

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
CSG
Tuesday 25 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.

Elisa Cooper:: All right, so we have a lot to cover today so we should probably get started. First of all I want to join in the other CSG leaders in welcoming you to today's meeting, where we will be getting ready for the board meeting which will occur immediately following this meeting, but we have a couple of other sort of last minute presentations and in particular we'll be hearing from Larry Strickling, so he will be coming in here at 10:25.

And we'll have 20 minutes or so to ask him questions. I'm sure that many of you have already had a chance to hear him speak, so I've not asked him to come in and prepare anything. It's really more of a Q&A session. We'll also have an opportunity to hear from the SVAC and they'll be joining us at 9:55. We have a little bit of time up at the front to kind of get started. I've got sort of a draft agenda for what we'll be discussing with the board.

We already spent a fair amount of time on Sunday going through what the topics would be and what the supporting points would be. We've identified some speakers who might speak on particular points, but you know, that was just an idea. Those are recommendations. If you're not comfortable, if you don't want to do it, we have time to make last minute adjustments. Is there anything else that folks would like to try to do today? We don't have a ton of time, but are there any other issues or topics that we should discuss while we're together today?

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper:: So Marilyn would like to make a quick announcement.

Marilyn Cade: I just wanted to make a quick announcement. You may have seen on the agenda that on Thursday there will be a mock board meeting, and I want to welcome - ask you to welcome four representatives from the youth who will be shadowing the DC today, will be coming with us into the meetings and then they will be participating in a mock board meeting on Thursday.

And the topic that they are addressing is - of ideas, so join us in welcoming (Marie Patello) and Angie Graves are helping me - and Chris Chaplow to help shepherd them around, but do welcome them and they will be with us through most of the day, the morning and the board meeting, and then in the afternoon they'll be in the DC.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper:: Are there any other topics or areas that people would like to discuss before we kind of go through our agenda with the board? It's probably - makes sense to do, since we've got a larger group today, to do just a quick update in terms of where we're at with the election for board seat #13, and I think, Marilyn, you wanted to speak on that.

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Elisa Cooper:: But we should do that briefly and then we should talk about this.

Marilyn Cade: And of course this is the public meeting. This is an open meeting, so I'll be providing very high level points, feedback points, and then we can talk offline with any more detailed questions. The board seat, just a quick recap, the - there are two seats that are elected to the - from the GNSO. The voting is

done by the policy counselors. We have six policy counselors, two per constituency.

The nomination process is done and the election process involves both - have to come from both SG's in our house, both of the - sorry, the SG's in our house, plus the one nominating committee appointee, and that is (Dan Reed) this time around. We have from our side of the house, we have nominated Bill Graham. There is a nominee from the non-commercial stakeholder group, and that is (Audrey Doria).

There's some interest in some parts of that house and another candidate as well, but they have accepted the idea that there would be one candidate. Christina, the CSG executive, Christina in this case and Tony and myself, are trying to meet with the NCSG executive committee to agree on a procedure. I did have a few minutes with David Cake last night, and we've agreed that I will send a formal invitation for the three of us to get together with a yet unnamed number of representatives from their executive committee to work on procedure.

It could be one person. It could be more. They're deciding. And then we will have to continue to work out how we move forward with the election. The time - the big issue right now is getting agreement on procedures, and the last election we held, we had agreed on a requirement of 60% of the votes across the house, which means that any candidate has to get, even if they get all six votes from one SG, they have to get at least one vote from the other SG and the non-nominating committee appointee vote, or two votes from the other SG.

It is a very challenging situation to have to go through with all these elections. We - it's similar to what we went through with the Life Share election on council, and I would ask some of you coming back to your executive committee with feedback and with questions, because we are electing a

board member for the good of ICANN, even though they are elected from the SG.

And they are - it's always very difficult - it's a difficult situation to reach agreement on what the overall purpose of the board is and what the issues are. Bill Graham has met with us. He has offered to meet with any of the constituencies again face to face, and I would urge any of you, I think people continue to have questions for him, and I think it would be good to take the opportunity to talk with him directly.

He's a fairly quiet guy, but he is very active in the three board committees that he is on. It's not something that we all do, we board committee members throughout the time, but if you are interested in more conversation with him, your officers can reach out directly and find individual time for you.

Elisa Cooper:: If I could just add just a kind of further complicating factor is that the ICANN bylaws require that we notify the ICANN secretary of who our candidate will be six months before the end of the annual meeting, which means that we basically are looking at - I think it's you know, April 16th or something, by which we have to have this election conducted and a candidate, so that obviously is not making things any easier.

All right, so thank you for that. We are now joined by the SVAC and we are going to hear from them. As I mentioned, then we'll be joined by Larry Strickling and then we'll have some time to finalize our preparations before we move into meeting with the board. So thank you so much. Patrick, over to you.

Patrick Falstrom: Thank you very much. I'm always impressed by people that are keeping the timelines, so thank you very much for that, because we're one of the groups that today are running around from meeting to meeting, right between the rooms, so thank you very much. Patrick Falstrom, chair of the secure desk

subdivision of our subcommittee, and I join you here together with Jim Galvin my vice chair.

And then I also have a number of SVAC members that also came with me into the room. Can the SVAC members please stand up so they see who you are? And the reason why I want them to stand up is because if it is the case you have follow-up questions, just capture any of them and thank you very much. And you can also follow up with questions.

On the agenda, you have got all the slides, I hope. Otherwise we can distribute them, and so this is the agenda for today. We - I would - I can give an overview of our activities. Then we have prepared the presentation of the two latest reports, Acts 64 and 65, and then question answers.

Question to this group is whether you want us to go through all of this or whether we should move into question and answer quicker. We can for example concentrate on one of the two reports, do a quick overview, and then concentrate on one of the two reports. That is what I would suggest.

Elisa Cooper:: I think a quick overview would make sense for this group.

Patrick Falstrom: So let's start with a quick overview and then we'll see where we end up. And let's see, and we have until quarter past 10, so SVAC was commissioned in 2001 and began operations in 2002. It provides guidance to the ICANN board and the ICANN community and the international community as a whole. What is important is what we have here on the chart, our charter.

And this is something that specifically in these days, I think it's important to remember. It is to advise the ICANN community and board on matters related to the security and integrity of the infinite name and address allocations to (Unintelligible). We are currently 40 members appointed to the ICANN board for three-year terms. We are - because of that we have been viewing about a

third of the numbers each year, and we're just moving into a real - a start of a real cycle.

The current activities include the membership committee that is doing the review. We are working on DMF site workshops, that we have every Wednesday, and encourage all of you to send the people in your organizations that are interested in DMF set to this workshop, and also for future ICANN meetings as you submit proposals to this workshop, with is gaining popularity in the ICANN community.

