Transcription ICANN Singapore
CSG Stakeholder Day
Tuesday 10 February 2015
09:45-11:30 SGT

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

Elisa Cooper: All right why don't we go ahead and start to think about getting started. I want to start off by welcoming everyone to the CSG open meeting. This is a meeting where anyone from the community is welcome to join us.

We're going to start off by continuing our prep for the board meeting which occurs immediately following this meeting. Then we'll be hearing from the FSAC. And I'm hoping that they'll present really some of the highlights and that we'll have a fair amount of time to do some Q&A.

And then we'll continue with any remaining board prep that we need to do, and then we'll quickly go over to (Petting) which is where the CSG board meeting will occur.

Any questions or thoughts or comments? There are a couple of mics that are out in the audience here. I mean normally we're not set up this way. Normally we're set up in a horseshoe, but a little bit different this time.

So if you do have a question or comment or want to share something, please do use the mic. This is being recorded and transcribed and so it's important to speak into the mic so that they can get it for the transcript.

Anything from (unintelligible) before we get started? Okay, let's dive right in. (Unintelligible) go to the slide that shows the three different lists of risks that each - the IPC, the BC, and the ISPs -- had prepared and submitted.

So I know that not everyone gets here over the weekend and many of you may not have been at the meeting that the CSG had on Sunday, our closed meeting. In that meeting we did some initial prep for our meeting with the board.

And the plan is this. We will start off probably spending around 30 minutes or so sharing with them this slide. They have this slide. The slide will be shown. And essentially the plan is for us to get some high level thoughts on this slide.

And those slides are this, that we prepared - each of our groups prepared - our list of top five enterprise risks - and this is again we're sharing this with the board because this is what the board risk group asked for. They wanted to know what our top five enterprise risks were for 2015.

And so each of us went out into our individual constituencies and prepared these lists. And this is essentially what we came up with after about a two-week period.

When we talked about presenting this to the board I think we may have thought that there could have been more similarities, but as you can see from these lists of risks, while there are some themes that carry over, they are actually quite unique in some respect.

That said, you'll notice that on the list that multi-stake - risk to the multi-stakeholder model are really a theme and an issue that all of us have concerns with in this coming year.

And so essentially that's what we'll be presenting to the board, and then we will ask them for their thoughts and their questions because essentially they had asked for us to prepare this and to present this. So we want to hear what their questions are for us.

So that's the plan. Any thoughts or things that you want to make sure that I'm highlighting or presenting or positioning in a certain way? (Steve)?

(Steve): Thank you. I just had kind of a logistical question. I agree with your introduction to this, but will we then have a brief period for each constituency to present their list? That was kind of our expectation, and we've got someone prepared to do that. So I don't know if that was what everybody else thought.

Man: That wasn't exactly where we were heading. We could do that, but I thought from where we left it the other day, the focus was going to be for - Elisa or a lead on this meeting to put the list up and really to turn it over to them rather than us walk through each of them. Let them pick the nuggets of what they want to discuss with us. But I'm happy to do it either way (Steve).

That's the reason why it would be better to try and get some dialogue around issues rather than us doing a presentation of each of them.

Man: I just think a very brief (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: I saw (Tony) then (Ellen).

(Tony): Just curious about the first bullet point for the (BC) multi-stakeholder model, if there's any - exactly what that would be addressing or what the concept would be.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, so, you know, that's an - if they ask us about that, that's an opportunity for us. Our explanation was actually quite lengthy and I wanted to keep this to

one slide. But it's risks to coming from marginalized groups. It's similar to some of these other ones that are out there.

It's risk of capture. It's risk of over representation by governments. There's a whole category of items that we think pose potential risk to the multi-stakeholder model.

Now they've received - just so everyone knows - they've received these sort of big categories and then each of us also sent to them probably a paragraph worth of explanation. So they didn't just get something that says multi-stakeholder model. There's actually a paragraph that goes with it, and they've already received that. (Ellen)?

(Ellen):   Is this on? Thank you. I thought we were going with what I'll call the Jonathan Zuck model, which is saying the top three points. This would be up so they could see it, but not that each constituency would do, and that we would frame it with three takeaways.

We'd hope to do it, and I for one would love it if Jonathan with his wonderful voice was the one who did that. But I don't want us to backslide to talking about all of these, discussing all of these, and getting lost in that again.

Elisa Cooper: Yeah, so I thought that's what I had just done when I said, you know, this is the list that we had come up with and that we had been asked to prepare them and that although there are some threads of commonalities that there are in particular for all three of us, we're very concerned with risks to the multi-stakeholder model. And that's what we had talked about as sort of the three bullets, yeah.

(Ellen):   I would - for user-friendly sake - label the three. We want you to walk away with three things - one, two, three.

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I agree.

Elisa Cooper: So we're all clear and we're on the same page. (Unintelligible) One, we basically we're asked to provide this list and we did this in relatively short period of time. Two, although there are some commonalities you can see that there are some quite distinct differences and that three, there is definitely a concern across all three of the constituencies that there are risks to the multi-stakeholder model.

(Ellen):   Much clearer (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Okay, okay. I can do that. Other thoughts? Other thoughts or other things we want to make sure that we get across? We could be flying through this meeting if it continues at this rate, which would be great.

Man: A question, not necessarily a suggestion, is whether we - and it would be diluting our message to point out any of the other commonalities, kind of the two out of three points - or just wait for the dialogue to see if it develops in that way.

                    For instance if they something about security, point out that both the ISPs and the BC express that, but not kind of muddy our message with plurality type issues. I'm not advocating one or the other. (Steve)'s hand is up.

Woman: (Steve)? The mic.

(Steve):   Yeah, I don't - I get it that we - there's not support for each group presenting its own, which is fine, but maybe just at the end because I'm wondering, you know, we'll put this out there and I'm hoping there will be some dialogue. So we should at least invite them. If they want more detail we could go through it individually - or if they have questions about specific ones.

Then we have a bit of a traffic cop issue about who answers that. But I guess we'll deal with that depending on what they ask about. So I mean I think for the IPC we talked about (Brian) making the presentation if there is a presentation, but presumably also if there's a question about an IPC - something in the IPC - what do you mean by this, then that could be (unintelligible) (Brian).

Elisa Cooper: Okay. I don't know that we necessarily have go-to people in the (BC) but I'll rely on people to respond if they feel that they want to. (Jon)? I think it's already on.

