

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
Registries Stakeholder Group  
Tuesday 25 March 2014  
Afternoon Session (Part 3)**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Keith Drazek: It is 2:15 on March 25. This is the gTLD Registry's stakeholder crew. We will begin recording. Thank you.

So we'll get started in five minutes. We'll get started in five minutes.

Okay, this is a one minute warning.

(Cherie Stubbs): If everybody's like to take a seat, we'll get started. And we do still - we show (Barbara Knight) from VeriSign is still on as a remote participant. We can start the recording now. And again, just a quick housekeeping detail -- just to remember to announce your name for purposes of the transcript, and for those participating remotely. And actually I show (Alan Tan) on remote too. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, (Cheri). Welcome back everybody to the afternoon session of the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting. Is Kurt here? I know he was just here a second ago. There he is. So Kurt, we're going to move directly to your presentation for the Domain Name Association. Kurt is the Executive Director of the DNA, and we've given Kurt 15 minutes of our time to give a presentation update and, you know, a little bit of information. So fire away.

Kurt Pritz: Fifteen minutes? Fifteen minutes? Thanks everybody for hearing me. All of you are familiar with the Domain Name Association, so I'm sort of asking you to sit through this and help me hone this message. Because I want to, and we

want to in the Domain Name Association deliver value to our members. And so to the extent these slides convey that we're providing value, that's good. And to the extent they could be more clear or the message could be changed somewhat, that would be helpful.

You know, I don't know - well, I don't want to say a better reason, but a really clear reason for the existence of the Domain Name Association is what I just went through in watching you guys with the board. Because you really spend a lot of cycles on issues that are really important to ICANN, but not necessarily directly important to your businesses or promoting your businesses or protecting your businesses in the long run.

You know, clarity around ICANN budget process is really important, and the internet governance process is really important, and some of those other issues. But just think, if we combine in a way and combine with (unintelligible) and registrars in a way, and provide that same energy to your businesses.

And so I think, you know, that's a big pointer to why with the growth in our environment and the number of new TLDs why the DNA exists and how it can be a forum for you to really grow within the community and take advantage of all the resources inside and outside your organization that are there.

So that's kind of my whole pitch. But I made slides because that's what I've done for the last 10 years. And so you can tell I'm building a pyramid here. This is a big experiment for me. But, you know, the DNA is like a pyramid. It's kind of like (unintelligible) need hierarchy, right? And what's at the basis of the pyramid is promotion and communication, you know, the value of domain names. Go ahead and get the next slides.

So what we're all about mostly is the uptake and use of domain names. As we create all these new businesses, as we've got existing TLDs that can actually leverage off the new environment, and ccTLDs too. And so what do

we mean by promotion and communication -- which is the most important thing that we would do?

So this - so are these the PowerPoint slides or is this the... Yes, so can you - so I'll do a song and dance and you will change to the PDF, okay? Can you go to the PDF? All right.

Jonathan Robinson: Quick question or comment for you. It's Jonathan. I mean you're your headline slide said, "Registry Stakeholder Group joins the DNA". I was told that we had actually signed up as a stakeholder group.

Kurt Pritz: You know, actually while we're waiting, everybody could pull up the membership application on their laptop and I can take you through the process. That's what I was going to do.

Jonathan Robinson: That was just - it appeared that our stakeholder group had joined rather than individual members of it, and so...

Kurt Pritz: A discount for members. So I apologize for that -- the way I should have been more clear.

Jonathan Robinson: Can I ask a question now while this - are you going to Brazil?

Kurt Pritz: Yes. So the board and, you know, Adrian or others that are on the board might talk about this. You know, we're building a pyramid here. And at the bottom, the most important thing we do is promotion and communication and the - about the uptake of domain names. And at the (unintelligible) this pyramid where we want to get to is, you know, this great reputational benefit to our industry.

When we talk it's like (unintelligible). People, like, snap their heads and listen, right? And becoming involved in the internet governance debate is part of that. But (unintelligible) to our business models with the, you know, the

cauldron that's become internet governance (unintelligible). And we debated whether to spend cycles on internet governance and going to Brazil or on just focusing on our core mission. So it's a lively debate we're having right now. And we decided to get involved, which meant writing the, you know, our submission to Net Mundial -- which was submitted and we've some things about internet governance that I'll talk about.

I guess so. It's going to be messed up though. So go ahead. So core to promotion about domain names is the value in a domain name. So go ahead and go to the next slide. That's kind of messed up. But there's been a lot of debate about, you know, the value in a domain name versus search, versus QR codes. But, you know, we're convinced -- and our mission follows -- that domain names are the primary mechanism for establishing an internet presence.

So this is sort of a sales thing to people outside of us. So I want you to look at this messaging and see if it really resonates with you. But with new availability and new choices, domain names become a lot more intuitive. So, you know, we can make use of the words to the right of the dot.

And certainly we think domain names have more value over search. So, you know, domain names are price certain, their permanent, their your brand, they can't be taken away. So domain names have great value. Time did not pass them by because the new gTLD program took so long to launch, and this is our core messaging around the use of domain names.

Go ahead and click the next slide, (Barry). (Barry)? There we go. This is going pretty good so far, don't you think?

So I've already said that promotion is our primary objective. And so what have we done so far? Well, we're preparing a promotional campaign that's created through donated comment, and the whatdomain.org site. You know, we're developing a long term strategy. Next.

So this whatdomain.org site is available for members. So starting now in the membership packet you get directions for hosting this domain site. And what's kind of cool about it is that it's configurable. So instead of -- for example -- the TLDs you see over those building there, you can insert TLDs that are (unintelligible) to your businesses. Can I have the next slide?

And if you can, you know, if you're not - if Japanese is your primary language, it's there too. So we see this as a useful and important marketing tool -- the whatdomain.org website. Go ahead and...

So more than pitch the DNA I want to tell you about what we're doing, because what we're not doing really anymore is putting a lot of energy into getting new members. What we're doing is putting a lot of energy into our core mission. And when people see work getting done they'll join the DNA.

And so in the packet -- well, the packets over there, go back -- so in the packet that's over there, there's an invitation to join the marketing committee that's forming right now. We've engaged with people in the Middle East and center, and Singapore. Here I've had a few meetings with a Japanese group of businessmen, and I have another meeting with new Asian gTLDs later this afternoon.