We have a work party on ICANN for these metrics. We have since quite a number of years now explicit outreach to law enforcement and cooperate with law enforcement in production with the ICANN community. We will this year just like previous years host a workshop at the infinite governor's forum, and we just started a work party on the public suffix lists, where I emphasize that this is included.

We are also just launched a work party on security and stability implications for the globalization of ICANN. We don't have the exact wording here on the name of the work party, and that is because the work party itself will actually form in a few hours, so we don't really have the exact wording of that work party, but we are - we do have one that is looking at this and related issues.

The publications that will - related publications by category if we look at them, we of course have been looking quite a lot on DMS security lately, but also we have been also sort of moved into various different abuse scenarios. We have since long term back had our eyes on what's happening regarding internationalization, regarding IBMs, these specific reports on this Act 60 that you see on the slides, is also having some comments on trademark clearing house which might be interesting to this group.

We also are following the work on (unintelligible), and we are very happy to say that the - with the current events regarding (unintelligible) in the ICANN

community is actually following an architecture on how to attack these sort of problems that we took a step back in SVAC and wrote the report and said this is how we think the community should attack these issues. Otherwise we have to wait until the cows come home.

So we're very happy to see that things are now moving forward, everything is moving well. So with that I have - is it that we start by asking if anyone have any questions on the SVAC and any other questions.

Elisa Cooper: How do you actually determine your priorities in terms of what you'll be research and advising on next?

Patrick Falstrom: We do have once - at least once a year, we do ask the SVAC members to do an outreach in their individual capacity in whatever kind of sort of - what times they have as individuals for what they believe are important reports on what two-year period. But it takes us between three months and a year to produce a report. So the way we work, we come with (unintelligible) something happened yesterday. Let's do something.

That's incredibly hard for us. So we ask people to please come with what do you think is important, what could actually help a year from now. From that we have a list, and we have a longer - we have a discussion in SVAC on what we believe the priorities are. That is driven by input from various sources.

Now given that we are an advisory committee, there are of course other things which immediately get high priority, and for example, if we get a question from the board which we express advisor to, then we makes sure that we are responding to that. The more directed questions are from other SONAB's. For example, from - we got some direct questions from the government advisory committee we - that was so easy to respond to that question, which means that we also prioritized that because that was pretty easy.

So the prioritization we do is sort of a broad prioritization once a year, but then we say that we can have approximately six work guidance in parallel depending on the amount of resources we have, so every time something closes, we go back to our list of priorities and say should we pick the top one or should we pick something - or is there a reason to pick something else. Thank you. Please.

Jonathan Zuck: Hi, Jonathan Zuck from ATT. I was wondering with a number of reviews, you know, coming up under the affirmation of commitments in the next year, 18 months from now, whether or not some of the things on your priority list might be input, potential inputs into those reviews. I know one of the ones that I'm working on right now is the review on consumer competition, trust and choice. And in the trust area there certainly seemed to be a lot of areas where a well-timed report would be very helpful to a review team that would have to convene in that time frame.

Patrick Falstrom: The work we're doing are quite often two different kinds of reports. One kind of report is that we are reviewing material that is produced by someone else, basically like sending something to you in the commentary or during the reply period during an open consultation. The other thing we're doing is that we're responding to specific questions and that question could either be issued by ourselves or by some other constituency.

I must admit that we are pretty bad at sort of getting our acts together. It is the case that we've just seen something that is - that might actually happen, so if I'm happy to talk more with you about what we more specifically can do, because our reports - the goal of our reports more and more ends up being recommendations to someone to do something, okay?

And if a question or the activity that we are doing cannot result in a recommendation to someone, we have internally, we have seen that those reports where we just describe something doesn't get a lot of traction. It's

much better if we actually can find some kind of actionable result of the work we're doing, but I'm happy to talk more with you about this.

Elisa Cooper:: Christina?

Christina Rodriguez: Thanks. Patrick, I need to take this off track a little bit, but I think it's a question that folks sure would appreciate your answer to. You and I are both invited to the CEO calls that (Claude) has, and in the February call, you made a couple of statements that I was hoping we could follow up on, one of which was that we had new GTLDs that are so broken technically that I think various clauses that state that they (unintelligible) has been matched, and that the issues of satisfaction has been seen have been broken, clearing the house has not yet been acted on at all.

And I was hoping that you could provide a little bit more clarity as to have those issues been addressed, and going forward, is there a formal or perhaps informal role for SVAC to be providing input on some of these new GTLBs' technical issues as the rollout continues, and is there anything that we as a commercial stakeholder group could do to support that effort?

Patrick Falstrom: Yes, first of all the comments I made was as you said on one of the (unintelligible) advice chair calls, and I think it is important for us to be able to have these calls and make - able to make statements on the experience that we have in the various groups. To some degree the quote of what I said first of all was spread sort of out of context, which meant that there was a lot of paddling backwards for all of us on the call.

And (unintelligible) got all this encountered rumors based on that, so thank you for being able to clarify this. So first thing, I appreciate having only one discussion in this room. So first of all, regarding the brokenness, it is a fact that the ROTDs in the new (unintelligible) round, which is - which are live in the root zones, which do not follow the requirements laid out in the PDP, and

that is something that anyone can see, and we don't see there's any (unintelligible) action on this because (unintelligible) does not do this.

This is something that anyone can see by just looking at the STLDs and looking at the requirements in the applicant guide book and the (unintelligible). The reason why I pointed out was not as an SVAC chair is that from the technical unit, there is a discussion going on, on people (unintelligible), and of course individuals are asking themselves how - what is the role of the compliance team? How is this going on?

And just because I saw the discussions going on, and there started to become some concern in the technical community whether the - what the role actually is for a compliance team when - how long should we wait for the compliance team to act, and in reality if it is the case that those requirements are not fulfilled, then the rules are that EBERO can actually be activated or (unintelligible) has been broken for six hours.

The question is then what - how do you count six hours, what do you mean by broken? Is it the same thing as listed in PDP? And that's why I said the word that actually was lost in the quotes, and that is a bureau could be or can be okay, because according to the letter, a bureau can be but doesn't have to be okay. And this ends up being a process into - which I found as a chair of one of the SONACs that also have (unintelligible) within my community that I represent, might end up being a process issue.

And I wanted to make the other SONAC chairs aware of this. That's a very big difference between having the SVAC making a statement, based on the computation, based on some kind of (unintelligible) so the point I made was about the potential attack (unintelligible) process not the actual fundamental issue that was brought up. It was just an example, okay?