(Jon):   Good. Is it on?

Elisa Cooper: It is.

(Jon):   This is more of a question, but this dance has been going on for a very long time. I just wondered whether any of the constituencies had sat down and decided what if anything they're going to do if these concerns are not answered.

Elisa Cooper: Well, I don't think we're really looking - this is my personal opinion on it -- I don't think we're actually looking for an answer. They asked us to provide to them our top five enterprise risks. And I think we're just here to explain what we think the top risks are and why we think they're a risk. I don't know that we're looking for them to give us any sort of answer at all.

(Jon):   You're not expecting any actions?

Elisa Cooper: No.

(Jon):   This is just us (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: This is - yeah. Well they have requested this and I know in the (BC) we spent a fair amount of time actually culling this and trying to understand it, which I think was a valuable exercise. And I think we do want them to understand what we think the top concerns are. But I don't think we're asking them to respond necessarily.

(Jon):   Okay.

Elisa Cooper: (Ellen)? (Ellen), Greg, and (Marilyn)?

(Ellen):   I think (Jonathan)'s question though is an important one. I don't think we're expecting them to respond in our meeting, nor do I think that there should be any kind of threatening, "Well these are doing, and if you don't do something about them we're going to do," I don't know what. But I do think that (Jonathan)'s putting on the table an important long-term question which is okay, you asked us.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, what are the next steps?

(Ellen):   What are the next steps, yes. And I think that should be in the (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Yes. Let's see, Greg and then Marilyn.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Kind of following on what (Jonathan) said and looking at it from a slightly different angle, I think that providing the board with a list of enterprise risks in a year when enhancing ICANN's accountability is a front and center topic shouldn't be lost.

                  I think that we should note that if we're giving you the list of risks and people are talking about accountability, there is a linkage to say the least and that in the time of that we need to - part of giving you this list is not just for you to file it away but that this a list that we as stakeholders would be holding you

accountable for in the grand scheme, whatever that means on a granular ground level.

That's a different question but this list should be viewed in the context of accountability. I guess that would be the sound bite for me.

Elisa Cooper: Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Marilyn Cade speaking. This actually grew out of our request and comments to the community's request and comments to the (unintelligible) that they take input from the community on what the risks (unintelligible) are to ICANN because they're spending money on certain activities.

So it wasn't a direct request but in feedback, we've very often been at the microphone at the BC. Others have, the FSAC has, etcetera, talking about where the risks lie. So to follow on Greg to your comment, I think there is a linkage.

The other thing I would just point out if you're on online you may want to go take a quick look at who the board members are that are on the risk committee. They're heavily from the technical liaisons.

Elisa Cooper: (Jonathan).

(Jonathan): Yes my point was (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: Oh, just for the transcript.

(Jonathan): (Unintelligible) another one?

Woman: No, but you need a mic.

(Jonathan): My voice isn't booming enough I guess.

Woman: It's for the transcript.

Man: It's being recorded, so...

(Jonathan):   It's being recorded. Uh, oh. I take it all back. Ultimately - and I say this just as an academic exercise - the risk it seems to me, or the primary risk - it's kind of the elephant in the room - is that one or more of the constituencies, they finally decided they're fed up with being marginalized and start to look for other options for getting what they're getting, that being part of this multi-stakeholder group.

                 Now I don't know what those options are. Some people are exploring them. Some aren't. But I think to leave it - I mean I don't think that it's a time to threaten. I don't mean it that way. I don't think it should be a threat, but in fact, there's an underlying truth that there's a point in which volunteers and other people are going to say themselves, "This isn't worth it any more."

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

(Jonathan):   "I'm not being listened to or I have to struggle so hard. I have like 12 people doing all the heavy lifting, and no matter what I do, I'm up against what I consider to be a weighted or unfair voting system. And I can't get to certain circles and blah, blah, blah. What the Hell am I doing here?"

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

(Jonathan):   And I think to leave that - I think to leave that unexpressed in some way may be an error because Greg put - I didn't think I had to say it, but I'm glad he did. There's a time to do something about this. If there's ever a time to address some of the - I think -- mistakes that were made going all the way back to ICANN 2 - 2003 - this is it. I don't know if it will happen but I think this is your chance.

Elisa Cooper: Well, I'm assuming they're probably going to ask us more about what we think the risks are to a multi-stakeholder model, and I think those comments, you know, are definitely related, that if, you know, people are not feeling that the model is working and that they're considering looking elsewhere we also have bullets about volunteer burnout and the fact that there's marginalization.

I mean, it's kind of a thread in a string and for me I think, you know, that kind of ties in. I'm sure they're going to be asking us some questions about those types of issues, and I think that would be the time that we would probably respond.

Other thoughts, ideas, questions? Are we comfortable with this approach though? One thing I will definitely do is I will go through those three points but I will also ask them the question, you know, now that we've gone through this exercise it would also be helpful to understand what your next steps are.

Other things that folks want to make sure that I position or cover in any particular way? Okay, let's move on to the sort of second part. So this I anticipate will be about 30 minutes or so.

There is a second part where each of us will be presenting a hot topic. And again this goes back to the fact - and we appreciate that Fadi recognizes the differences between our three constituencies. And as a result we're approaching this meeting a little differently than we've done in the past in that we'll each be bringing to the table our own sort of hot topic or topic area that we're interested in speaking to and letting you know (at that) board.

So I'll start off with the ISPs in terms of your hot topic. Maybe if you can just share the hot topic. I think the idea is it's something we would spend like maybe no more than five minutes just saying what the topic is and allowing the board to ask some questions. So this will account for approximately another 30 minutes. (Tony)?

(Tony):   Okay I think in terms of order it may be best if the ISPs go last on this one. And the reason I say that is because we've actually got some good news and obviously we prepare our issues in (France). In France it was universal acceptance.

We came into this meeting really concerned about this, that it wasn't getting the focus, it wasn't getting the attention. And we heard the other day from a number of board members in a couple of forums that they just hate Tuesdays because they have this continual parade of constituencies and groups going in telling them their problems and looking for a fix.

They seem to be under the impression that we look to them towards a fix all the time. What's happened here since we've been here is that we've actually had as ISPs a number of conversations with other parties, registries, registrars, also looking to get the ALAC involved. We've had ICANN staff involved.

And there was a discussion yesterday afternoon on universal acceptance. We've actually got a work plan that most of it's been generated with ICANN staff and support, but generated by the community. And we can actually come along today and say we've moved forward. We're not coming in here from where we started this discussion, which was major concern.

