ICANN Prague Meeting
BC Meeting - TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 26th June 2012 at 13:30 local time

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.

Marilyn Cade: So we'll pick up the transcript from this point. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm the chair of the business constituency. We'll do a few other discussions and comments from other officers later.

We're going to go immediately into welcoming our guest, Patrick Falstrom and Julie Hedlund. Patrick is the Chair of the SSAC and Julie is the Senior Staff Support to the SSAC. I'm sure she tries to do other things but she's kept pretty busy by the SSAC as well.

So it's particularly important at this time for business users to begin to learn, I think, more directly about what the SSAC is doing. They are, I think, increasingly a group that we're going to want to prioritize being aware of their agenda and their activities.

There is a list of the members that - and bios of the members that's available on the website and we won't do that in detail now but we're going to talk later. I'm expecting as a result of the great comments Patrick is going to make that people are going to find technical people in their companies and want to come join the SSAC.

So let me turn this over to Patrick by saying one more thing. Patrick used to be with Cisco and is a longstanding friend and ally of the business community, does a huge amount of work in the Internet governance space, and also advises Swedish government and has labored through many long hours in sub-basement conference rooms in UN facilities with Ayesha and myself and a few other people.

He survived all that and he has now taken a new job, which I'm not going to say a lot about, but just to tell you that when he left Cisco and it was announced, those of us who knew him well and knew his bosses at Cisco tried to negotiate an agreement that he would always have a fond place in his heart for the business community.

Patrick Falstrom: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Of course, I have not spent as many hours in the basements as you are - you have, but you're absolutely correct that the business constituents have always been very close to me even though I started with the (unintelligible) so I'm sort of mid - in-between business, technical community, and as Marilyn said, since 2003 I've been an advisor to the Swedish IT Minister.

We (unintelligible) governments from leftwing to rightwing governments in the middle of this and they still kept me so I'm doing something wrong probably.

So what I will tell you, we have the generic slides that we are showing for everyone. These might be a little bit too technical and not too technical but they go - dive a little bit too much, these slides seem to (unintelligible) report and domain name registration data model. So we'll not go through those slides in detail.

I will instead start by continuing in talking a little bit about SSAC itself. SSAC is a group that is an advisor to ICANN Board. We write our own documents and the documents we write - and we are write - we manage to produce around six documents a year, not more than that.

Those documents are numbered from zero - that was started a little bit more than ten years ago and we just produced Document 54 so 5.4 documents an average so far. I hope that we are speeding up a little bit now.

This documents - we create among our members and we have 38 members as of today. And you can see here a list of the recent - most recent document that we publish in 2011 and 2012, which are various advisories on - for example, blocking actions, various different risks for registries and registrars and also domain name holders.

Of course the last number of documents have been responses to questions from either the government advisory committee or the ICANN Board.

So what we are doing is that we have these six documents a year that we can produce and one can say that maybe two of them or - sorry, half of them are sort of direct questions from other ICANN constituencies where, of course, just because we report to the Board those are the ones that we prioritize.

But we also pick up various issues on our own when we do detect that there is something that needs to be done, needs to be written.

The status of this reports, which is something that is quite important to know, is that compared to other groups inside ICANN that produce documents where the documents go on a public consultation period for example, we decide internally whether we have consensus for the document and then we publish them. So there's no public consultation on these documents.

So the documents live on their own and one of the reasons for that is that, of course, it's very easy for us to write a document. Of course, it's never easy to get consensus within a group about security and stability concerns, people to get consensus of something. It's never easy but relatively quickly. And then

it's up to the community, for example you, to reference those documents if you want to.

So just because SSAC - even though we are advisor to the ICANN Board it is not until potentially ICANN Board make a Board resolution and reference our document or they choose to pick up a recommendation in one of our documents. That is when the documents and the content actually get some status within ICANN.

So to start with you see that it's a document, reference them if you want to. And our goal - and one of the things that we are doing is we are mastering the quality and the feedback we get on our documents.

And we have actually specific work item where we are looking very carefully at, for example, how many external documents are referencing our documents, which ones are the most popular ones, what is the - what number of hits is there in Google on our respective documents. We try to get a feeling of what is interesting.