What's important about that? They're looking for experts to help them develop their businesses, and we point them to other DNA members, registrars, and registries to help them out. So there's already been business partnerships forming as a results of people's involvement in the DNA. And like I just said, whatdomain is being - whatdomain.org has been really for use by its members.

How are we doing on the whole...

Keith Drazek: Hey, Kurt, do we need those slides? Can you maybe just highlight what we've been (unintelligible) and...

Kurt Pritz: I think so. Yes, so I'll go through the rest of it. So (unintelligible) need hierarchy and a pyramid. And we just talked about the DNA's core mission being about the promotion of domain names.

At the next level up we provide access. So what's access? Access means member can interact with one another and talk with one another. So for example, we've started monthly roundtable sessions that are topical where members can share business models that they have, or some members that are seeking to provide services to other members can advertise their wares. So one example is Architelos is going to give a presentation on their products and offer a discount for DNA members. So that's kind of cool.

And what the DNA has provided already is the facilitation of global partnerships. So we've had people in the Middle East join with larger registrars elsewhere in the world. So if you think about how we're building our mission and how we provide value to you, at the bottom is domain names and the promotion of domain names. The next step up has to do with access.

The third part of the pyramid has to do with solving problems. So there's barriers to us being successful in the marketplace. You know, one of the items we're talking a lot about here is universal acceptance, and how IDN email works. So we've established a technical committee that's identified a couple project. And their first project on the top of its list is universal acceptance. And we want to use our contacts and, you know, our association has large members that have contacts with a lot of application writers and other providers to help work on that universal acceptance problem.

Another set of problems we work on have to do with ICANN and our issue here. So we offer policy advice to our members with regard to how to interact with ICANN. You know, to me a lot of what happens in an ICANN meeting is

inevitable. And it carries on for some time and there's some arguments, but there's an inevitable outcome to all of these things. You know, our advice really goes to, here's everything that's going on at ICANN. Here's 90 percent of the stuff you really don't have to spend cycles on, and so you don't have to spend time on that. And here are the two issues you really need to focus on.

So going up the pyramid then, we have promotion of domain names at the bottom, access the second layer, problem solving at the next layer, and then finally at the top of the pyramid we have reputational impacts. And that's where we might get involved in internet governance as we have today, or we become an advocacy organization.

That's where we have - where we've built the reputation of the domain name industry to a place where when we talk -- when the DNA talks -- people sort of turn their heads and say, "The DNA is talking", the same why they turn their heads when (unintelligible) has something to say. And so we can have that same impact in big policy discussion and governance discussion and things like that.

Keith Drazek: So Kurt, just a little feedback. I think it's really encouraging that the DNA, you know, as an association is not just focused on marketing. You know, that you've actually described other components, you know, of focus -- areas around technology and trying to resolve issues like universal acceptance and things like that, and policy advice or policy engagement. Certainly the contribution that you did to the Net Mundial effort I think was, you know, a strong demonstration of a somewhat young organization's competence and sort of expertise.

So just generally speaking my initial reaction is I'm encouraged that it's not just sort of a marketing arm of a bunch of industry players. It's actually an association -- a trade association -- that's looking to do much more for its memberships. So just some initial feedback while we're hoping to get slides up.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks for trying for trying to save my presentation with some positive feedback. So I think - the last slide is a slide of all our members and the, you know, we're up to about 35 or 36 members. We've gained a few more during this meeting and we're exhibiting steady growth. So we have several notable ccTLDs that have joined the DNA. We have Nominet and SIDN, (unintelligible) and CIRA has joined and .at. Yes, just go to the last slide.

What I want you to - the pyramid work was really good, I thought. So we, yes, we have (unintelligible). We have a cross section of existing TLDs, ccTLDs, registrars -- affiliates that aren't in the domain name industry exactly, but provide services to us.

So I've used up my 15 minutes. I hope I conveyed somewhat of a coherent message. I'm willing to talk to anybody after this at their convenience. Are there any other questions?

Pat Kane: Just to mention that we have a reception planned for Wednesday at 6:00 pm, you know, tomorrow at - remind me of the location.

Kurt Pritz: Remind me of the location?

Pat Kane: Conrad Hotel?

Man: Yes.

Pat Kane: Yes, so all are welcome to come and talk with Kurt. This is Pat speaking. Sorry.

Adrian: My name is Adrian Kinderis. I am the chair of the Interim Board of the Domain Name Association. I just wanted to add that this group is gaining good momentum, good traction. And thanks, Keith for your words, because you said it really well.

We're winning in such things as, you know, when Larry Strickling comes down and in his announcement about the NTIA and handover of (unintelligible), he mentions us as the first organization that he refers to as far as, you know, looking for feedback from. We're winning.

And so to those in this room, we're fighting a greater fight here and really trying to take things out of an ICANN realm. So don't look at us as just another ICANN body. We're not. We're looking to take this much further forward, looking to look after the interests of our industry, and so to have a voice in that you need to participate.

So there are many levels on which you can do so. We'd love to see you step forward because, as I say, we will be the peak body for this industry. And we will make a difference. And the only way we can say that with any confidence is if we have the membership behind us -- the punch behind us to do so.

And so we're looking at people in this room to step up, to dig into your pockets and contribute. And it's not just the financial contribution. It doesn't stop there. We need you voice, and we need (unintelligible), and don't forget, the DNA is the only show in town where we get to -- if you're in the value chain from registry through to registrar, reseller, ccTLD, gTLD, you know, there are various members -- we're the one place in town where everybody gets to come together and speak. Because that doesn't happen anywhere else.

So please consider what Kurt has put forward today, and consider it carefully. Because we'd love to see more membership in this group, and we'd love to see the existing players come along. This is not just about new gTLDs, and if you hear me for long enough you'll note that I bang on about CCs more than I do anything else, because we really want to have good representation across the board.

So I just want to just throw my two bits in here and hopefully pull people out of their laptops just enough that they consider taking a look at the application form and indeed our website to see what we do. Thanks.