There isn't enough focus; there isn't enough happening. And the community worked together to fix that. So I'd like to leave this particular CSG session with the board on a positive note, and I think for once we can go along and do that. So on that basis I would suggest that we go last.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. I'm fine with that. Since I'm talking so much it would be nice to turn it - I'm sure people will be tired of hearing me. Maybe I can turn it over to the IPC?

Man: Sure. Actually (Steve) has been nominated to be our hot topic deliverer.

Woman: The mic.

(Steve):   Thank you. I just love this setup here. Isn't this great? Yes first of all I just
             want to say I think it is important when we introduce the hot topics not only to
             say this was Fadi's idea of how to structure this, but also to say we're not
             necessarily asking for board action on any of these. We just share with you
             what some of the things are that we're concerned about.

             And I think the way I would summarize our concern is it's about compliance
             which is certainly something the board is used to hearing from the IPC about.
             I think we've raised it at almost every meeting. But it's somewhat different
             now. It's a bit more focused on the problem of lack of transparency in the
             compliance activities.

             We now have new provisions in the RAA 2013 version and in the registry
             agreement with the new gTLDs that we think are very important for
             responding to illegal activity, abusive activity that takes place using domain
             names that are registered by those registrars or part of those registries.

             And we're finding a lot of difficulty understanding what ICANN and the
             compliance function believes those provisions require. We're seeing some
             cases where ICANN is issuing breach notices based on inadequate response
             by registrars for example but we don't know what the response was that they
             found inadequate.

             We're also aware of cases where abusive activities have been brought to the
             attention of the registrar if they do nothing. Its complaint is filed with ICANN
             and ICANN dismisses the complaint saying that the registrars did enough.
             And we don't know that the registrars did anything.

So it's a black hole, and that serves neither the contracted parties who also are left to kind of make up what they think these contractual provisions mean and it certainly affects us as non-parties to the contract who depend on strong and clear guidance from the compliance team in order to know what we can do to use these contractual provisions to deal with this huge problem of abuse.

So that's an example of the lack of transparency in compliance that we're concerned about. It's not the only example. There are other examples that also deal with new gTLDs and with significant changes in new gTLD policies that are contrary to what's in their applications but have never been disclosed, have never been subject to public comment. There's a lack of transparency there also.

So it's not the typical complaint that we're bringing of, you know, you need more compliance people. They need to be doing more. They need to be - it's more qualitative that we don't have any insight into how they're interpreting the contract and we need to have that insight. So that's basically our hot topic.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks (Steve). Any questions, comments, thoughts for (Steve)? Okay, so from the business constituency our hot topic is around all of the remaining open new gTLD issues, and specifically, you know, we have concerns - again I think I'll phrase it like you did, that look we're not really asking for answers today.

We just want to share with you what our concerns are. And they are around things like the public interest commitment specification and the fact that there are many highly regulated strings. Some have already been allowed to be delegated. Others are in the wings.

And we're uncomfortable with the fact that there is not more uniformity in terms of what is required from those highly regulated strings. We have

concerns around sunrise periods and the lack of sunrise periods for reserve names.

When they come off those reserve names list they're never subject to sunrise nor are they subject to claims periods. We're concerned about issues of sort of inconsistent sunrise periods where they may not even be occurring at all. So these are just a sampling of the new gTLD issues.

And I think, you know, some may say well we're sort of past new gTLDs, but the fact is we're not, and some of these issues probably won't come to light until later this year, and we'll probably continue to see all kinds of new gTLD issues. (Ellen)?

(Ellen):   While I appreciate that everybody keeps framing the introductions to what you want to say - (Steve) and Elisa - in saying well we're not expecting your answers today but this is our hot topic; we want you to know it.

I agree with (Jonathan) and with what Greg said. Don't let them off the hook. You can say, "This is our hot topic. We're not expecting answers today, but we are expecting answers, and this is the accountability here. This is the time we're looking. We're giving these to you so that you can think about, but don't think that we're just saying we don't expect answers today and we're just laying them out." Don't give them a free ride.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. I think we can be clear that we can't get answers today frankly because we don't have time in (unintelligible).

(Ellen):   No, I understand that. I'm saying you can say, "We're not unreasonable. We want you to understand these are concerns that are continuing concerns. We don't expect answers today but we are expecting answers."

Elisa Cooper: Okay.

Man: This is a piece of a dialogue in other words.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. So any thoughts particularly from BC members because I know we put this together rather last minute, things that you want me to make sure that I'm including when we bring this hot topic up? No, nothing? Okay.

                 Okay, well if you think of something, catch me before we go over there and I'll do my best. (Tony)? Oh, sorry - Greg?

Greg Shatan: Yes on the BC's hot topic, one thought -- and I think this came up in the intercessional, and it actually kind of relates to the compliance topic as well -- is that we're noticing what we think are a number of sharp advantages being taken of various loopholes in there, and they aren't contractual compliance.

                 So if we talk to compliance about it, they say, "It's not our job. We can't enforce something that's not in the contract. And we couldn't control prices so if somebody wants to charge $300,000 for a domain name, you know, right out of the gate, that's fine." And that's only one example but there is this issue of it going into the second round.

                 We know, we need to help identify those loopholes where, you know, the marketplace has been left with the kind of Kasbah-like atmosphere where you can walk into a shop and leave in your underwear.

Elisa Cooper: Yes and we actually have talked about the fact that those loopholes exist and that from a contractual perspective there's nothing unfortunately that can be really done. So I think, yeah, we'll mention that as well.

Greg Shatan: Why it's not a compliance issue but it is an issue (unintelligible).

Elisa Cooper: It is a new gTLD issue, specifically with sort of the predatory pricing.

Greg Shatan: I would just also say (Allen Grogan) is not supposed to be just in charge of compliance but also consumer safeguards which to my mind think about the FTC, goes beyond contractual compliance yet there's nobody in the consumer safeguards space in the seat. There's a job but it's not filled, so this also goes to the issue of how far are they supposed to go to be a watch dog on all these loopholes.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. I think - do we have somebody on the line that has a question?

Woman: Yes, one moment. Okay, we have a comment and Anne Aikman-Scalese would like to comment, "ALAC just told the board that compliance is insufficiently proactive in their view is compliant - their view is compliance is reactive." Anne also has a question, "Do we need to anticipate that the board may ask us to define capture?"

