruce): Great really just add less the board update the more a question actually.

One of the things that we're being asked to do and that came at TRT to report as well as increasing the civic globalization is that an active discussion within the GNSO at the moment in terms of sort of reviewing participation that you get in working groups and means to wider participation?

And has there been any thought to how you get topics on the agenda that might be interest to perhaps a developing world?

You know, a lot of when I look at the agenda of the GNSO the last few years it's very much dealing with what I call first world problems. Has there been any thought or process to try and get different issues that might be of interest to other parts of the world into policy development processes?

(Jonathan): Anyone want to comment or provide any input on that? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sticking my hand up just to see if Claus is in the room. Is Claus Stole here? Okay I defer to Claus.

Claus Stole: Yes absolutely honestly I didn't pay any attention. I was reading something. Could you please repeat it?

Man: I think (Bruce) made a couple of points really about issues on either I think globalization or in particular topics relating, you know, noting that with respect

to globalization much of the agenda of the GNSO over the past or rememberable past has seems to have been focused on issues that may be seen to be more primarily associated with the developed world rather than the developing world.

So Mikey suggests that you may have some comments or issue around globalization.

And you also talked about participation I suppose in working groups and the extent that participation reflected any kind of diversity?

Claus Stole: Much as this is embarrassing for me that I didn't pay attention on the most important point I think it's - which is on the agenda. Because I think we can't separate any of that what is going on with the IANA contract or this globalization from the topic of development.

And what we need is basically more dialogue and more mechanisms to get things together.

And sometimes I've got the feelings that we are talking on the basis that we have different groups and everybody expects the other one to come into adapt to their terms and conditions and work of doing some things together instead of trying to find simple mechanisms.

And there is also the other element of resources and funding. Development always smacks of somebody has to sort something or fund something.

And I think the development world and especially through that wonderful tool of the Internet has now the opportunity and is establishing opportunities to basically self-fund and to make itself sustainable.

And that only works and that is a big - and that's a great thing because we're a multi-stakeholder process to bring the different things together.

So what you're seeing there are so many things which overlap and are overdoing. And for example what we're trying to do in NPOC is now to show on very, very small examples like the (unintelligible) and other things to demonstrate hey have a look.

This is how it works and how it could work to give you very quick example for example the new gTLDs. I think it was 16 new gTLDs from Africa ICANN was heavily criticized for that. Why only 16?

The answer's very simple. Because why should somebody invest money in gTLDs in Africa if they don't have a business model to pay for it and to sustain it?

And in the developing world and we demonstrated that there are business models and that there is a second, a third and fourth round if we not only tell people hey there are new opportunities of gTLDs.

Also say hey this is a way how you can actually sustain and maintain and bid for them. Then you have instead of 16 you have 500, 600. And you don't have to look for new solutions or great committees or costly implementation.

These things already exist. And what is needed and to come back to the what I said at the beginning what we try to have to do to set up a multi-stakeholder process to do this I understand -- and sorry that I'm talking so much -- and I understand this is not core business of ICANN but it's something ICANN effects and ICANN is effected by.

So these mechanisms what we are trying to do is to set mechanisms where everybody can go freely in and out as they feel comfortable and as they are right with it.

And if somebody wants to know more about it NPOC me and a lot of other people here who are participating in that dialogue for quite a while are happy to talk to you about it and do this.

This is something - and to be absolutely honest this is something we've been waiting for since many, many years out, thank you.

(Steve): I see at least a couple people who want to respond but I want to insert myself here and just raise one point. I agree with virtually everything you said about using tools that are in the developing world and so forth.

The one area that I'm not certain about is the relationship to the IANA contract and functions in that from where I sit there is essentially no coupling, no relationship at all between the IANA function and any of the issues that you raised.

The IANA function is a - is reduced to its simplest is a clerical function of publishing information that is pre-determined - determined by others I should say, handed over to IANA to publish and that's the end of that.

And the primary issues are making sure that it works reliably and accurately and in a timely fashion and is divorced from policy issues and sort of big issues is supposed to be as unexceptional as possible.