So that was number one. Number two, trademark clearing house, I think that phone call was actually only two weeks ago, we have got the report back

from SVAC saying that if now a proposal that is worked on regarding trademark clearing house which do resolve our issues, okay, that's that. It is under deliberation and of course we deliberate when it is the case that the deliberations on the changes are done whether it actually matches what - I can say that now we actually do see signs that not only that work is ongoing which I said on the call. It's actually seeing even more positive results of what is happening, so I would say there are positive things happening there.

Christina Rodriguez: Appreciate the clarification. Thank you very much. In terms of the process point with regard to EBERO, is that something that we can help with? Is that something that you see a role for the CSG perhaps in monitoring compliance, coordinating with SX, you know, to the extent that there is, I think that it's probably safe to say that everyone would be happy to do that.

Patrick Falstrom: I have no idea. And this is one of the reasons why I brought it up on the calls between the SO and AC chairs to discuss this.

Elisa Cooper:: Sorry, Ron, and then I think Steve Metalitz who's on the line has a call. And Rick.

(Ron): Thank you very much, Patrick. I was wondering if you could just come back to the comment you made about that there's - SX is voicing concern about compliance lags with regard to new TTLDs that are - have been added to the root and there's an issue...

Patrick Falstrom: No, no, I did not say that.

(Ron): I want to understand that, thank you.

Patrick Falstrom: Yes, I said that I pointed out to the other SONA seated chairs that there might be a process issue here, okay?

(Ron): And so - and the - but these are new TDLs that are being added into the root now?

Patrick Falstrom: That is correct.

(Ron): And they're not - there's issues that would be technical issues that would cause a problem in terms of stability.

Patrick Falstrom: There - that might, because this is not black and white and specifically not the way the PDP and (unintelligible) is written, there is nothing black and white in there, and that's why it's very important that these kind of discussions or the process does not turn into black and white discussions.

(Ron): Thank you very much.

Patrick Falstrom: Oh, sorry. I got - maybe people don't know what PDP means. That is the pre-delegation testing that is part of the acceptance of the application and the deployment of the ATLD.

Elisa Cooper:: Steve Metalitz then Rick, and then Mikey, and then we should definitely let Patrick continue on, because he's only here with us for another less than 20 minutes.

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper: Yes, so I'm sorry, did you...

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz. Can you hear me?

Elisa Cooper:: Yes, we can hear you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. My question to Patrick was about SVAC advisories. Are these posted for public comment, and if not, is there an alternative way to either

raise questions about what's in the advisory or to provide reactions to the advisory?

Patrick Falstrom: Thank you for that question. First of all, no, they are not open for public comments. And the reason for that is that the way our advisories work is that we could use our advisories ourselves, and then it's up to the community to decide whether the (unintelligible) is something that you should reference or not, and what is then up to public comment is for example if it is the case that the board or ICANN staff for example kept our device, then what - their actions that they want to do based on our advice, that is up for public comment.

So the public comment and feedback on advice is sort of one step off to what we have done. Next part (unintelligible) is how do you come with feedback to us. Well one way is for example to ask questions at these meetings or to come to our open meeting which this week is Thursday morning, 8am. Hurray! Bring coffee!

Where we are discussing the work parties and what we are doing, where we can have discussions, it's also - this is also one of the reasons why I bring all the SVAC members to this room and why I present to you what we're currently working on, because I want to have more discussions with others on these specific topics.

Now the only thing that in reality because of this is really done in a closed room for SVAC is when we write out - when we finalize the actual recommendations, because that is something that as you might understand for various reasons is something that we absolutely must do in a closed room, so here - so if you don't like what we write in our recommendations, do not reference it, okay? It gives you an ability to completely ignore what we are saying - we even to say these guys are nuts. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Rick, then Mikey. Well, actually, let Mikey go since Rick can come up. So go ahead, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi, it's Mikey O'Connor. I just want to do a plug for the little email list that I started in my typical haphazard way that's called GNSO-SSR, and I want to thank Patrick and the other members of the SVAC for joining that list. It's off to a bit of a start. It's not really settled yet what we're going to talk about or how, but you know, to Christina's point and Steve's point and stuff, the goal of that list is simply to open a channel for conversation, communication, you know, the sort of informal sidebar about this topic.

And if anybody would like to join and can't dredge up the notice - we sent out a notice a month or so ago - please let me know or get a hold of your respective executorial type people and we'll get you on the list. I just wanted to say thanks to the SVAC for being right in there.

Patrick Falstrom: Yes, and let me emphasize what Mikey said. Even if you think for example that I might not speak up so often on that list, let me tell you that I read every single message there, so when you're discussing even the discussions only between you, we see there, and that's a very good input. So (unintelligible).

Rick Wilhelm: Rick Wilhelm speaking, and I just wanted to - or deal into a little comment that Christina made on the - should (unintelligible) try and provide more oversight of new demands, new processes, and provide that information back to the SVAC, and I think (unintelligible) is really the best place to send that kind of (unintelligible), and there's so many new capabilities that compliance has within the elite program, so I think that's really the best place that this kind of stuff go. Thanks.

Patrick Falstrom: (Unintelligible) let me just say very explicitly (unintelligible) of the evaluation or anything of the new CODs. We are not part of any of the PDTs and the only comments we are making just because it takes us between three months and a year to write the reports, the only thing we are commenting on is for

example the overall architecture, whether it's - whether we think it's stable enough.

We haven't got quite a lot of questions the last few weeks on for example variance and the label generation rules and the integration panels, and this is whether we would like to evaluate the result of the label generation rules for variance, and we are saying that - and we don't want to because we're not a part of the process of the evaluation.

On the other hand we have already made a statement that the process itself from SX perspective looks sound as long as the evaluation of whatever is produced in that process is actually - actually results in decision by the integration panel. So we are pointing - we have pointed our (unintelligible) integration panel which is key, which makes that process robust and stable.

That is the kind of evaluation we are doing of a process that is sort of invented in ICANN, and also we in this case, we trust the process, we see that is how the process is implemented, then the process itself should continue to run and as (Rick) said, it's up to the other processes regarding potential appeal whether that exists, compliance team, etcetera, etcetera.

So we are sort of more close to SSR on those kind of readings that is happening more than where the compliance team sees what I mean regarding being close or far away from actual operations within ICANN, so we are actually further away from sort of operations of the - of ICANN than what people think.

Elisa Cooper:: Tony?

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Tony Holmes. Patrick, as you're aware from earlier conversations, one of the big concerns and SP's and others have had is over known collisions, and since then the events have moved on, we've had the JIS report come out. Would you say as part of that set's potential role to do a

retake of the metrics that have been put forward in the recommendations and how that's changed the overall landscape?