    And another comment from Anne is, "ALAC asked the board to freeze all gTLDs." I'm sorry, "GAC safeguard categories one through eight."

Elisa Cooper: Okay, so I think - so BC didn't talk - I don't think that BC talked about capture per se but I see the IPC did, so if they do ask about that I'll turn that over to the IPC to address.

    In terms of the safeguards, that's sort of - I'm not sure when Anne asked the question, but that is a concern that the BC has is basically the fact that the GAC, the ALAC, and we - we all asked for them to review that particular issue. And I already now forgot her third question.

Woman: Third comment is ALAC asked the board to freeze all gTLDs.

Elisa Cooper: Oh yeah, yeah, and that's basically we signed on and also asked for the same thing. So we're raising that as our hot topic.

Woman: Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: (Tony) and then...

(Tony):   Okay just a quick one. I wasn't sure what you were actually asking earlier, but just so everyone is aware, I mean I mentioned we're going to be positive about progress that's been made and I'm going to turn over to (Tony) and (Christian) to actually say a few words about that.

                  The only thing we're asking them for is their continued commitment in the way that they've engaged with their community on this, so that's the only ask that's coming.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. Let's see, I think we have two minutes before we're scheduled to hear from the FSAC. Any - oh, (Tony) were you going to go ahead and...?

(Tony):   Sorry, not particularly now. I'm making a point, then I'm turning it over to you and (Christian) when we have the session with the board to actually amplify that because you've both been actively engaged in that process.

Elisa Cooper: Any other thoughts, comments, questions? Marilyn? We have just a minute and then we're going it over to FSAC.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. We're experiencing a different approach in how we're operating. This particular session with the board we - some of those who were here heard the board agreeing with us that Tuesdays are not working. Are we prepared to comment on that if that question is raised with us today, or is it something that we would want to say we need to come back - talk further with our constituencies? That's question one.

                  Question two -- or maybe it's a statement very quickly -- the drinks with the board -- and I'm not suggesting we approach it -- but the drinks with the board Sunday night turned out to be probably not what our members

expected, and maybe there - we could take that up separately offline with staff to make sure that we have more attendance, et cetera, from the board.

Man: I just want to respond to that quickly. A lot of people were confused by the reception that was held in the (Bencoolen) Foyer which is on the way to the SB Foyer where we were. And there were more board members and I think -- although I wasn't there -- more CSG members in the (Bencoolen) fellowship cocktail. So basically everyone got confused. So this is not a malice of forethought. It's just about people finding the first bar that they walked into.

Woman: And to answer your other question, I'm not prepared. I don't think we're prepared to talk about what the format should be in the future.

Elisa Cooper: I want to thank both Patrick and James for joining us. I think we have about a half an hour, and I think we wanted to do something a little bit different, and that was to keep it a little bit more interactive and have more Q and A, but I think also if you can provide us with some information about what you think we should be most interested in and what's of greatest concern sort of to commercial stakeholders. I know that's a big question, but I know you can do it.

Man: Thank you very much. So there should be slides here somewhere.

Elisa Cooper I don't know that we received any slides.

Man: Yes, you have got slides. Okay. Never mind. So regarding what I think you should be interested in. That may - okay, no let's talk from the beginning.

There are people here that don't know us. We are the - what is normally called the SSAC or (SSAC) - the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. We are one of the advisory committees here at ICANN, and we advise ICANN board of our constituencies and the community on various security, stability and resilience issues.

We are - we are a close group. We are about - we are now 34 members, and they are appointed on three year terms. We write advisories which are - which include recommendations to the various groups that we choose to address the recommendations to, and we have (unintelligible) between six to nine reports during our lifetime. We write between five and eight reports a year approximately.

At the moment we are looking into a couple of things that are related to what I think business and more commercial activities. We are looking into what is called the public suffix list which is - which are various lists that are used by Web servers and mail servers to judge whether- how high the risk that a domain name is in use for various malicious activities.

We also look into the next round of gTLDs by going through our advisors and see what have been effective -- what have been implemented or not -- and the goal there might be to come up with a list of things that we think must be done before moving into next round.

It's also the case that we are looking into various other kind of SSR-related activities related not only to domain names but also IP addresses and the log-in system.

We are also looking into the overall architecture for Whois and specifically, we are at the moment -- and that is specifically (Ben) can you raise your hand and stand up -- it's one of our SSAC members here in the room is working with credential management life cycle.

So we are gathering information about various incidents or issues that you have had or best care practices that you have discovered regarding credential management because as we all know, there have been some issues and incidents with both registries, registrars and registrants having issues and have had break-ins and bad passwords and password

management systems and what not, so we would like to get more information - more contact with those of you who are interested in talking about that.

And when we - now when we ask for information, let me also clarify that we in FSAC, we do have an ability - we do have a disclosure policy which means that we do have an ability to receive information from you that we are not passing on further. So it's completely up to you who provide us with information on whether the information is only to be used by FSAC to make sure that the documents we write are more informed or allowed to acknowledging you and also describing the specifics of the incidents and whatever (unintelligible) it's completely up to you. So we have that ability.

We also - we have been looking quite a lot about the IM (cessation) issues and written three documents. One is what the IANA functions actually is doing. The second one, what the contract between the Department of Commerce and ICANN is covering which is a different thing. And the third document that we just released includes a number of recommendations for FSAC to (unintelligible) communities when they are producing suggestions for the IANA transition.

So regarding the IANA transition issues, we at FSAC - yes we are chartering an organization for both the (CWGO) naming and the CCWG accountability, but - and we do have representatives in the CWGO naming -- not in accountability -- but apart from that we think that we have sort of done our job regarding that.

So over to your questions, that's approximately where we are. So over to your question, what do we think you should be interested in? Well, it's actually pretty important for us that you choose yourself what you are interested in. What we can do is that we can provide some guidance regarding some specifics that you might not have been thinking about like the credential management, et cetera.

But it is your choice how interested you are, and we are trying to - for example regarding credential management and the PSL, in those two areas we are trying to make your life easier by in our document - documents producing best care practices and other things that will make it easier for you to be interested in those topics, but it is your choice.

So the important thing for us -- I would like to turn this around I am sorry to say -- that when we are writing our documents, we really want to write document on topics that people -- which are you -- are interested in. So one of the things that we have had some issues with the last couple of years is that we don't get any information from you on what you are interested in. We don't get any questions from you.