Claus Stole: (Steve) very quick answer. Yes you are 100% right. But there is also a level of perception. And there's a lot of symbolism behind it. And wherever people feel this function is now carried over to the community I think is a great thing and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

(Steve): And the reason I just made that speech is to deal with the perceptions. And so this is the beginning one of many speeches that we'll have to give I think

to try to separate out these perceptions and say there's nothing there even if you want it to be there. But it's...

Claus Stole: It is not there. That's understood. But we have - just what you said, we have to talk to it.

(Steve): Right. Do you want to jump and in other words I'll (unintelligible)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Steve): Yes.

Maria Farrell: Hi. This is Maria Farrell speaking. And just responding to (Bruce)'s questions there were two really there I think. And one was what if anything we're doing on participation and broadening the reach?

And like everybody else we're always talking about but, you know, that's not an action per se.

Yesterday we had quite an involved discussion about how do we onboard people practically into working groups? And we had a couple of different views on, you know, do you immerse people? Do you train them? Do you and bring them in gently helping them to do public comments?

So we've got quite a lot of I would say even using the existing resources we're really looking at how to improve the - we're reasonably good I think at getting people to come to their first meeting or, you know, to join the consistency.

And what we're really looking at and Mikey has really led on a lot of this is that's great but how do we now get them into being in a working group or, you know, being an active member? So we're kind of looking at the nuts and bolts of that.

And then the second question that you asked is, you know, I think it's a really fair comment but a lot of the GNSO council issues are first world problems in a way.

And, you know, I'm not going to talk about that so much as my idea was talking to a couple of people about it yesterday actually and with my apologies to the registrar constituency because I haven't mentioned this to them.

But I do wonder is there a piece of work that we could do which is about looking at, you know, the fact that well known statistics there are only six registrars in the entire continent of Africa.

And is there some piece of work we can do be it outreach, be it capacity building and there are lots of resellers but actually ICANN accredited registers...

Man: (Unintelligible)

Maria Farrell: ...even, yes I've heard five now, probably six. And so is there something we can do in terms of the legal model in terms of the contract to requirement in terms of the operational needs in terms of even pooling resources?

And, you know, is there almost like a registrar light? I know there's reselling but is there some way we can look at the requirements that we currently have?

And I don't know if it's watering down the requirements or if it's just looking at what is specific to that market that we are just not serving right now?

And, you know, we're not - and we're not providing a product which is the ICANN registrar model that actually speaks to them because it's just too expensive.

You know, you need to have \$200,000 in the bank basically to be one. And, you know, if you've got a small ccTLD or local market you're just not going to do that.

So I do wonder if there's something we can do, you know, in terms of looking at and is it research, is it outreach, you know, (unintelligible)?

Man: Maybe call on you (Ray) in just a second. Let me repeat some of what you went through in a discussion about the JAS process and so it - the application for a TLD, gTLD as big as it might look is a tiny part of what it actually costs to go into operation for a new gTLD.

So the overriding question is what is the business model as raised before? If there isn't a business model then it doesn't make sense. And I don't see any way to get around that. And I don't think it matters whether it's community drive or non-profit or public interest or what. There still has to be a financial stability otherwise we won't survive no matter how much it's propped up with initial funds or support and so forth. Yes.

Maria Farrell: Certainly I accepted, you know, the requirements for running critical infrastructure and I don't disagree with that at all.

But I'm wondering if what we said is the business model this is not - this is a managed market. And we've set up through our contracts and through our operational requirements a very specific model of what a registrar looks like. And I'm talking about at the registrar level.

And is there - can we look at that in terms of, you know, not every company that we may want to do that is going to be, you know, a northern American or European company.

So can we just look at the model again and see is there another way to go about it?

Man: At least two - let me start over here.

Man: Thanks I'm councilor from the non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. I just wanted to address that question (Bruce) posed on what whether the GNSO Council is having discussions on widening the pool of volunteers and PDP working groups.

And what Maria said quite a bit about that. And I would say the short answer is yes. Yes we are having this discussion. We have taken a look at the ATRT 2 report, the parts pertinent to that.