Patrick Falstrom: At the moment we - our meeting with SVAC, where we're going to discuss among other things this issue this afternoon, so I cannot - it might be the case, but what I'm not going to say is what the current status is. That might change. First of all regarding collisions, I encourage you to read set 64 which (unintelligible) issue from a technical point of view and explains what the actual issues are that we have been talking about before.

And regarding the test report in general, well the SVAC has made the recommendation, has - to the board to - or to ICANN staff to work on something that results on a study being made, like in this case with just we at SVAC, we do believe that that work is done based on the report from us, so it will be sort of awkward if we are directly commenting on the report itself, because we are now sort of neutral on the report.

On the other hand, if it is the case that the study itself is doing something which is sort of - shows that whoever did the - that whoever is doing the report did not understand our - which is a difference from disagree with - did not understand what we wrote, in that case we would have something. Otherwise, we are looking more at what is coming in during the public comment period and if there are mistakes or misunderstandings, we are looking into filing replies.

So I think that is where our role is, because we just like everyone else, it's sort of the trusted process ICANN has, and in this case we should report where we recommended ICANN to do a study. They are doing the study. It's an open consultation period and then there is a reply mechanism, and that's it. So with that?

((Crosstalk))

Elisa Cooper:: You have until 10:25.

Patrick Falstrom: Okay. Well, I'm - I can actually give you another like 10 minutes, so that's fine. I'm sorry, misunderstanding. I thought we ended - I thought I had to run out at a quarter past 10, so 10 more minutes.

Elisa Cooper:: No, you have 7 minutes if you can spare it.

Patrick Falstrom: Seven minutes and 31 seconds. Let's go. So let's - so just because you mentioned search system, (unintelligible) collisions, let me go through this. So I guess (unintelligible) so what we did was we looked at how current operating systems have retention process structures. We highlight our security and stability implications with some searched for behaviors and with the process forming on how to improve such data processing.

Now when we are (unintelligible) reports, we have over time discovered that if we write reports where the words are targeted to the whole community, we are not so popular. If the words we choose are targeted toward the community, then we are also sending recommendations to, which mean that then they are not so popular. This means that with the right something which is toward government, it's one kind of language.

These reports are to the technical community, so (unintelligible) oh what are they talking about? So this is one of the reports which are quite technical. Don't be nervous, but the people that we are targeted with this same page, either they understand or they should understand this. So what is searched this processing? That is a feature that allows the user to enter partial name and application and there are actually other domain names which are looked up.

So for example if you have a search list that consists of (unintelligible) domain (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) domain (unintelligible) and the end user types in system in the browser, the operating system would actually look

up systems under domain one.com and then systems of some domain two.com, and then systems in some order, not that order, okay? That's what I'm (unintelligible).

So on this slide of course, you cannot read it on here but I can read it because I am much closer, what we have seen is that there is a way to search this or applied is everything from not being applied at all to have the domain name plus what's in the search list plus dot dot dot, the fourth domain name being added. So - and you have all of these different variants in unspecified order happening.

So yes, we see in SVAC the automatic addition of WWW (unintelligible) in the browser is a security and stability issue, okay? So now the first issue is that we have all of this non-standardized way for application operating systems to work, so what does then happen because of this? You have the ability to get both clear linkage and because of that privacy issues, see my goals have privacy issues for having people registering domain names that previously didn't exist that don't match the cause of the search list issue.

And then you will have the applications start to send emails to those, which means that the content of the email or what - or cookies or whatever is actually sent to someone that was not intended to get that information. If we then look at - once again look at the systems data, if we look at the number of queries for various domain names, then we see that (unintelligible) or many, many more queries for (unintelligible) than the others.

We also have a logarithmic (unintelligible) access, depending on how much you're into - used to these kind of things, you might want to look at the linear way access or (unintelligible) access depending on what you would like to see. So anyway, we see that there is quite a lot of queries for specific development work, and we believe that there's a connection between that and search list processing.

Now this one I actually would like to see if I can increase the size here. There it is. So on this one we see what's happening today. And here's the time (unintelligible) of court, and the result is that (unintelligible) domain name dot dot dot (unintelligible). What then happens is that the operating system queries for dot dot dot (unintelligible) and the DNS (unintelligible) dot dot dot court then example (unintelligible).

Then there will be experience to F5 for dot dot dot (unintelligible). She called it an example (unintelligible) I'm sorry, there is no such domain name. And then there's no trying dot dot dot (unintelligible) an example (unintelligible) record with these (unintelligible). Now just think of the business that's happening today. It relies on getting back what is called technical annexed domain, which is domain name does not exist in step two.

Now if it is the case that court is navigated and someone allocates a second level domain which is dot dot dot, then you will no longer get back a next domain as a result after this query. You will get an IP address and the application will continue just like what happened on step 8, and we see that is something which is not a good thing.

So we have a proposal for how to remedy this and how to go into the details on this. So we recommend ICANN (unintelligible) to actually consider the proposed behavior, because one of the big problems as I said is the first finding is the application (unintelligible) behave differently, and we need to have harmonization there, and this includes vendors of hardware, software, and the whole nine yards, everything.

Oh, that's the easy task, so what we are then recommending because of this is that in one way we recommend ICANN staff to work with DNS community and update the RSVs to include this new algorithm.

Elisa Cooper: Hi, actually I think we're just at about time and we really do need to bring in Larry Strickling. Would it be okay if people had questions, how can they have them answered?

Patrick Falstrom: The easiest way is to stop one of us in SVAC in the corridors and talk with us, and I see all the people that have questions, I know that they know who we are in SVAC but they should also reach out if they have questions. So with that, thank you very much.

Elisa Cooper: Well, thank you, Patrick, very much appreciate it.

Mikey O'Connor: So while (Alyssa) has gone away and thus the meeting is totally out of control, I was actually going to speak to the younger folks for your model board meeting. I've forgotten the name of your organization. (Unintelligible)? So this issue that Patrick just described is exactly like the issue that you're working on in that, in the issue you are working on, the problem is how do we get all of those software environments changed to accommodate the new TLDs, universal acceptance?

In this situation the question is how do we get all those software environments changed so that they don't do this kind of thing that Patrick just described. So when you are in your board meeting, one of the things to think about is how do we get the world to know, you know, this is a very large group of people that need to be identified and informed about these technical issues, either the issue that you're working on, universal acceptance, or this one which is in a way very similar.

It means that (unintelligible) have to be changed so that people who need to change the packages need to be told and they need to be motivated because there may not be money in the budget to do it (unintelligible) to solicit that and regain your (unintelligible).