You must be concerned on SSR issues. Please start, ask us questions. Thank you.

(Cat Nagel):   Microphone here? Hi, (Cat Nagel) with LinkedIn. I have a question for you. You mentioned I guess some risks as they relate to cyber security in terms of businesses and what we face. Have you noticed - or have you done any studies looking at phishing or sort of cyber security issues and whether those risks have increased or the number of reports have increased, specifically as they relate to new gTLDs being delegated and coming online?

Man: So this is - to be able to answer this I would like to have the FSAC members in the room to stand up please. Okay, so you see there are quite a large number of them here.

So yes - so specifically now when you talk about - don't sit down (Rod). Okay, specifically when you're talking about phishing, this is one of those kind of things to explain to you that we in FSAC, we use our individual members also networked, and so we are not replicating. Sometimes we are summarizing.

And (Rod) is very active -- one of the people in FSAC that are very active in the anti-phishing working group -- so (Rod) is the one that is sort of keeping track of what is happening with phishing. So FSAC had not felt that we should do any specific work regarding phishing. On the other hand, we keep ourselves informed and we have a lot of good like interaction with them. So (Rod) is the one you should talk to regarding specific phishing activities.

And you said also the changes and trends. That's at the moment our source for that. Thank you, (Rod). (Rod), do you want to say a few words? Can we get a microphone back there or should (Rod) come forward? I don't know how to get a mic - okay (Rod) is coming forward.

Man: There's a mic in the audience.

(Rod):   And so I'm actually wearing the shirt today too. So we do actually Greg Aaron who is also on FSAC and I and a couple of other folks in the (HWG) every six months do a phishing trends report. And the new gTLD launch is one of the things we are tracking quite closely there.

We have data from the last half of the last year. There are some interesting things in there, but we haven't done the analysis yet, so I can't say specifically, but there is definitely some interesting things -- so we'll put it that way -- within the new gTLD space which we'll be publishing - probably we're shooting for April timeframe I think on that.

And then any - I don't know - I see a few people here who are involved with the APWG as well, but anybody wants to know more about that or be involved, talk to Greg or I. I'd be happy to help you with that.

Man: Thank you very much.

Elisa Cooper: I think (Jensen) has a question.

Man: Thank you Patrick and Tim. Well, I'm interested in the internet security processes. It is said that charity begins at home. In view of the security breach that was reported (unintelligible), so what is FSAC doing (unintelligible) immediate threat and what will be planned ensuring that it doesn't repeat itself?

Man: So, it's quite important to know what FSAC is not doing and there are specifically two things that we in FSAC are not doing.

First of all, we are not interfering or have anything to do with ICANN corporate security and IT. That's a separate group. Let me start with that. We do have good cooperation with them, and sometimes of course the issues that ICANN corporate have are things that everyone have and from that perspective it might overlap, but so the first thing we're not dealing with is ICANN corporate security issues.

The second thing that we don't do is that we do not actively participate in operational security which are sort of ongoing activities or - because that is handled by the search and the various trust communities that already exist in the world.

FSAC in general instead make recommendations of what should be done. What communities, what entities, what whoever can do. Software developers. What changes should be made in policies to not repeat what has happened. So what we are - in a normal -- what do you -- change cycle, we are data gathering after incidents.

We are drawing conclusions. Come in with recommendations. And then in the next round, we might see whether those recommendations had an effect. And we might produce like in the next cycle updated recommendations to get a higher effect.

And that's why -- for example -- we are working together with (Rod) that you've just heard that are looking into what kind of - and that's also the way that we're looking at the next - potential next round all new gTLDs where we are looking at what kind of effect our recommendation have had. What recommendations we forgot. What recommendation we gave that actually have no effect, et cetera.

So that is where our - that's where we are most effective we think.

Elisa Cooper: (Karen).

(Karen):   Hi, this is (Karen) from (unintelligible) accounts writers. I heard yesterday that the - there will be a call for volunteers in June of this year for the SSR2 AoC review. I'm probably one of the people who's fairly ignorant about how I might get involved in SSAC and SSR issues, although I do recognize the global importance of it to our clients and our organization.

                  I was wondering if maybe then you could help me shed some light on whether it would be useful for some of us in this group to volunteer for that and what areas of interest in particular we should focus on and maybe prepare for in volunteering for that review.

Jim Galvin: So, Jim Galvin. I'll give a two part answer. The first thing is to answer specifically the question of getting involved in the SSR review, you know, that's an ICANN staff function, and they'll put out a call for volunteers and one should certainly do that and put your name in and work that process itself.

                  But I think a little bit of behind your question was getting involved in SSAC and SSAC's role in that review. And if you want to apply to be a member of SSAC, that's a separate process and we actually have a separate membership committee and an application process, and anyone is certainly eligible to put their name in and submit a request to want to join.

And, you know, then there's a natural process that'll take place. You'll be asked to submit, you know, like a CV and a statement of interest and you'll go through an interview process and, you know, there'll be - there's a committee of five people.

As Vice Chair, I'm a non-voting chair of the membership committee of SSAC. So if anyone is interested in joining SSAC, I'm happy to talk to you about that and direct you to sending a message to Julie Hedlund who is one of our staff people who manages that process. So does that answer your question?

(Karen): That's good. I guess also, that's helpful information. I'm kind of wondering what the SSAC's role is in that review -- first of all -- and then what our role would be in supporting the SSAC, either as members of our individual constituencies or if you want to be a member of the SSAC, I'm not sure.

A lot of us have the bandwidth to join another organization but if - I know (Fadi) mentioned that. It was nice to hear that everybody knows that we're burnt. But the, you know, how we might support SSAC in their role in that review if there is a role for SSAC in that review. It seems all connected to me. If that's a misunderstanding then, you know, help me correct that.

But I think that the security issues are increasingly important, and I see many opportunities and avenues to get involved, the review being one of them. And I think that might be a little bit easier than joining the advisory committee completely. So just looking for some basic items on that.

Man: Yes, to continue what Jim said. I completely agree that we cannot join all groups, like each one of us. And just like myself personally do believe that you here in this constituency do a really good. I don't feel that I have to be here. I hope that you trust me trying to keep track of SSAC and doing the right thing. So we should be able to offload. We need to, like each one do what we do the best.

That said, that increases the requirement that we actually do communicate and keep in sync, because if you worked on something from your perspective and you just sort of believe that we in FSAC are looking at the SSR issues relate to the same topic, I think we need to communicate better to, yes, at least I know that because that's what I have been talking about.