(Tim Switzer): (Tim Switzer). Let me just add one more thing too. Look at the names up there. It's a very diverse group -- which is really good. I mean you've got entities that have been around for a while in this business you have brand new entities, you have small single string applicants, ccTLDs -- look at that. It's a very diverse group, and I think that's important when we're trying to move forward with all the different things we're doing as it relates to domain names in general. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much. Thanks, Adrian, thanks, (Tim), thanks Kurt, appreciate it.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, you guys.

Keith Drazek: And great, so we'll wrap up that session and unless there are any questions - - if folks have questions for Kurt at this point, we have couple minutes here. And if not, we'll move on to the next item.

All right. Thanks, guys. Appreciate it. Okay, next item on the agenda. We do need to go back to page 1, because there's some unfinished business from the morning session. The first item on the agenda that we missed was a discussion around the use of mandatory policy advisory boards for regulated industry sector, and consumer trust sensitive new gTLD strings.

And we don't have a name next to this. Is there anybody that wants to volunteer to lead us through this section -- or this discussion? I'm wholly unprepared to do so, so... I saw some email traffic on the list earlier. But I don't remember who sent it. Nobody is volunteering. All right. Let's move on then. Let's move to the GNSO Council section. Jonathan.

Jon Nevett: Actually, I'll take it, Keith. I think we should talk about it.

Keith Drasek: Thanks, Jon.

Jon Nevett: Real briefly, there was a proposal that some folks have seen floating around for the last few months by certain individuals -- Marilyn Cade and a couple of guys from ALAC, and Ron Andruff -- related to policy advisory boards for certain TLDs that have a highly regulated type nature to them.

We all assumed that that was a -- and it originally was a proposal to the ICANN board and the NGPC when they were evaluating the GAC advice related to the highly regulated strings. The NGPC ended up rejecting that proposal, sending a letter to those folks saying, you know, thanks but no thanks. You know, we're dealing with the GAC advice for highly regulated strings this way, and if you want to propose that, propose it in whatever other forum you might chose to do that.

So we all assumed that that would mean, you know, if they want to pursue that, they could do that through the PDP process through the GNSO. And that was the end of it. But for some reason -- I guess the ALAC picked it up, and also proposed that directly from the ALAC. So ICANN for some reason put it out for public comment last week, and there's a bit of a backlash saying, what's the point of a public comment at this point where you've got to follow the process? ALAC can't propose policy directly to the ICANN board, and the ICANN board -- as we discussion -- before ICANN instituted its own policy - its own policy I guess - it (unintelligible) through the policy develop process, but it has to go through the GNSO like anything else.

So if we have to go through the GNSO for all policy, why wouldn't they just do that for this and not open up for public comments? What's the point? Is an end around - another attempt of and end around the policy develop process?

So NTAC has a strong draft letter ready to go -- either a letter or comments in the process -- and perhaps this group might want to join that as well.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much John. I appreciate you taking the lead on that one. So I guess a couple of questions. One is timing. Is there a deadline? You said it's been posted for some sort of a public comment. But, you know, is it the standard 21-21, is it something else? And I guess, yes, I mean it seems like this is sort of out of bounds just in terms of process and procedure. Yes, (Jacob), go ahead.

(Jacob Malthouse): Thanks, Jon for flagging that. It's (Jacob) (Malthouse), NTAC chair. The deadline is 16th of April for the comment, and 7th May for the reply.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks very much for that. So we do have some time. Brett, go ahead.

Brett Faussett: I hate to sound like a broken record. I think this is the third time I've mentioned this today. But this is another need for a parliamentarian. I mean somebody should have said this doesn't go up on this web page. It's not appropriate for a public comment.

And I think if there were someone on ICANN staff who is tasked with process, who is tasked with, you know, understanding the policy development and how it gets made, this would never have gone up here. And I just don't - I don't know how this happened.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thanks. That was sort of my reaction too. And I really do actually think your idea of a parliamentarian is really an interesting one, and probably is worthy of further pushing. Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: I think we should request a public comment period on whether there should be a parliamentarian or not.

Keith Drazek: Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: I hope I didn't miss something in the (unintelligible). But is it - are we suggesting that we respond to the substance of the proposal or the existence of the proposal. Because it may be that the public comment we could do is simply say, "We don't think this..." - I guess nets have been drafted, haven't they? So I - yes, but that could be something we could think about is just putting in a very short comment that says, "This is not appropriate."

Keith Drazek: So I think there's certainly a procedural issue. My next question was in fact, is it really a substantive as well. I assume that it is. Statton, go ahead.

Statton Hammock: Statton (unintelligible). I just want to - in the draft we lead with the procedural point that it's wholly inappropriate, but then we also do make comments -- specific points -- related to the process that we've gone through with the picks and how the, you know, the NGBC and the ICANN board and GAC have already resolved, you know, the (unintelligible), and this is how they're going to be implemented. And so we do with both. But we certainly do lead with the inappropriateness of the action of being publicly posted for comment.

Keith Drazek: So my initial reaction as stakeholder group chair is that just on the procedural issue, that this is something the Registry Stakeholder Group probably ought to take up. You know, and probably on the substantive as well, but certainly on a procedural issue. So, you know, if and when the NTAC and drafting team is ready to share that and forward it, you know, I think we then go initiate the process for, you know, getting the stakeholder group feedback.

Okay, any other - Jonathan, sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Very briefly, Keith. I suppose my point might be we should think about whether we actually don't want to get into the substantive. It might be quite powerful to just simply say, "Actually, we're not responding to this

substance in the public comment. This is a procedural point, and there's other areas to discuss the substance."

Keith Drazek: And maybe it's a - we could do two. NTAG does one with procedure and substance, and the registry simply focuses on the procedure.

Man: The NTAG doesn't get into substance -- just to be clear -- of the proposal. It does not say this proposal is good or bad for any reason. It just says it's a process point, but the process it refers to the board already ruled on this. As far as new TLDs, if you want to go with this proposal -- we're not commenting on it -- if you want to go with this proposal of policy advisory boards, go to GNSO. And we don't get into that substance.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks John. Pam.

Pam Little: Yes, that was going to be my question. If that's the case, should some correspondence come from Registry Stakeholder Group to, say NGPC rather than submitting a comment within the public comment mechanism? Otherwise we're kind of agreeing to - somehow consenting to the act of even posting such public comment.

Keith Drazek: Okay. (Donna).