Gisella Gruber-White: Thanks, Mikey. So we are very honored to have both Fiona and Larry Strickling here to answer questions so first of all I want to say thank you very much to both of you for agreeing to come. I know it was very last minute, but I think that there are you know, many members of the commercial stakeholders group who are very interested in asking questions and are probably looking to get some further clarification, so I really appreciate your flexibility. And I'm not sure if you want to say a few opening words, but I know that members do have questions.

Larry Strickling: So well let me ask a question to start. We just came from safety NSL and I came in and sat down. You know, I've been talking about this for the last three days here. I assume we can just go straight to questions, and they said no. But I'm prepared to go straight to questions if people feel they have a good handle on exactly what we announced in the paper, we announced, then we can get right to busting some myths here if that's what people would like to do.

Gisella Gruber-White: I think that is the case. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks for all you're doing, fantastic. I had a question out of the first session with (unintelligible). I am just as clueless about this as I was yesterday when I stood (unintelligible), so in terms of the content I've got nothing to ask about, but in terms of the process, one of the things that I think I misunderstood and I wanted to check with you all is that when Fadi had Jonathan and all the other leaders of the - you know, Patrick, (Kenny), and a whole bunch of people up there, I thought I heard him say something along the lines of this is sort of an organizing committee or a steering committee.

But when I talked to some of the folks afterwards they set me straight. They said, no, not really. We were just there to sort of describe what our organizations do. And if that's right, then let me follow up real quickly with a comment, which is it would be I think fantastic if by the end of this week we

had some group of people that was identified to sort of carry the ball, not necessarily perfect, not necessarily exactly right.

But the problem that we had in Buenos Aires as I'm sure you know is that we sort of threw all the cards in the air and they all kind of floated down on the floor and then it took us a while to pick the cards up and make a hand out of it, and so if we could get some sort of core group organized right out of the chute, is there any planning along those lines going on?

Larry Strickling: Well, first off, we think our role at this point is to basically step aside and let the (unintelligible) stakeholder process take hold and move forward, and frankly I was quite pleased by what I saw yesterday in the meetings in terms of the engagement. We did say in our statement it was very important that this not be just an ICANN effort, that it needed to engage the IETS, the IAV Internet society, the other groups.

And so I think part of what you saw with the arrangement yesterday morning was ICANN's response to that by bringing representatives of those groups up on stage, and then at the same time since those groups didn't include the CC community, the (unintelligible) community, there were representatives that were also up on stage and assumed they could clear as included - as inclusive as possible, though, even with that, I think Sebastien (unintelligible) said well, we're the end users.

So obviously you could never put enough up there, but so I think that that was good. And we do want to see a process emerge out of this that engages all people that are interested in it, that's transparent. Whether a steering committee evolves out of this or not is not for us to say. I do think that there really are two sets of issues here that are teed up by our announcement.

One is the very specific one of how do the INA functions work and defining the US role in that, and I do think personally although we would never dictate this, that it might make sense to have that specific question answered by

people largely out of the customer base of INA, because they're the ones that at the end of the day have to be satisfied with this.

That's not our decision. That's the community decision, so that might make sense, but there's also the other issue that's clearly been teed up by this, and everyone recognizes it, and many of you have spoken eloquently about this since we got here on Friday, and that's the symbolic role that we've played, whether it's providing confidence to the community that these systems are going to work right, if the extent that people think that we were able to discipline ICANN by virtue of having - I know that's Steve's made that point quite directly throughout the weekend.

And so that's an important topic for the community to work through as well, and that was I think teed up in the second session yesterday. From our perspective we think the issues are interrelated. We certainly think it's appropriate for the community to take on both issues. I think all we would like to see is that it be organized as efficiently as possible so that we get a good outcome at the end, and that we get a consensus outcome that the community can buy into.

Gisella Gruber-White: Phil, (unintelligible) - I'm sorry, (Christian).

(Christian): Good morning, Larry. Thank you for being here. My question, and this is spurred by some of the comments particularly yesterday afternoon, it's clear from the NGA press release and what you've said since you got here, it's clear what the substance of the whatever is produced by this process is just getting started here, it needs to meet the four principles that you've set forth (unintelligible), and it can't cross the two red lines of government control or international type organization.

But on the process, and I know there are shades of gray here, is the US looking for a final proposal that ICANN produces after listening to the stakeholders, or a proposal that the stakeholders have created and in

essence presented to ICANN? And I know there are shades of gray in there but - and I have no idea if this process is actually going to work since we're just starting, but I just wanted to get your feelings on that.

Larry Strickling: So we're looking for a consensus proposal developed through an open and transparent process that has attracted the support of the community. That's what we're looking for. I don't know the right processes to get to that, but any process that prevents that from happening won't be a good process.

Gisella Gruber-White: (Steven Trician).

(Steven Trician): (Unintelligible), Larry, we do believe that this is the leverage aspect and the actual functions are (unintelligible) related. I personally (unintelligible) there's a linkage there. There's a good bit of reluctance from management to do the linkage, and in the morning session, when I had transitioned, a few of us talked about the accountability, discipline, predictability.

We were told, oh, no, no, that comes in the afternoon. So we dutifully got in line in the afternoon and the afternoon panel ended up being mostly about APRT and the affirmation of commitments, our favorite document. So we will do our best to maintain the linkage there, but we - the thing - the statement you made to us about you see them as interrelated, I would encourage you to make that statement in every opportunity to ICANN board and management so they understand it too.

It's not just us making stuff up. There is inherent linkage, and we watched you exhibit it in 2012 by cancelling the (unintelligible), a brilliant move. So my question for you would be, you used in your four principles the word multi-stakeholder, and I would just ask is that shorthand for the longer expression of a bottom up consensus based multi-stakeholder?

Because a top-down high-level expert panel is also multi-stakeholder, but it isn't bottom-up in consensus, and so is it really all - is it really the full mouthful of bottom up consensus based multi-stakeholder?

Larry Strickling: Yes, I - yes. Period. But again, the question of how you organize to make that happen I think is on the table for the community to decide, and I think what - just to repeat what I said a few minutes ago, we - at the end of the day there has to be a proposal that is a consensus community proposal, and I think that in order to get that, and when you look at the front end of that, you need to be as inclusive as possible at the front end to do that.

Now as always when you're starting with the large question and you're trying to scope it and you're trying to in effect staff it, there's going to be a lot of churn in terms of how do you now narrow this down to a workable process that people will have faith in and will feel that they've been able to have input into, and I'm not pre-judging what that looks like, which is why I'm not saying that you know, to Mikey's point, that the idea of the steering committee or some committee making sure all aspects of the community are represented and kind of having the responsibility to actually put some words on paper that the community can react to.

I express no opinion as to whether that's good or bad, but it does seem that that's one way to approach this would - that gets you past the total chaos stage. But yes, but we expect something that the whole community beyond ICANN, the full Internet community, is going to be able to endorse. You know, people have been asking me, well, what's your criteria going to be at the end?