We need to communicate better so we actually are assured that we actually do cover sort of the different grounds to come up with the whole picture. Whether that is succeeding or not, that is like more like an audit process. That's more what SSR is.

And yes, we in FSAC do participate in those reviews, and we are - specifically because it's part of our charter. We're actually chartered by the ICANN by-laws to keep track of very specific SSR issues regarding names, numbers and other parameters. So we are bound by the by-laws to really carefully participate and also act upon the recommendations from the SSRs. And that's what we have done.

And it is also one of the reasons why FSAC was probably one of the first -- if not the first -- F1ac that actually did our review and according to earlier reviews of ICANN according to not only to the SSRs but everything that is covered under the affirmational commitment. So for us that's really fundamental.

Elisa Cooper: (Cat)?

(Cat Nagel):   Hi. (Cat Nagel) with LinkedIn again. I have another question. This one with respect to name collision. I'm just curious kind of anecdotally how things have changed since the loop back address went live in August of last year in terms of just name collision issues just in general.

Man: First of all, yes. The answer is yes. And I think this is one of the areas where we in FSAC are looking at things like (Rod) said, a compilation of the actual

what we see regarding phishing and what we see regarding traffic. We don't - I think that no one in the industry do have enough data yet to actually be able to draw a conclusion.

That said, it is - this is one of the cases where FSAC gave a different recommendation than what ICANN decided to implement. And this is also one of those areas where we in FSAC do believe -- I would not be surprised and you would probably be either -- if both FSAC and non-FSAC parties in ICANN is going to evaluate really carefully what happened, what the issues were, what FSAC recommendations were, what recommendations from others were, what effect the actual implemented mechanism had. So I think you will see quite a number of evaluations that.

But to some degree, we don't even have the data to sort of start that evaluation yet. So yes, I do think that things have changed, but we don't know what yet.

Elisa Cooper: Steven and (Tony)?

Woman: I wanted to add on to (Jensen)'s point in operational security. And I know that, you know, you were pretty clear that that wasn't something…

((Crosstalk))

Woman: …but it appears that the attack -- and you know this is just information sort of gleaned here and there -- on ICANN was extremely similar to attack that was on eBay in which they were - the domain manager's account was - email account was completely compromised. The same attack was tried on Facebook. Luckily that was not successful.

And there is a very interesting read about Forbes.com. So they, you know, outside forces are concentrating their activities and learning each time, which is a little concerning. I'm very concerned even though (Varus Syn) is a

(unintelligible) company and very safe, but it would be the bad guy's take. They're learning from it.

So it seems that as an organization that supports ICANN that you should also take the time and the resources to look into this.

Man: So, let me regarding this specific attack on ICANN, let me assure you that we in FSAC, we are keeping ourselves informed over…

((Crosstalk))

Man: …and in very close communication with ICANN security and IT team. Keeping ourselves informed from that is as I said. We are keeping us informed of what happened there just like we do with other enterprises that are (unintelligible) conversation with us which of course in many cases includes the enterprise of (unintelligible) that also are FSAC members. So we're not treating that differently.

That said, if it is the case - this is one of those cases where -- for example -- if the business constituency for example - if you believe that the incident at ICANN might have (unintelligible) implications to the overall internet management of parameters which they reporting to FSAC charter, and you would like FSAC to have a look into that from that perspective which is different from like an enterprise under the by-laws and incorporated the normal requirements you have as a company there, in that case please ask us that question.

This is one example where a direct question from the community is - and the more precise the question is - the easier it will be for us to answer that question.

Elisa Cooper: (Tony)?

(Tony):   Patrick, one of the things that you are aware of is the fact that any virtual
                acceptance is something that's pretty close to all (unintelligible) parts, and I
                know that your committee is aware of the issues around that. And some of
                the activities that are now spawning from the discussions we've had here.
                There was a meeting yesterday. I think some of your members were there.

                And there is going to be an initiative to address this. But one of the questions
                I have is from that. There's probably going to be a need as we gather data
                that's coming out to look at probably providing some information on best
                practice to other parts at the industry. And I wondered whether that is
                something that you'll be able to respond to as SSAC if that comes up?
                Because I know you have a very focused approach and the way that you
                undertake your work are studies which you identify and some that the
                community identify.

                Is it going - is the current thinking that any input we require on that from within
                ICANN would come from the personal engagement of any of your members,
                or will you be looking to address that as a group, and do you have the
                capability to respond within the timeframes that that will require?

Man: Both. Or all three. The - first of all, we in FSAC in some cases -- or in quite a
                large number of cases -- example regarding (OS). We are trying to come up
                with recommendations on how the community should untangle the problem
                and attack the problem to be able to come to conclusion. Which means that
                we in FSAC do very much believe in the multi-stakeholder model. So it's the
                multi-stake community that should decide what the outcome should be.

                That said, we could come with suggestions -- for example -- the taxonomy
                that we came up with for Whois came up with some suggestions on how the
                program should be addressed so - to come to some conclusions.

                So regarding the universal acceptance issues, I think we in FSAC, we have
                already come up with a number of different recommendations that we don't

feel have been addressed yet specifically related to (unintelligible) domain names, variants, the management of character (unintelligible), the what I would call the non-synchronization of how comparison of donning the TMCH with the variant discussion, et cetera, which means that those are issues we have already pointed out. So from our perspective, we don't feel any need to point them out again.

And those are sort of part of the overall universal acceptance issue, if you see what I mean. So we are more doing the building blocks as you say. That's how FSAC do the most effective work. We work on very specific issues. And then there might be very well individuals at FSAC that participate in the work that refer and point to the result of FSAC as a whole.

So to answer your question regarding whether FSAC can do anything in the more generic overall thing the variants, no I don't think we can do an effective job there, and I think it's better for the community to work together. But we could very well maybe work on some more building blocks there. I don't know. But that's normally how it has these kind of large issues have been attacked before.

Elisa Cooper: (Tony)? Do you have a microphone?

(Tony):   Patrick, this was extremely interesting because we're - as a constituency we're heavily involved in the universal acceptance (unintelligible) angle, which is called the (UAXG). Can we count on your group in some way supporting this because I think we will need your help in going forward with this initiative?