(Donna Austin): I kind of think - I agree with Pam that it might be worthwhile having a secondary letter taking clarification. But I actually think it goes to (unintelligible), you know, so they say it's the policy department. Because that's where the ALAC (unintelligible). That's probably where this has come out of. So on the procedural question and why it got there, I would send it to (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks, (Donna). I think that's a good suggestion just because of the nature of the source. Okay, well let's - I think that was a healthy conversation

so let's table that. We look forward to seeing the drafts, and we'll take the next steps as appropriate.

All right. Next item on the agenda is handing it over to (Jonathan Robinson) for a discussion of the GNSO council issues and motions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Keith. I don't know how many of you were in the GNSO working sessions over the weekend. They were comprehensive and gratifyingly well attended. So that was great. And, you know, I would remind anyone who wasn't there, I understand it's a big commitment and it may not be practical or possible for everyone. But there is some valuable opportunity there to (a), track what's going on in policy, and (b), benefit from some exchanges with executive staff, the board, and others that don't necessarily get covered in other forums. So there is some unique content there.

We went through a series of working group updates which I'm clearly not going to go through with you. I'm just making sure that there's not something that I should flag with you here. I noticed in our agenda that we picked up on the review item. I think -- sufficed to say that (Ray Plzak) who runs the Structural Improvement Committee chair -- the Structural Improvement Committee on the ICANN board came and presented his latest view of how this is all going to pan out -- including a draft timetable for the way in which the review is going to work.

I think that that's probably enough said. Perhaps we should circulate that presentation that (Ray) gave. That's probably not a bad idea to get that to the stakeholder group, and then we can do Q&A on that next time around. Because it's not happening at such a pace that it's urgent to deal with today.

Chuck Gomes: Jonathan, this is Chuck. Can I jump in there? Because did I understand (Ray) correctly that the - they're really not looking for structural change issue this time around. Although it didn't seem like they ruled it out totally. How did you read that?

Jonathan Robinson: I forget what the other term he used as opposed to structural. I'm not sure. I forget what - let's just call it operational for the moment. Let's just - so I think his view is that the review is an operational review and he keeps making the analogy to something along the lines of an audit. Now what he acknowledges is that an audit that exposes deficiencies could well lead to structural change, but structural review is not the subject of the review per se.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck again. And they certainly haven't allowed enough time in their tentative schedule for a structural change. It's very brief. Now - own opinion, I think that's positive, because there - once we get to the structural change issues of the GNSO we need to expect that there's going to be a major push against contracted parties in terms of the way that GNSO is structured right now

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. So notwithstanding how we as contractual parties may feel about a structural review or not, it's not currently within the scope of this review. That's my understanding.

All right. So other items. I'm just checking if there's anything else I should cover other than the motions. I guess the one key point is to note the meeting between the council and the GAC -- for those of you who didn't participate in that. There was an update from - and it does, it links into things like this IGO, INGO thing we've been discussing. Because what this is all about is developing both a relationship with and some tools to engage with the GAC, and between the GAC and the GNSO.

Because as you all know - in a sense it also even links to Chuck's point to some extent on the review a moment ago. There's a kind of structural problem with ICANN in that the GNSO develops policy, gives it to the board, and the GAC has the sort of position of -- at least perceived position, the hierarchy -- that it then comes in at board level and gives GAC advice. And

that gives us all potential problems in the sense that the GAC comes to the party so late.

So going back to their ATRT review 1 -- not 2, but also 2 -- and going back to common sense frankly, we should be talking with the GAC along the way. And what this group is attempting to do is set up a framework by which the GAC can engage with the PDP process, because the current mechanisms have proved to be unsatisfactory, and in such a way they feel better informed than better engaged.

Clearly there's some risk that the GAC, if it's not - if this discussion isn't managed and doesn't have effective outcomes the GAC might think -- and this is what one of the concerns is -- that the GAC has some kind of early veto in the PDP process. But actually the critical point to recognize is that this discussion and work that this consultation group is doing is not altering the fundamental rules of the PDP or the bylaws -- at least not at this stage. And it's not visage currently that it will. It's more about facilitating effective interaction.

So that's what's going on. And I suppose at a level of tone, the meeting was as constructive a meeting as I've seen us have. And that sort of body language was on the softer side. The sense of it was very, very, positive. So frankly I think it's probably a good thing for us as a stakeholder group -- let alone as a GNSO. So just to highlight that particular thing.

And then I guess we'll work systematically through the motions. Fortunately they - I don't think there's a lot to worry about. But I will rely on the other counselors picking me up on this. Let me just pause a moment and see if Bret or Ching has anything to add prior to getting into the motions.

Bret Faussett: I would like to say something. I would point people to item number 9, which was added by the council after a fairly lively discussion with some of the registrars about the data retention requirements and the 2013 RAA. And it

was too late to have a motion on this, but the sense of the council was why didn't we simply ask for a temporary suspension of the data retention requirements in the 2013 RAA until something could get put into place for accommodating European registrars that have different data protection requirements on them.

So we couldn't make it a motion, but we added a 15 minute slot for discussion of this. I think the purpose is to move it toward a motion perhaps at maybe one of the next council meetings. And if anyone has input into this it would be helpful to hear it before we start that discussion tomorrow.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bret. It paves the way for future action, and I think it was felt that not only was it important to pave the way, but it was important to get it on the table in the public meeting of the GNSO at this stage. So that's what's happening there.

Let's have a quick look at these motions. They're not in the - I've got them up on paper here, which is not necessarily the ordering which they appear on the agenda.

But the first one I have in front of me is one to deal with the output to adopt to revise GNSO operating procedures to address resubmission of a motion and working group self-assessment. This comes out of the standing Committee on Improvements for GNSO Processes. It's a desirable process improvement for the GNSO, and I would suggest we can move over it quickly and unless the other counselors or anyone in the room has a different view, we should vote in the affirmative on this one and just put it to bed.

Next motion is one put forward by John Berard of the business constituency. That's really probably more in his capacity as liaison to the CCNSO, and this is a motion to adopt a charter of the cross community working group to develop a framework for the use of country and territory names.