It's like there's a - you're all taking a test, but nobody knows what the answers are, or even what the questions are, and I keep trying to tell people that's not what's going on here. We've laid out you know, four corners to frame the discussion with the conditions, and now - and what I always answer to people is you bring us back a consensus proposal that's been developed

through an open and transparent process that the community buys into, and I think the rest of it will take care of itself, because we know that all of these issues are well-represented and allow all of you and all of your counterparts here and in the community globally.

And the question is bringing all that to the table in an efficient way to coming up with a consensus to compose when we try to (unintelligible) request for policy to come, and we'll come back and ask for clarifications of what they may have meant by their four principles, and we're usually told to read the principles. But in this case it's six months in.

If we have any straw man plans ready to go, I wonder if your office would respond, would send a straw man plan to you and ask hey, how close is this to the principles and red lines that you lay it on? Would you be willing to consider giving us interim evaluations along the way? (Unintelligible), it's again, we want a consensus this year saying that the community has a consensus proposal, and you know, (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Larry Strickling: Well we're not here to just (unintelligible) in favor of one set of stakeholders, if that's the question, so that I don't think we would participate in.

Man: It's a lot about tipping the scales and about learning whether we're on the right track, Larry.

Larry Strickling: Consensus, open, transparent - I don't know what this...

Gisella Gruber-White: (Christian)?

(Christian): Well, just to push that a little further, could you envision an eventuality where the community has a transparent consensus-driven process, and it didn't

bring forward a result in your conditions for you to say not good enough, go back to the drawing table?

Larry Strickling: Yes, if you throw in the towel and say let's give it to the ITO.

Gisella Gruber-White: Christina.

Christina Rodriguez: Hi, Christina Rodriguez for the transcript. Thank you very much, Larry and Fiona, for being here. I have a timeline question and I have a message question. Clearly we're looking at a current contract that expires September 30, 2015. Some of the draft timelines that I've seen from ICANN are extraordinarily aggressive in terms of when a proposal or at least an initial proposal would need to be developed.

From your perspective to the extent that you have kind of a general date that you think would need to be met in order to then meet that September 30, 2015, deadline, is there such a date that you could share with us so that we have a sense of notwithstanding what ICANN is saying is the timeline here is really kind of the drop-dead timeline? And I ask that in part because the community has already, especially with (unintelligible), extraordinarily stretched right now, so that would be helpful to know.

Larry Strickling: Well, a couple of comments on that. One is there's no hard and fast deadline. We simply stated a fact, which is that the current contract expires on September 30th, 2015, and I think it's always helpful to have a date in mind when you're trying to plan getting something done as opposed to just letting it drift on and on.

If the community doesn't present a proposal to us in hand to be implemented by that date, there's no cliff. We have the ability to extend the contract for up to four more years in two two-year options that we have, and so first and foremost in our mind is preserving security and stability. We'll just exercise an option and keep going and the community can continue to work on this.

So nobody should feel that there's a cliff in front of us or that we are trying to put pressure on the community to arrive at anything other than the most optimal result the community can arrive at. In terms of your question, you know, backing up from that date, you know, when does the community really have to have a plan in order to allow that, they - I can't even begin to predict on that because a lot of it would depend on what the proposal is.

I mean, if the community were basically to say you know what, we think there's no need for anything to replace what you actually do in the passing of root zone changes and updates, that it can go machine to machine with adequate transparency so that everybody can see what's going on in the data aspect of it, the technical aspect of it really doesn't require anything new, I think people would want to make sure that's been tested out.

And obviously there would be additional programming that has to be done to provide the transparency people are looking for. Now, that might be something that could be implemented fairly quickly, and if there's going to be some new organization that requires some transfer of engagement with us, you know, then we may have different start-up timeframes, so I don't think it's possible to say in order to meet that date, work has to be done by date X. I think it's too dependent on what the community comes up with.

Christina Rodriguez: Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Jonathan Zuck and then Tony Harris, and that's probably all we'll have time for. Yes, I'm sorry. We had a question over here that was (Marilyn Ross), but unfortunately - oh, yes, (Olivia) - but unfortunately we only have you for another three minutes, so Jonathan?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, hi, Jonathan Zuck from DCT. Thanks for coming to speak with us. I guess I want to ask a little bit of a philosophical question that's somewhat inspired by your exchange with Steve, but something (Bobby) said during his

introduction to this yesterday struck me that is interesting, in which he said the first thing we needed to do is look at the architectures and the systems that currently exist.

And there may not be any need for anything new, and then you just said something about different types of proposals that might lead to different timeframes for execution, and all that leads me to wonder if what you just - you - your primary criteria for the plan is the process with which it was created.

Is - do you envision a possible scenario in which no plan is necessary, that all the function of NTIA is in fact by now been replicated and is just duplicative, and is it just a confidence building exercise for the entire Internet community to say that in fact nothing new needs to be done in order for this transition to take place? Do you see that possibility, or do you envision that some reforms are in fact necessary to facilitate a transition?

Larry Strickling: In terms of the specific role we play on the updating of the root zone file, I mean, if you're focused on that, that does strike me as perhaps primarily a technical question, and on that one I think it really does come back to first and foremost what do the customers of that effort want to see? And I don't know to what extent they might be comfortable with that as an outcome or not.

But I guess we're ruling in nothing and we're ruling out nothing in that regard other than through the criteria that we've already expressed. But I know that in some - I will say this, some people, not necessarily here, but I've seen it in the press - keep referring to transferring to a new organization, transferring the US role to a new organization.

We've never said that. We've never made that a condition of what has to happen here. We want to leave it up to the community to figure that out, so there's no expectation one way or the other as to whether this requires, you

know, some new body to come in and take a look at every root zone request as it passes through and say yea or nay to it based on some, you know, checklist that they might have, which is basically what we do now.

Jonathan Zuck: I guess I'm talking more about the awarding of the contract itself. I mean, the discipline oriented thing, one proposal could be - just extend the term of that to be 100 years, so I mean, that would literally take almost no work whatsoever by anyone, but once that contract's awarded it's awarded for 100 years, and is that an acceptable proposal?

Larry Strickling: And leave us in the role we have today?

Jonathan Zuck: Well I mean - you know, I didn't - I guess I didn't mean to make that point as much as say eliminate the contract then, there's no longer a contract. It's simply the functions are simply permanently assigned to ICANN. Is that a sufficient plan in your mind or do you believe that there is some - I don't mean necessarily some other entity or anything like that, but you believe something needs to be done, or is it really just a question potentially of everyone getting their mind around the fact that nothing needs to be done?