Man: Yes, absolutely. For example, the work that we're trying to do there with the public suffix list, that's one of the key things for universal acceptance. And as we - as you see in the slides when you're looking at it, at the slots we do have in the timeline to release that report -- I think even of the first quarter, maybe the second quarter of this year -- it's also the case that we had released

these and repeated our statements regarding TMCH and (REM), but specifically the PSL is something that I think is something that I think you can use in your work, yes.

Elisa Cooper: Other questions? Thoughts? Comments? Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Steve Metalitz with the IPC. I see on - in the slides that were flying through there but that you sent over that there's a work party on new gTLDs that's part of your ongoing work. Could you or someone on the committee talk a little bit about that and I'm thinking in terms of the IPC, we're collecting - trying to collect data about some aspects of the gTLDs -- particularly the rights protect mechanisms -- and feed them into their review process that's under way.

How - could you just talk a little bit more about what FSAC will be looking at in this work party and how we might be able to collaborate? Thank you.

Man: So to expand a bit on what Patrick had said earlier, what FSAC is doing in that work party is we're going back over the recommendations that we have produced over the past few years that are all related to new gTLDs and the program. And we are looking at the actions that have taken - that have been taken as a result of those recommendations.

And an action in this case includes the possibility that, you know, it was rejected or ignored -- you know what I mean -- as long as it was a decision, a decisive pointed by the community that it was directed to. Our goal is to collect those set of acts - those recommendations and review them and consider if the action that resulted, if we agreed with it or if we, you know, might want to suggest something additional, perhaps, you know, tweak our recommendation a bit given that obviously many things were happening in real time -- if you will -- as this program was rolling out. And so much has changed in the way that it's managed and it runs.

And in the end when we're done with that review, we may or may not produce a document. If there is something to say, then we will say something about, you know, this recommendation should be revisited. The actions that were taken. We might highlight recommendations that have not yet been acted on.

There are actually a few that are still outstanding, and I think the most specific thing that we will do if we do have recommendations this time around since there have been, you know, complaints over the years about some of the recommendations and whether or not, you know, they were required to be completed or not before we move forward, is we will be very explicit about whether or not we believe that the actions taken from this recommendation should be completed before a next round is opened.

And we will be very specific and support our particular recommendation in that space. And then at that point it becomes, you know, up to the community to review and decide whether they agree or disagree with us. So, is that helpful?

Man: Yes, that is helpful. So basically in a sense it's retrospective. You're looking at what you've already commented on and - to see how that was or was not followed. Thank you.

Man: And also potentially what we did not - if we for example in the work that (Rod) is doing if we look at the whatever (unintelligible), whatever, there might be some things that we now see that we should have commented on but didn't.

So - and but also here the reason why we do that kind of list is also that we see other communities do similar things. So hopefully it is possible in the future to sort of aggregate or even see whether we have different views on certain issues and that needs - those are typically examples that probably should be addressed with - so we limit the amount of stress if it is the case like we're moving around and moving into the next round. So I think we're out of time, so thank you very much for the time we got.

Elisa Cooper: Well thank you very much. We appreciate your time. And what is the best way - if our members do have input or ideas or thoughts, what is the best way to get in touch with you?

Man: The best way to get in touch with you is to - or with us - not enough coffee - is either to contact any of us FSAC members. That's the absolute easiest way, and that's way I'm so happy to have so many FSAC members here. But otherwise, the formal way is by having you contact our - the head (unintelligible). Julie Hedlund is waving back there back in the back. So that is sort of the more formal connection between our two groups.

Elisa Cooper: And by the way, Julie did send me the slides. I did have them. They were forwarded on, so I apologize. But I think it was great to have this opportunity a little bit more interactive than what we normally do. So thank you so much. Thank you guys for all coming. We appreciate it.

Man: Yes.

Elisa Cooper: Well, I don't want to jinx us, but this may be the first time we're actually running ahead of schedule. We did allow some final time for sort of final board prep. But I think we got through what we wanted to get through. Oh, is there a bicycle in here? But let me open it up again.

Are there other things you want to make sure that we really emphasize with the board in terms of either the top risks or going to our hot topics? (Tony), Greg, anything that you want to make sure that we particularly position? Are there other - any other topics that people would like to cover? Normally we don't finish this quickly and normally we're scrambling. We're not today, which is pleasant. Are there any other topics that folks would like to bring? Oh, yes. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Not quite a topic, but I just wanted to mention for those of you who may not have expected to see me at the front of the room, it's - obviously the IPC knows that an election took place. Ms. (Kristina Rosette) who gave, you know, incredible service to the intellectual property constituency for the last several years stepped down and we had an election. Steve Metalitz was acting as acting president as our vice president under the by-laws until we had that election.

We had two fantastic candidates, in myself and Brian Winterfeldt, and as of 1:38 in the morning Singapore time on Sunday, I am the president of the Intellectual Property Constituency which...

Elisa Cooper: Steve. (Tony).

Man: Well, I've got something I'd like to do here -- as we've got a few minutes -- and that is from all of us to thank three people in particular. And that is Greg, Steve and Wolf, who are really the focal points for all of the work that's going on with regards to IANA transition.

I know that they're incredibly busy carrying the load for all of us. And I'd like to ask a question both ways. I would like to ask the three of them how they feel about the way we are -- as a stakeholder group -- providing them the steer that they require, whether that's working or if there is anything we need to improve upon.

And I would also like to ask anyone who's a member of any of the three constituencies how they feel about the interaction back to those three people from our side. So I think it would be helpful to get some views, probably starting with the three people in the frame to know whether they feel we're giving them the support and they're able to respond in the manner and timeframe that that role requires. Greg, maybe you could start.

Greg Shatan: I'll start. I certainly feel like I am getting the support I need. I feel like I need to do a better job of communicating back the activities of the CWG. I see Steve DelBianco's reports that I think set a very good model. Short, crisp, timely.

There's so much to frequent - there's so much to report and if you get bogged down in the details you could spend, you know, 20 hours writing a report. So I do want to do better in terms of that, but clearly - and also to use the email list that was set up -- called CSG IANA -- up to provide those.

We should recirculate the subscription for that. I believe ISPs were subscribed en masse, but the BC and IPC were given the option to opt in. And so the opting is, you know, spotty. So I will use that in the future, and obviously you all know where to find me.

And I certainly would appreciate, you know, feedback. And there's a lot going on this week and, you know, it's a very dynamic, fluid situation, so I will keep you apprised of and would certainly be looking for feedback on issues as they come up, especially right now even in kind of the free exchange of discussions mode.