I'm not that familiar with the work of this group. I don't know if either of the other counselors is willing to speak to this. It doesn't seem - or if anyone else in the room frankly is more familiar with this than I am. But it's essentially that the council is - the motion is to approve the charter, approve a GNSO co-chair, and to commit to collaborate to work with other SOs and ACs to get volunteers for the working group. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Yes, very quickly. Thank you, Jonathan. Just to emphasize that this motion is particular on the top level -- not including at the second level. Just to make sure that everybody's on the same page on this. But we'll keep an eye on how this cross community working group moves, because the way I see is that - actually two fold.

First CC, they think it's actually (unintelligible). So they give kind the welcoming signal to us, and asked us to join a cross community - I mean working group. But I mean on the other hand is that we should keep an eye on this whether this will move to the second level, kind of the things that we have reserved on the IGO, INGO stuff. But just a quick remark on that.

Jonathan Robinson: So I don't have any reservations about adopting this charter and getting on with it. But I have to confess, I'm not particularly familiar with all of the detail. I don't know if anybody's got any comments, questions, or input. So we propose to vote in the affirmative for the this one as well, right? That's the plan unless we hear otherwise.

The next one is the motion to approve the charter for cross community working groups to develop a finalized framework of operation principles for future cross community working groups. So this is really in essence a collaboration with CCNSO and potentially other SOs and ACs to the extent that they participate to ensure that we end up with a - the valuable mechanism of being able to work, or having a framework in which we can work across the community, and something which is -- I know Chuck certainly, and others probably -- feel is long overdue.

And evermore so issues percolate up about things that require more than just work within one SO. And so this is an opportunity to further develop that framework -- something that we could then use to collaborate across the SOs and ACs. Again, I think it's a no brainer to support it. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: The fact that this discussion was actually started when I was still chair of the GNSO council -- which was 2010 -- I think it really is overdue. In fact, we're at a point right now with regard to the NTIA transition where -- at least within the ICANN circle -- if this was in place it would be very helpful.

Now we have some experience with cross community working groups, so we can certainly benefit from that. But I reiterate the fact that this is way overdue, because - and there's been some good cross community working groups. The JIG. Let's just - one of your motions was with regard to the JIG, right, for the council meeting tomorrow? That's been a cross community working group for several years.

But it is overdue. I don't think it has to be terribly complicated. But if we have procedures in place for whatever combination of SOs and ACs are impacted by a particular issue that's bigger than just one SO, then this I think will be very helpful and you have to spend less time on logistics and administrative matters at the beginning you can jump right in.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Next motion then seeing no comments or hands is approve of the Charter of the GAC GNSO Consultation Group. This is the group that I referred to a few minutes to when walking through the agenda, so this is kind of interesting and it's probably worth just running on it for a very short moment in that this is not a conventional GNSO working group that we are approving the Charter for.

It's this consultation group which is essentially deliberately not a GNSO working group, but it's following - it's well populated by GNSO (unintelligible)

including both the council of Vice Chairs including myself. So we're very familiar with our working processes, but because we're collaborating with the GAC on this, it has, essentially it has the capacity to operate slightly uniquely, but nevertheless, we felt it was appropriate to (A) have a Charter which we have an GNSO working group, and (B) formalize that Charter by getting signoff at the council level.

So I encourage you to, you know - I think my advice is that the council's vote to support this - we as councils vote to support this, and again, it seems uncontroversial.

Finally then that the motion to close the GIG which is a longstanding cross community working group Chuck referred to a moment ago and it seems that it's time has come, it's not to say that all of the issues are resolved or completed. But as far as the GIG is concerned, it seems to be universally accepted that's it's time to put a line on it. I don't know if you would want to add anything -- a line under it I should say.

Ching Chiao: Sure actually thanks Jonathan as Chuck graciously pointed out is a good example for the cross community, I mean working group and the motion although is to close it, I think the council at our level is trying to identify an effort -- I mean advisor to the ongoing varying working group - I mean sorry, the IBMBIP working group to kind of oversee - I mean the development process for the varying projects.

So I guess we would, as you suggested, we'll pass the motion and then the wrap up session, we'll try to identify one person to serve as an advisor- I mean potentially it could be Edmon or some other volunteers who are capable of dealing with this issue.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Ching. That's a really good point and basically when this motion closes the GIG and the issue for the council is to ensure that the work - the ongoing work on IBN isn't then left hanging or unsupervised or if we

don't keep attention to it, so that's the issue for the council wrap up to make sure and Ching's proposed in the form of a liaison, which might be the way we go, and so that's really a question of how we keep this on the radar and keep our attention on it.

So, again we vote - we will vote in the affirmative on this one I expect, you know. Okay, great, so that's it. So we - there's nothing that we're going to find ourselves at this stage it appears in hot water or with challenging issues to deal with that seem relatively straightforward. It's quite a substantial workload in terms of clearing through some motions. But it doesn't look like this is something that we have to concern ourselves with.

And I suppose then final closing remark at some point and what's sort of being discussed, is we have to find ways of how we deal with as a stakeholder group; as constituents of the GNSO and across the whole community there's something which I feel a degree of responsibility to try and facilitate; assist with the management office how we participate in this whole IANA transition, and it's something that's in a great deal in sort of flux at the moment exactly how the mechanisms will work, but you know, I guess we'll be talking about that a lot over the next weeks and months.

But it's just a question of mechanisms yet for how we handle that - have yet to percolate that through. So if anyone has suggestions or comments, I'm not sure now is necessarily the right time. I don't want to open up a whole new can of worms, but I do want to mention it. I guess in my capacity as Council Chair, I feel a degree of responsibility here to keep a very close eye on this. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Jonathan for walking us through that. Just on that last point with regard to the sort of the IANA transition, you know, the next phase around that. The public comment, or you know, public consultation I guess whatever they're calling it now. The bottom up consensus process for inputs. I think it is going to be very important that we as a - the registry stakeholder

group and the contract party house, you know, along with our registrars - registrar customers really do spend some effort on this issue and focus on it.

And my recommendation would be is that we, you know, establish a working group within the registries, and that we actually try to identify as we develop our own positions, is that we are active in the community and are reaching out to other groups to try to identify others with, sort of you know, like mindedness or similar concerns that we might have.