There was also a staff paper presented with some possible actions we could take. The discussion is not only taking place on the council level but also within stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And we - we're not just looking at how to widen the pool of volunteers in the PDP working groups which is quite challenging but also on how to retain those who do volunteer because we have seen volunteers who come in and then drop off after participating that first time.

And one of the initiatives that I'm sorry that Mikey's taking up is a sort of a Webinar to introduce new volunteers to the PDP process and the working group and how it works sort of wean new folks into the process and make it easy - make it that transition to it a little easier.

But it is still a work in progress but again the short answer is yes and we are looking at it and we do need to find ways to improve. Thanks.

(Steve): (Ray) and then (Ilv)?

(Ray): Thank you (Steve). Going back to the registrar discussion there has been actually a lot of discussion and some work done in this area. And it is in the strategy for Africa. And that was a very specific topic of discussion in the session that was held in India about a year ago and it's been discussed since then.

The - it would make sense to me that for example if certain members of the registrar constituency would - or stakeholder group would go to the Africa sessions that are going to be held this week discussing the strategy for Africa because this is one of their major goals and objectives. And there's been some considerable discussion on that with regards to not only gTLD registrars but also registrar contracts with regards to the registrars and site ccTLDs.

And so that discussion is active. And the thing is that the registrar constituency I think needs to go get involved and get linked into that discussion because there needs to be more people in that room just in - to understand the people in Africa having a discussion about Africa.

Because if we're going to work together then we have to sit down together and talk. So I'll be glad to talk to you some more about that plan afterwards.

(Ilv German): Yes thank you, (Ilv German) for councilor for the registrars. Actually Claus I couldn't agree more than what - from what you are saying. There's one thing that you said that I (unintelligible) you said that you're not sure if it's the role of ICANN but I think I'm sure it's the role of ICANN.

I think that ICANN must make sure that now - it's not only Africa, it's other countries that are third world what we sometimes call the third world countries or underdeveloped that are - that will have the ability to take a part in this game.

And as we all know this - the businesses around the domain name community are mainly coming from, you know, the mature countries of the world, the western countries of the world. It's dominated by this part.

And we certainly need to find ways to help more businesses develop. I think that's a part of ICANN to help the Internet develop in these countries.

Now you talk about or you've talked about working with the - or developing the ccTLDs or something like that and in Africa. I can tell you all registrars specializes actually in registering the Africa.

It's extremely undeveloped. It is like really in bad shape. Certainly I would - I can have some ideas on how we can make things better. But it's not - it requires real activities, real programs and maybe even I don't know, just a thought, maybe some money put into it by ICANN to promote these things. This is how you move things in these areas.

(Steve): Start here.

Man: Okay I specifically mentioned Africa because Africa was the point of discussion.

I will also point out that there are strategic initiatives for Latin America and the Caribbean. And there's also one right now of that deals with the Middle East.

And so, you know, I've been involved with all of those. And I can tell you from my personal experience when I go to the sessions on Africa primarily everybody in there's from Africa.

When I go for the one that's Latin America and Caribbean pretty much everybody are my friends from South America.

And if I go to the one in the Middle East it's all the people I know from the Middle East. You know, I think that there needs to be some outreach by this group into there and to participate into how get these things to happen.

And so, you know, ICANN is supposed to be working together as a community. And so if the ideas are there they need to get into those strategic initiatives because those strategic initiatives are designed to get things into a strategic plan.

And once you get something into a strategic plan it goes into the operational plan. And once it's in the operational plan it goes into the budget, you know.

So there is a logical path that you could follow and there's certain things you could do to move things forward that in perhaps a little bit more accelerated manner if that's possible. But you won't know it until you get involved with these other initiatives that are there.

So let's take advantage of it. They're all here this week.

Man: Maybe just one side comment. The fact that there is just a small number of registers in any given region does not necessarily mean that the region is underserved.

I work for a larger reseller registrar. We have in under-served or countries where - areas where there are very few registrars. We have a lot of resellers there.

We have a lot of business partnerships with local registrars for their ccTLDs where we buy their ccTLDs from local registrars.