But we will really be getting more to the conversions and consensus mode, and at that point it's really important that I as your representative represent the consensus that emerges out of the three constituencies which I have to represent -- which I am honored to represent -- and will figure out what to do to the extent that the constituencies may not agree with each other on how to deal with a certain thing.

And ultimately it's going to go to the GNSO council to approve this report, and that will also pose some interesting challenges down the road. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. (Unintelligible) speaking. From my position on the ISG point of view, I would say what I'm doing is - well I have the list is (unintelligible) where I'm communicating to. So this regards to the different constituencies here. So and I do it myself as well in this way as Greg Shatan was saying. So informing you about what's going on the (ITT).

In case - I keep (unintelligible) in case there is no reaction on that, I keep it as support. It's none objection. And so I encourage all the others as well as Steve and Greg Shatan who are asking us as well to engage more and more sometimes so to keep it that way. Because otherwise you get in - come in doubt what's going on. So and then how you are going to (unintelligible).

Personally, I am sometimes in a position where it gets questions from Steve and Greg. I tell you this way. I say - I see it that way. So I should (unintelligible) because it's important, yes? But sometimes it's not possible. So it's not - well it's of timing point issue is served because a timely issue and I see that from other people as well that they have time problems throughout.

I put it on my folder which is the to-do's, yes, but this folder is going to be filled up. There's just too much to be done, yes. And that's a problem. So the point is then - and I see these meetings here at ICANN as the most important ones to communicate between us and between Steve, myself and Greg Shatan and the community members in order to focus on the issues.

So rather than to do it on the - over the time on the list. Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Steve DelBianco, did you also want to provide your thoughts and feedback in terms of how you think it's going? Can Steve get the mic?

Steve DelBianco: Hi. Steve DelBianco in the BC. I'm the CSG rep on the CCWG for accountability. I send you all frequent reports and as Greg indicated try to

keep in (unintelligible). I haven't said the words at the top of an email. Critical words in all upper case called last call.

And if you see me put those words in there it's because we're in the final stretch of auditing and editing a draft and approving it for consensus. So other than that, they're intermediate reports. That doesn't mean that I want you to ignore them and stick them in the Spam Folder, but you're - if you have 15 minutes, you can usually zero in on what it is in my email I'm asking you to look at. I'll say, "In particular attention, please look at this clause." Or I'll put it in red or highlight it.

That gives you an opportunity to dedicate no more than 15 minutes giving us a response. I have to give a lot of shout out to the folks in the ISP, IPC and BC who on Sunday -- I think it was -- or Saturday night responded within three or four hours to some critical items on stress test that we're going to apply. All three constituencies gave me really substantive inputs and mark-up.

Greg gave me an extensive number of comments. It was almost an embarrassment of riches because I had to spend several hours trying to sort out all of your conflicting advice on what to put into the comments.

But that's the kind of response that we live for. It makes it feel like it's really worthwhile to put the time in that we are. And glad to receive any other input, either here or after the meeting. Thanks.

Elisa Cooper: (Tony)?

(Tony):   I was just going to add that aware of the demands from this and the fact that you've all been involved in some of these meetings that take place - the Frankfurt meetings. And it crossed my mind, there's a lot of dialogue goes on at those meetings, and maybe either before or after when those sessions are arranged, it may be helpful to think about having a CSG-wide call either to get

input from us or to bring us up-to-date after because as you know better than anybody, tracking this stuff across the mailing list, it's one hell of a task.

And I think we are not carrying everyone with us currently. So maybe a quick call might help with that.

Steve DelBianco: (Tony), this is Steve DelBianco again. (Tony), right after Frankfurt I sent something out with the outcomes of Frankfurt, but I neglected to say I'm available for a call if you'd like to have one. And I believe an ISP call would be appropriate. Maybe a BC call would be separate because we like cover it on our own. I'll do that. And please note it's a standing offer that if you wanted to have a call, we can do that.

I also want to encourage you to probably ignore the CCWG mailing list. There's very little of meaningful progress and substance that happens on those spiral out of control debates you see. The real work is done in those who hold the pen and draft the documents and move the documents through work parties and work teams who specifically edit and move them slowly toward consensus.

A lot of times the mailing lists off into a tangent that really leads to nothing. Because it's somewhat easy for people to respond to an email. It's much harder for them to actually read a document and edit. But the real work is done in the documents, not so much the mailing list.

Man: Just (unintelligible) on that. That's exactly my fear, Steve. Because I know that we're losing people because they look at these mailing lists and the volume is (unintelligible) to start with. The content isn't that great. And we lose them along the way.

So we have to have other ways of making sure that they're engaged. Otherwise, the worry is we get to the end of this process, you're going to give us the final call, and people are going to say, "Hang on a minute. We're not

even on the same page." So it's keeping them all engaged that's the critical thing.

Elisa Cooper: Any feedback for either Greg, Wolf-Ulrich or Steve? I too would like to thank all three of them. It's just - I know it's been a tremendous, tremendous amount of work, and an excellent, excellent job. And we all appreciate it. Any other - Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yes. This is Steve Metalitz with the IPC. Before we adjourn, I just wanted to thank Elisa and the rest of the BC. We rotate the leadership of this - setting up all these meetings and agendas during the ICANN meetings, and I think this was very well organized. The agendas were out in advance, and we've kept to the time. So I just want to thank Elisa and also the other two BC.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. It's been a pleasure working with everyone. Yes. I see Heather's hand. Oh, I don't want to throw... Oh. Well, thank you so much. Let's see, do we have a comment from Heather?

Heather Forrest: Yes. Thank you. Heather Forrest very quickly, but it's complimentary so it's worth the wait. I want to say I found it helpful the BC's document that combined the CSG agendas.

Not only is it useful to have that information, but it was set out picking up on the point that (Tony) just raised. It was set out in a very clear way, and the ICANN normal schedule is really increasingly less clear, so kudos to you guys. You've set a high bar for the next folks to just live up to. So thank you for that.

Elisa Cooper: Yes. No, I'm glad. I'm glad. Thank you so much. It was a pleasure, and I'm looking forward to working with everyone, especially our newest member, Greg. So thank you, and so we're now in (unintelligible), and the meeting starts at 11:15 and we should try to be starting right at 11:15. So thank you everyone.

Man: Also, IPC members who think they can leave stuff and return here, there is a meeting in between so you can't.

END