So it's not that we're silent - overly silent but that we actually are reaching out to find out what other people are thinking, which will help inform our own, you know, deliberations. So, I think it's important that we do dedicate some effort and energy through establishing a working group, and then commit to not just working internally, but also reaching out to other groups. So, just a thought and certainly open that up Sarah. Feel free to jump in if want to add anything to that. Any other comments or thoughts with regard to - sorry go ahead Sarah.

Sarah Falvey: I'll just add one thing. I know that - I don't really know how this is going to work, but I think it's also going to be important to possibly think about - this is going to be discussed outside of the ICANN contacts a lot. And I think decisions will be made outside of these meetings as well, and so it may be worth in conjunction with that working group possibly thinking about, you know, whether or not we want to have a representative at certain meetings to speak for our group that's outside of ICANN.

You know the discussion with the Board I thought was really interesting because if you noticed when they came back us they said, well you guys there individually all going to Brazil and it's your job to talk about, you know, your business while you're in Brazil, which is fantastic. But then I think what happens is that we all individually are engaging in our own very specific and protecting our own equities and we're missing the broader perspective and point.

And so I know that's not quite how the ICANN model works, but it might be worth thinking about how we're going to engage outside of ICANN a little bit and making sure that we're representing this group particularly in those four that will take place, and people will be representing their views, and we could potentially sort of miss the boat. So that's the only point I kind of wanted to make on that.

Keith Drazek: All right. I think that's very helpful. I completely agree. Okay. Let's - then -- so I think that's it for GNSO council business, correct Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Keith Drazek: So let's move to the next item from our morning agenda which is the biweekly teleconference call rotation update. Over to Paul.

Paul Diaz: This will only take a moment Keith. So as we've already mentioned earlier today, our next conference call will be on April 9. And we had previously agreed that we're going to maintain the traditional time 15:00 UPC. Looking ahead to the call thereafter though, we want to continue trying to find or experimenting with our schedule, find a different time that crates a more inclusive or a more easier dial-in time for members up out of the traditional areas.

To that end, we will put out a doodle with a couple of suggestions; couple of suggested times. And, you know, recognizing as Zantag already does as a stakeholder group really needs to rotate the pain point on there's no perfect time to get everybody on the phone when we have a global base like we do. So, you know, we will offer a couple of options. Whichever one's chosen, and then sometime thereafter, we may revert back to the original time. And then experiment with a third slot as well. That way we will have gone through and then we'll have data points.

We can come back to the group; we can talk about participation levels; the impacts that it had and solicit feedback. Hopefully thereafter for creating a more standard of regular schedule. We'll wait to see.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Paul. Comments or questions? And then on to the next item. Welcome Kit updates. (Donna), I know we heard from Krista that something may be eminent. Is there any update that you would like to provide or any further discussion on that?

(Donna Austin): I'd just like to say it's been eminent for quite some time now. Sorry, I shouldn't say that. It's been eminent for quite some time now. That's all I got. Sorry. Just on the registry stakeholder group new member kit, which is a separate exercise that (Sherry Kalamán) and myself are working on. We are actually making some progress with that.

We've got a structure idea of what we want to include. It's just a matter of creating content now. So we are making some progress on that.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much (Donna). So I'm going to open it up to any other business now. We actually are looking like we're ahead of schedule. We do have the registry; registrar joint meeting in this room starting at 4:00. So we have an opportunity for, you know, half hour break here, but we need to be back here at 4:00, and you know, please come back for that.

These are our customers. We want to make sure we're well attended and well represented. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Well the hot issue of course this week is the NTIA transition. It seems like we should spend a few minutes talking about that in terms of, and maybe even in giving our councilors and Johnathan in particular as Chair of the GNSO Council, any thoughts we have in terms of where this thing should go.

My fear here and I think it's not an artificial fear, Fadi and his leadership team and presumably the Board as well, or at least some members of the Board including Steve I'm sure; really want to take this thing and drive it. And I don't think we should let them do that.

I think it's time for the multi stakeholder model to work, and that means the GNSO; the CC and SO; the ASO; the Advisory Committee taking a leadership role and coming up with a way to develop solutions here. I heard one person from one of the Advisory Committees make this statement; well we need guidance here. No, I think we need to give guidance.

Otherwise some stuff's going to be driven down our throats, and I don't think that's good. This is an opportunity I think for us to really show that the multi stakeholder model works. Not by waiting for ICANN leadership to direct us and tell us what to do or even suggest what to do, but for us to come up with solutions.

I think there's enough commonality in the policy development procedures certainly between the CC and SO and the GNSO, but I think even in the ALAC and the FSAC's kind of a unique animal, but I think they would be cooperative so, I guess a nice outcome here in my opinion, and please feel free to disagree with me, would be for us to give our councilors some leeway here to pursue that kind of a direction as it's possible.

And in the meantime, we should be talking about principles and possible methods that we can feed into the bigger process.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck. I think that makes a lot of sense. Anybody else want to jump in?

Jonathan Robinson: Just a brief - its Jonathan just a comment. I don't know if you heard Bruce, and I think it was a little bit of a slip of the tongue, but it just shows the thinking Bruce talked about ICANN facilitating a process to which we were

invited. And I think that goes back to - there's all sorts of, you know, assumptions in this so, we, you know, I think I'm with Chuck.

We have an opportunity here to be - one of the challenges we face on GNSO level that we need to make sure there's a kind of mandate. So to the extent that this group, you know, helps the councilors and me as Council Chair to feel empowered, that's very useful to try and take some sort of leadership positions and work with others to coalesce where we go from in this way.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jonathan and thanks Chuck. I think one of the concerns that I see is that, you know, if you read the NTIA announcement regarding their intent to disengage from the IANA functions; they say very clearly that ICANN and the ICANN community in a bottom up consensus base multi stakeholder way, you know, has the opportunity to shape the future, and to create a process by which this disengagement or this transition is being called, you know, takes place.

And that's very different than sort of the presumptive close or the presumption that ICANN, the organization will end up with all of the IANA functions including route zone maintenance.

So I think that the focus very clearly on establishing a process through which the community can come together and to work towards a recommended solution is the appropriate focus. We need to very cautious about and very sensitive to is the desire by ICANN and to Chuck's point by driving this, is the desire by ICANN to drive it to a predetermined result where ICANN ends up with consolidated power and autonomy.