Larry Strickling: Again, I rule nothing in, I rule nothing out. I say consensus developed through an open, transparent, conclusive process so that all the issues have been dealt with.

Gisella Gruber-White: Well, thank you so much. Yes?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...because that you (unintelligible) and I see that some people (unintelligible) are questioning the (unintelligible) commitment between ICANN and (unintelligible) as well as the concept of the (unintelligible)?

Larry Strickling: Actually I think people probably deserves more of the credit for the intellectual product that emerged as the affirmation than I do, but I will say this, that I think it's emblematic of a larger question that really ought to be addressed, and people are using the affirmation because it's a tangible document and it lets people wrestle with the concept.

But that is, when you have an organization of this type created, it doesn't have a membership. It doesn't have shareholders. It does have contracting parties, but what it really comes down to is how do you define an enforceable fiduciary duty from that organization and to whom is it extended? That I think is the question everyone is wrestling with when they talk about getting more people to sign the affirmation of commitment.

But then you get into this metaphysical existential debate of having them sign it with every global Internet stakeholder worldwide and of course that's not practical, so - but I think that's the larger question here, and it may make more sense to start framing this in terms - rather than talking about internal and external or accountable - accountability measures or extending the affirmation of commitment, that first and foremost what you're looking for is how - to whom - is ICANN, is it accountable in terms of its various activities and how do you enforce those undertakings that's making those people to whom it owes a duty?

That's a very broad question. I don't purport to have the answer to it, but (Olivia), you know from our experience on ATRT1 that that was always in the background, and it continued to be in the background as an issue on ATRT2, and it's something that I think as the organization continues to evolve, that it's the one we all need to get our heads around.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you so much for joining us, and I apologize to Tony and Marilyn that we were not able to get to your questions, but as you know we do have to prepare for the board, so again, thank you, Fiona and Larry. We really appreciate your time. Is there a way that if there are any questions that they might be asked?

Larry Strickling: Sure, so you know, we're around here all day today. Good luck finding us because we'll be in sessions like this with groups, but I think most people know our email addresses, and yes, feel free to get in touch with us.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Okay, so we have just a little bit of time now to prepare before we walk over to meet with the ICANN board. We have a sort of draft outline and hopefully I know that this was sent to the BC, and I hope that it was - I believe it was also sent out to the ITC. I don't know if it went out to the IFT members?

Man: No.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay, so IFT members, this might be the first time that you're seeing this, but essentially this is based on - I'll get to you in just a second, Steve - this is based on our conversation that we had on Sunday. We talked about addressing two main issues. One was around you know, all the sort of outstanding issues around the multi-stakeholder process and practices, and then one was around sort of outstanding new details, the issues to incorporate compliance issues that we are seeing in particular there.

When I do my introduction, I would like to say that we have discussed and obviously the whole NTIA transition is a very important topic, but that because already so much time is being devoted to it, we wanted to focus on some other issues that may not be getting as much attention and I want to make sure that as a group we're okay with me framing it that way. Is there anyone that has an issue with me saying that?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I think that's a fantastic way to acknowledge that we're not done with all the topics, but we (unintelligible) a lot of exchange, but we're prioritizing, and I think it really is important that we do that, because we may then be coming back at the public forum and saying (unintelligible) we had constituents in here.

Man: (Unintelligible), on the first topic up there, when we laid this out together over the weekend, it is my recollection that as a part of just introducing Peter, Phil, and Brian, the very first issue I was going to raise is something that Tony and I took on this week, this notion of high-level strategy panels, and asking the board to confirm what management told us this weekend with respect to the stature of either the findings or the recommendations that are in those four high-level plans.

And if the board will confirm the understanding we got, then I guess we just had a misunderstanding, and I think it would be important for them to do that. So with the understanding of everyone here is that all your - does everyone agree that I would cover that before I simply pass the ball to Peter?

Gisella Gruber-White: Christina, I'm fine with that, and I think we had another conversation offline, and I said that I was fine with that, but yes, we should hear from everyone individually.

Christina Rodriguez: Yes, I'm fine with that. I would actually suggest - I - frankly I'm tired of asking the board questions. I think we need to be telling them what we expect and what we want, so having said that, I would suggest frankly that you freeze it. We have been advised by staff that it is our expectation that, period. And if that - if they have a different view, let them raise it, because - and if they don't take the opportunity, then frankly we've kind of set our position.

Man: So indicate that we are relying upon that representation, and that is coloring the way in which we are reacting to the public comment period on these panels.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: Tony.

(Tony): Well, I have a slightly different take on that because I actually want confirmation from them that it's going to happen. And we can go in there and say what our expectation is, doesn't achieve anything. I want to know that those reports are going to be revised in the right way, and what the status of them is, because quite clearly yesterday we pointed out that there are errors in there, and they're out in the wild.

And if they're not going to revise the report, what's the point in sending comments in anyway? And the inaccuracy is just so - so I would really seek confirmation from them with a commitment that they will be updated.

Man: Perhaps we declare our expectation, reveal a little bit of our concerns, and ask for them to acknowledge them. Would that be all right?

(Tony): That's good, good line, just to make the point that I really want them to confirm what the next step is without any question.

Marilyn Cade: I just want to - it's Marilyn - I just want to follow on. I'm actually not satisfied, and I did speak to one of the members of the cert panel with all the erroneous charts in it, I spoke to him about the fact that he has to insist on the having the public meeting yesterday. Freezing those documents as they are now, they are out in the wild.

Those are my - that's my language and trust me, boys and girls, I got the charts sent to me by the government, thinking that they were approved ICANN charts, and they right now show ICANN as having many errors, so I actually think that they've got to either be - and I don't think this allows them - I think they've got to be corrected and updated.

The (unintelligible) support has got to be paused, because there's no time for dealing with this with the work we have to do. But I fully support - because some type of problem because a lot of people are already using those supports.

Gisella Gruber-White: I see.

Man: Yes, and in the limited time available in this session, I'm just - I was going to not get into the content of either their analysis as bad as it is, and the recommendations, as frightening as they are. We're trying to establish the context, that these reports are simply given to the community and they can't be cited and footnoted in subsequent work as indicating ICANN has declared that (unintelligible).

ICANN's board has a recommendation that we can't have these be cited as if they are the product of a bottom up consensus-driven process. They were simply outside, appointed experts dumping some creative ideas and interesting interpretations of the ICANN world that they're not a part of.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay, I think that makes sense to put it forth and get a confirmation of that and does that meet your requirements? Okay. So then Phil was going to cover sort of desire of transparency and in particular for open board meetings and anything else that you want to say around that. And then we talked about sort of direct accountability of the CEO and the board, and Brian - oh, hi - was - are you comfortable with touching on that?