So as a reseller registrar we work indirectly in serving those areas where there are not many registrars. And working through a registrar that has experience they may graduate at some point to becoming registrars themselves some by implementing their own technical infrastructure, some by using ours but becoming accredited on their own.

So registrars that currently operate on a reseller model serve those countries as well. It does not meet - small number of registrars does not necessarily mean that there's no one registering domain names.

Infrastructure's not a problem but that's not something that ICANN has to deal with.

(Steve): Let's hear from Latin America here. (Olga)?

(Olga): (Unintelligible).

(Steve): All right (Ilv)?

(Ilv German): Just a very small comment. When I was - I was not only referring to registrars. It was also for the new gTLD the fact that it was mentioned that we had only a few new gTLD applications for that area.

(Steve): Wow.

Woman: Thank you (Steve). I want to come back to two notions. First of all I absolutely welcome any effort within GNSO to increase globally from the developing world the population of potential new registrars, et cetera.

But that said (Steve) made a very good point that this is not only a monetary issue. The amount of capital that you need to get into this line of business is

really not necessarily a bar. And it's also not a question that these amounts of money don't exist in our regions.

But from a given perspective what you really have is ICANN almost has like a type of franchise opportunity. There is an opportunity to get into this line of business called being a registrar.

And I believe that there is a communication gap between the existence of the opportunity and the developing world just to know that this is out there, how do we get in it, et cetera.

So I would - this is a huge undertaking. It's more than just what a small working group could do. But I welcome that within GNSO. And I would highly recommend that that be integrated with what ICANN staff is doing in terms of outreach and communication and becoming known to new constituencies globally. So thank you very much for that piece of news.

(Steve): Mike and we're over time so we've got to bring this to a close. But Mike?

Mikey O'Connor: Let me be really quick. (Ray)'s covered my thought of what I wanted to say but as I think the only person at the table that actually lives in Africa, these have to be local solutions.

ICANN has done a lot in they're not trying to impose anything but rather facilitating it for local people to come up with solutions. They're there.

I would rather suggest instead of a GNSO telling us that we need to do stuff is as (Ray) mentioned a lot of those sessions engage with other people. They'd be rooting to know that their people are interested and there's good business to be had.

Africa's not a clear continent. It's not a particularly well serve continent but Africa's not a bad continent.

Latin America is not (unintelligible). And the opportunities are there engage. But it's got to be locally driven. It can't be driven by us. It can't be driven top down. It's got to be locally driven.

(Steve): Thank you. As I said we're past time. But sir?

(Vincent Odifre): Yes just to say a quick one. My name is (Vincent Odifre) the Chair of Africa ICT Alliance. You can see my badge. I (unintelligible) newcomer on the business side, user side.

And I want to really use this opportunity to appreciate the outreach that has been done that made it possible for me to be here especially appreciating (Mary Lee) and (Max Sieber). (Max Sieber) was at the event last year. And that gave all of our members some kind of wait. You've got (unintelligible) splitting ICANN.

And that's why I'm here today, my first ICANN meeting. And I think we need to really be fully engaged, involved with our team locally. The solutions are there really but we need to get their buy-in. We need to be fully involved in what they're doing.

If you are not here last year I don't think I'll here today, truly. I saw the commitment. They were there fiscally. And right now there are a number of executives that are behind me that we are just preparing to be more involved.

So ICANN (unintelligible) registrar but we user or communities must be empowered effectively to be involved locally, what they're doing locally.

Thank you.

(Steve): Thank you very much. (Jonathan) I'll leave it to you to bring the session to a close.

(Jonathan): Well thanks very much (Steve). I think we're done. We've - you've given us a lot of time and we've dug into some of the issues, so appreciate it, appreciate your time as always. And it's useful to have the opportunity and the fact that you've committed us to raise issues as we see fit is much appreciated as well rather than to try and shape or, you know, curtail the conversation.

So thanks to you and your board colleagues for the time and the approach.

(Steve): Thank you. And as I noted at the beginning the most useful part of this are the pointed and sometimes pointy and uncomfortable aspects.

We have been listening. We will pay attention to the points that have been raised about things that have not been done or that need to be done better. And we'll take all that to heart and work on it. Thank you.

END