Without the leverage of the IANA's functions contract being held over its head by the US Department of Commerce, what does that mean for the AOC? You know, ICANN's able to terminate the AOC with 120 days' notice today. They certainly won't do that as long as the US Government is holding the IANA's functions contract over its head.

But if that's gone; if that leverage is gone, then where is ICANN's commitment to the AOC? To the ATRT processes? To the review teams and e everything associated with it. And I think this is where we need to work as a community in a bottoms up consensus way to figure out how we ensure those accountability structures are in place. A replacement to what exists today.

And whether, you know, all functions end up with ICANN or a subset or, you know, maybe there's different structures that can be developed even around the route zone maintenance function. I think we need to make sure that we're not allowing ICANN to simply drive this to a conclusion that's been predetermined without bottom up consensus community input. So I'll stop there. I saw (Maxim) first and then Chuck is your hand up? Okay. And then Jonathan.

(Maxim Alzoba): (Maxim) (unintelligible). The self-question is IANA functions, there will be a contract; bunch of contracts. And we have no information on what is there; what is going to be there and the second simple question is what is so multi stakeholder about IANA functions? Because you cannot vote on how to profess digit four, for example, yes? You have to do this according to the contract. And who will be the body to these contracts? What are the like obligations? Until we know this -it's just following the process.

You do not know where you're led to, but you will be led to some particular (unintelligible). So, thanks.

Keith Drazek: So, if I understood correctly, I mean I think I agree with you in that the process is very important. Whatever the process is that's established to lead to that end, really in a sense will determine the result. Yes. Did I understand incorrectly?

(Maxim Alzoba): The results might be predetermined because the - what's in the contract - you have to know what end will be because I'm not sure if the contract - the Department of Commerce will be happy with open end contract.

Keith Drazek: Well my understanding is that the US Department of Commerce has signaled that it's prepared to dissolve the contract that it has with ICANN for the IANA functions, and so what's left, right? So what is the replacement mechanism? Is it a contract? Is it something else?

(Maxim Alzoba): It might be some article with some other parties, but it can't exist without a contract, and so we might need some more from ICANN on what's going to be next. Because either way, we will be left with predetermined finish of the process.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thank you. So Chuck then Jonathan.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck speaking and the first thing we need to recognize is that the next step is not finding the solution. The next step is coming up with a process to get to a solution, and it's that process that needs to be multi stakeholder. Okay? You're absolutely right. I don't think anybody that knows anything about the IANA functions wants that process to be multi stakeholders.

So if that's what you're saying, you're absolutely right. But our focus needs to be on, okay how can we contribute to developing a process; coming up with a plan to develop that process. Now with regard to a contract, my guess is with quite a lot of evidence is that there are people within ICANN that think that there definitely needs to be a contract. Just turn it over to us. We can do it.

Now if any of you attended the accountability session at 5:30 yesterday, there was surprising unanimity from across many sectors for the fact that there needs to be external accountability. I wasn't the only one that said it. I was

one of them, but and there needs to be something related to that as a separation of function so that there's some checks and balances.

I really think from what I've heard from the community; that there's a lot of agreement in that. Now what we need is to come up with a process to come together, not only as an ICANN community; it's got to be bigger than us, because it's not just the ICANN community that's impacted by this. So, let's focus on the process not so much the solutions first.

Because and then we're going - I'm sure everybody's thinking about solutions. They are. We can see it in the comments and everything, but what kind of a process. And you know we have within ICANN, processes, probably some of the best, not perfect, multi stakeholder processes there are. If we can combine our resources within ICANN not just GNSO, and then bring in the broader community that's impacted by this outside of ICANN, I think we can come up with some good things that have checks and balances.

That have the accountability; that won't be there at all when the Department of Commerce backs away. Again, it's an opportunity for us to take leadership.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I mean I support what Chuck says on formulating the process. I'd also say that if anyone's worried about whether or not they should be involved in this, I mean although we have the good fortune on that session on accountability highlights can be very strongly, there's one thing in here that, you know, ultimately might affect the bottom line. It's this issue of accountability and being sure that we get the performance from ICANN that we need.

And if there is no - I guess the balancing factor and that's left the other thing in mind. We just have to be careful in supporting, and I'm thinking now very much into - I know you cautioned against doing the solutions Chuck, but I do

think in the longer term, we have to be - with the external accountability, we've got to be sure that that external accountability doesn't take us down a - I'm struggling to articulate this. I think we need some form of external accountability and fortunately that was strongly expressed in the accountability issue.

We've just got to be careful that we keep a close eye on what that accountability - external accountability mechanism needs to be. But that's thinking from a stakeholder group point of view. If you evaluate yourself out of the stakeholder group point of view, I firmly believe what Chuck says is the first instance we need to do is concentrate on getting together a process that gets us down the road.

Keith Drazek: Okay, Chuck you want to reply and then Ching's in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I'd like to. Thanks Ching if I could just follow up with that. I don't think that external accountability needs necessarily means some other organization that just replaces Department of Commerce. If you look at the protocol functions, and if you look at the internet protocol number functions of IANA, there's already some external accountability there.

Because in the case of protocol, the ITF develops the protocols. ICANN via IANA. You know, process the administrative work associated with that, but there's not one organization, and ITF is not part of ICANN, but there's some separation of function. So some of that accountability can come in ways like same thing with the IRR's with regard to the IP numbers.

There's some separation of function. We do have the ASO, but there's also the -- what the NSO is it? The Numbers Supporting Organization. No, it's not a supporting organization - NRO. They're not associated with ICANN. So there's some separation. So accountability doesn't necessarily mean some other organization like another government, for example taking over and I don't think Commerce would tolerate that. Or at least they say they won't.

So, your concern is valid Jonathan, but let's not assume that accountability means something like just a replacement for NTIA. Thanks Ching for letting me follow up with Jonathan.

Ching Chiao: No problem. Thank you Chuck and actually if you've notice I haven't really been trying to speak about this particular IG topic but it actually strikes me because we are here in Singapore - here in Asia, where in Singapore, you know, the citizens here, they follow whatever the government says. I mean most of the people if not all, here in Asia, we tend to, I mean listen and you know, try not to have a fight with the "Gene" or other protocols that's actually, I mean (unintelligible) or guided by the government, so I'm feeling that on the other hand is that ICANN is here as far as I've been told; actually participate in.