And this is not to say that others are not welcome to contribute or shouldn't be speaking, but I did want to make sure that we were able to hear from a variety of different members across the CSG who many of you spoke very eloquently about these topics, frankly, on Sunday, and so I thought it would be great to hear from a wide variety. Jim?

Jim Baskin: It's Jim Baskin. Who's going to be managing the clock for this session?

Gisella Gruber-White: You can count on me to move you along.

Jim Baskin: Okay because I really don't want us to get behind and have to miss some of the stuff.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes, I think we'll be okay. I will definitely keep a good eye on the - if there's one thing about me, I will make sure we stay on time. Yes, (Peter).

Peter: Just on both of those issues, I'm not entirely clear what the issues of accountability are that don't fit in with the desire for transparency or CEO and board accountability.

Gisella Gruber-White: So when you talked about accountability in our Sunday meeting, you talked about having sort of the different layers of accountability, who is ICANN accountable to, who is the - you know what I mean, about all those different layers? And I think that you spoke about that very eloquently.

Peter: So just tee it up for Phil and then Brian to go into the specifics on those two areas?

Gisella Gruber-White: I think that would make sense. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Just real quick, but I do think in your comments, I think we all agree but we should test this, that we actually can't spell the word accountability or the word transparency without the word "and" in between, and noting that they are linked, because the board and the staff keeps saying we're transparent, we're transparent, we're transparent. I'm - I will question that and the delivery of information, but I think the bigger issue is we want to link transparency and accountability.

Gisella Gruber-White: So moving on to - anything else to discuss in this first sort of topic?

Christina Rodriguez: Does anyone - Phil and Brian - this is Christina - the only thing I would wonder is do you guys have enough specific examples of some of the issues that we're talking about, or do you need - are you good on those? And do you want to run through them now?

Man: I mean, very quickly what I'm going to - what I said I would do, and I'm just jotting down some notes since I'm working on about five hours sleep here, gentlemen, start by pointing out that over here, (unintelligible) and the board have pretty contentious debate before the authorizing the POD program, and then letting the community see the board members take out their positions, and (unintelligible) vote strengthened the community acceptance and the credibility of their final decision.

And compare that to the fact now that there are - and I'm not arguing for you know, having politically choreographed board meetings the way they used to have at public meetings, but pointing out that particularly the resolution they passed last September authorizing (unintelligible) and other activities and keeping it secret from the community is perceived as being mistrustful of the community, as showing not being transparent in any way.

The rationale they gave was not convincing, and there's great concern that ICANN has, while it's a non-profit corporation, has public policy responsibilities and board decisions on policy need to be made transparently, that the trend in all bodies with those type responsibilities that live, real time Webcasts or audio casts.

If they don't want to go that far, they should immediately release full transcripts and the redaction should only be for certain sensitive personnel and other issues of that type, and that the current minutes are simply unsatisfactory. They just produce the resolutions. There's no description of whether there were dissenting board members, of whether there was a vote, of what considerations they've taken when they made these decisions, and

that in an organization which is committed to accountability and transparency, transparency has to start at the top.

And we've been seeing not more transparency but more opacity over the last three years, and there's great concern in the community over that, so that's what I'm planning to say, and if others have thoughts on that I'd welcome them.

Gisella Gruber-White: Hi, Jonathan, and then we actually do need to go just quickly through the second topic, and then we need to leave and walk over to the (unintelligible) room, because we are scheduled to speak with them at 11:15 and it's 11:02 right now, so Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, and I guess my overall concern is just to this topic doesn't seem big enough in a way. It doesn't incorporate the staff or sort of the accountability institution, but even dealing with the board, I feel like transparency isn't just about Web cams and open meetings. It's as much about the board explaining that they took X and such input in and made a decision despite them for X and such reasons.

And so I think I'm more interested actually in before the board's sort of decisions criteria than I am necessarily in seeing all their deliberations. To me that's the real source of accountability, is gaining some understanding that the inputs they've received were in fact received and considered.

Gisella Gruber-White: So I'm sure (Phil) can incorporate those sentiments.

Phil Corwin: (Unintelligible).

Gisella Gruber-White: Moving on to topic #2, yes.

Woman: I just wanted to - the concerns I have on the CEO board accountability, I think picking up on what Jonathan was saying is to make it broad, but if Peter is

going to cue this up by saying to the board, look, the CEO is accountable too, I think we probably shouldn't focus as much on CEO accountability, because we've already said to the board, look, you're responsible for him.

I think you can mention in the review, but I think we really do focus on board accountability, and I would say that really, you know, let's bring in some of our other issues. Let's bring in the fact that we have no idea in many cases what input they get when they're making decisions. We have no idea whether they appreciate the gap between the budget that's been approved and some of the expenditures that have been made.

You know, that to me is accountability as well, and I think we need to make it very clear that it is fairly broad, and I think they're failing. I don't know if folks are comfortable saying that, but I think they're failing.

Gisella Gruber-White: I don't know. We haven't discussed whether or not we would take that particular position, but I think we can raise concerns and hopefully they can see without writing the...

Woman: Sure.

Man: I did just want to mention and I know the BC members, I made them aware through an email yesterday that after I made the statement about concerns over the lack of board transparency yesterday morning, Steve Crocker pulled me aside in the afternoon and just said you're wrong, we're as transparent as can be. I don't know what you're talking about. So there's a huge disconnect between what we're seeing and feeling and what - and the way they feel about things, or at least the chairman feels.

Gisella Gruber-White: So we actually need to leave in about a minute, so let me just make sure that we're on track with the second topic. I know, Tony, you've got a very good hold of...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Just a remark on the (unintelligible) issues, I'm going to get through as quickly as possible to get free, but one of the things I do want to do is hand directly over to Mikey because he is one of the few people here who's actually got experience of one of the measures that (unintelligible) promoting as a potential solution.

We would have expected to have had some different results in, so we don't know whether it's working or whether it isn't, and it's that level of concern about the unknown. In my case, just so one of the few people that's got her hands on - hold on that, so I'm going to hand off.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay, that sounds good. Yes, David.

David Cake: Just very quickly, because I apologize for having the original prep session, but on the issue of compliance are we going to raise our longstanding position that compliance has not been satisfactory and as we move into a world of 1300 new GTLBs, ICANN is really going to have to step up to the plate, and enforce compliance not just on those two issues, but on the new obligations generally.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'm going to tee that up. There's a very interesting paragraph in the February compliance monthly report, so I'm going to kind of do the intro, lead into that, and then kick over to Tony. Okay, so I will see you folks over in the (unintelligible) room.

Marilyn Cade: And we need to stop the recording.

END