I'm glad that we have these global debates and bring plain English is that ICANN is trying to wake everybody up at this point, not the people in the United States; in Europe, here particularly in Asia. They're trying to get everybody to play their part. So I mean on that particular point, I think that's a good sign we should acknowledge that.

But on the other hand, I'm (unintelligible) with the contract with ICANN, their approach is kind of to me, it's really something that we should really - as everybody has noticed that, they're trying to end the process; get everybody to involve and also to be involved in our own contract.

I have repeatedly hear the government here; they're trying to implement or actually trying to get their hands in the future governments soft UTTLD's. Probably some of you have already heard in China; in Taiwan; in Thailand and to just to name a few, there will be or they already have rules or regulations on actually not the domestic but the falling "GTLD" how they can operate business in their home turf. So just a word of caution; we do 100% fully agree with Chuck and others about the process, but also potentially the

contracted party need to play very cautiously and potentially try to set up a framework of how, you know, not just the function part but the geographically how everybody to start to get engaged in the GTLD processes. Just my two cents; could be too lengthy but just my two cents.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Ching. That was very helpful and I think obviously a sensitive topic, but one that's well stated and one taken, so thank you. Okay, any other comments or thoughts on the sort of the IANA functions issue (Donna)?

(Donna Austin): So not much as to the discussion that we just had about process and involvement, but it's just an observation, and to some extent it goes to what Sarah said. The NTIA has asked ICANN to convene a group which is lastly the ISOC group. So I don't know whether anybody - so hear me out Chuck.

So the NTIA announcement, ICANN will work collaboratively with the directly affected parties including the ITF; the IAB, ISOC; regional internet registries; top level domain operators and their assigns and other interested global stakeholders. Now I don't think it was any coincident and not long after the NTIA announcement went out, an ISTAR announcement went out as well.

And so for the first time, that ISOC group included the three CCTLD regional organizations. So they have had discussions about this. I mean I don't think there's - I don't think we're naïve enough to think that they haven't. So I think that's where the conversation is happening. It's happening within lastly within the ISOC group, and Fadi is representing the interest of, you know our fault here as he told us in the contracted party's half.

So I think to my mind what I'm seeing is Fadi wants the contract of the multi stakeholder models that actually happens within the internet government space. I don't know that he makes that connection to multi stakeholder with ICANN that we do. That it's largely about, you know, policy development and working within, you know, the constant within ICANN.

So I think in Fadi's mind, multi stakeholders what happens in the internet government space. I will pass one of ICANN's rolling televisions here and when it talks about the multi stakeholder models, it's talking about those who participate in the internet government space. So it's those categories that he's drawing -- being drawn out.

So I think that's, you know, potentially part of the challenge for us. It's that I think multi stakeholder to Fadi is more that internet government contract, and what happens within ICANN while these multi stakeholders bought them out. It's not - I'm not so sure that it's something that he's completely got his head around. So I think the discussion is happening. I'd be very surprised if they haven't come up with a straw man themselves, but so I'm speculating Chuck, but the coincidence of that ISTAR announcement that came out of that two minutes after the NTIA announcement - I don't think there's any coincident.

So I think it's (unintelligible) potentially that we should engage with. I've had, you know, conversations with (unintelligible) over time because I've got a very good relationship with him. You know, they've been discussing these things for a quite a long time.

This announcement wasn't a surprise. Fadi said that on the community call. The surprise was that it came about six months early. That's what he said. So I think, you know, to Sarah's point, this conversation's going on outside of the ICANN construct so we need to figure out a way that we can have those conversations as well.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Donna). I completely agree with everything you said. And there's no question that, you know, I think that this has been under discussion for quite some time. This has been in the works; it's been a plan; it's been discussed and coordinated and, you know, in my mind, they're going to plan and coordinate and sort of, you know, engage in these details. Then they've probably thought it through to the logical end.

My concern is twofold. One is that on the frontend, we, the gTLD registries and CCTLD registries and the registrars too, but I mean, you know, the contracted parties, weren't involved in those discussions largely. It was presented to us as a surprise, you know, sort of a (unintelligible) in terms of the announcements.

It's like where were we. I mean as registries, we are direct customers of IANA. Certainly the new TLD registries you've had more direct and recent interaction with IANA than the legacy folks have. So I'm very troubled and this goes the conversation that we had with the Board this afternoon, as you know, the (unintelligible) statement. That was a big surprise to us, right?

But clearly had been coordinated with other folks. The ISTAR's right? The announcement that came out, you know, days or hours after the NTIA announcement; very clearly coordinated. That doesn't happen overnight. Where were we in the conversation? So I have real problems about process and procedure and the way that this came about, but you know, looking ahead, I mean we are the customers.

We need to make sure that this process, you know, if there's a plan forward and a desired outcome by ICANN or for ICANN and maybe other groups, is that we need to make sure that it's not - I think somebody said earlier not rammed down our throat. That we have the opportunity to shape the end result and to develop the process. And the process is key right now in order to being able to - to ensuring that we're able to do that.

So I don't want to belabor this but I mean it's been a really, really good discussion. Any other thoughts or comments? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Just want to say to (Donna), you assessed it very accurately. I think that's the reason why we need to take some leadership, otherwise it will be imposed using a definition of multi stakeholder model and bottom up -- it is not.

(Donna Austin): I think the bottom up is that certainly the missing piece. Multi stakeholder yes, it involves, you know half a dozen different categories of people but it's the bottom up that's certainly missing.

Chuck Gomes: Just a quick reply Keith. Chuck again. In fact I can't remember which meeting it was in the last couple of days, but somebody said we should not say multi stakeholder without bottom up.

Keith Drazek: All right. Very good. Any other business before we take a break? We've got ten minutes until the red stars come to us. So seeing none, let's take a break. Please be back here right around 4:00, so we can be here for our customers. Thanks. Actually before we do that, give me two minutes here. Actually one minute.

I just want to take this opportunity to thank our technical support and ICANN staff, (Berry Cobb), and I think really most importantly to (Cheri Stubbs) who in all of her preparation and you know, leading up to these meetings, and during the meetings and follow up after the meetings, and everything that you do (Cheri) thank you very much for all of your work here.

Cheri Stubbs: We can pause the recording.

END