So one of the things which is to - also a continuation of what Marilyn talked about, what we are writing, of course, also should help the business constituency just like everyone else. So even if it is the case that you find that you're not interested of anything that we are doing, we absolutely want to do that because that means that we should adjust what we're doing and do more things that you're interested in (unintelligible).

It's also the case that we don't mind if it is the case that the business constituency alone or together with other groups in the ICANN community do have something that they are concerned about that they think we should have a look at, please let us know and we might pick up that essay as a work item.

The - what we're doing at the moment is that we have a standing committee which we've called the Membership Committee, it's our Vice Chair, Jim Galvin, which is Chair of that one.

We are appointing SSAC members on three years and they're appointed by being approved by the Membership Committee which acts like the NomCom for SSAC, which interview people and it's a pretty lengthy process.

After that the Membership Committee comes with the recommendation to SSAC as a whole so it's SSAC as a whole that accepts new members, that's the process. People are appointed on three years as I said so each year we are reviewing the membership of one-third of the people in SSAC.

We are just now moving into actually started - sort of started today the review process of one-third of the members. And that by itself, as you might know, actually takes some time.

The other groups we have but we are participating in the ICANN working group on the Internationalized Registration Data. We also participate in the DSSA working group. And you have the ability to get the information on those - on the work from those in other (unintelligible).

We also participate in the former (ME) and the ICANN Board DNS Risk Management Framework working group, that has an open meeting on Thursday. We also have - and then we have two internal work parties which are groups inside SSAC that are working on potentially producing a document.

And the two that we have (unintelligible) at the moment is, one, is an extension of an earlier document on DNS blocking, what the actual impact is from all the different kind of viewpoints.

The - and the second one - work party, is a root key rollover and the reason why we take up that item is that when using DNS (unintelligible), now when the root (unintelligible) is signed there is a discussion that started on what are the various options and the various concerns that might exist regarding operations and continuation of - sort of functionality of the Internet when we're going to change the root key of the root of the root zone.

Because if we're doing that the wrong way it might be the case that because of DNS SAC that the DNS will not work for a day or two and that would be pretty bad.

We are also have public meetings and various collaborations and we try to go to as many groups as possible during the ICANN meeting. For example, we are here. We are also - so specifically Tuesdays for us as you understand we are running around and quite a lot. We are, of course, trying to do our own work as well as much as we can at the ICANN meetings.

We're also trying to not only inform but also get information on what other constituencies and other groups inside ICANN want us to do and that will - also at this meeting I will shortly switch and have the ability for you to tell us things and (unintelligible).

We also have a couple of work parties that were identified for potential future work. One has to do with the ability and how to handle registration that is done by - a registration of domain names or blocking of domain names that is needed, for example, to kill botnets where sometimes the - sometimes botnets register or need, like, (unintelligible) or maybe 20, 50 domain name each day. We have the configure botnet is still using about one domain name a day.

Then we have a couple of parties that are trying to register those domain names and take them over and that is, today, a cost for them that they have to pay to the registries. So we have some sort of good people that have been

trying to do the good but they are unfortunately have quite a large amount of money that they have to pay to the registries.

So maybe in the future, maybe it is the case that we should do something and do something about that. Was there a question? Okay, yes.

So that is something we're going to - so at the moment we are looking into at least describe the situation regarding abuse of domain names, domain name registration, and give that to the community to see whether that is something that should be done. Maybe there is something that should be done in the various PDPs here in ICANN.

We also, of course, are looking at the secure (unintelligible) issues related to new gTLDs and at the moment we are - just like everyone else, it seems - looking at the various implications regarding digital archery, the cancellation of digital archery, and batching.

And yesterday I - at the open mic regarding batching, that was scheduled at very short notice. I mentioned that from SSAC's perspective we think that to some degree we think that ICANN (unintelligible) by mentioning explicitly the number 1,000 do not really understand this - the scale of reports that have been written.

We are working on a clarification of that. We don't see - not really being in a hurry and (unintelligible) question of, for example, that is (unintelligible). Because if you write a report explicitly now this week there's no one to receive it because staff, for example, have a lot of other things to do and ICANN Board also have other things to do.

So we think that the document will be much more successful if we were to submit it carefully and release it early next week for example.

But even though we haven't released the document we sort of know what's in it and I'm really happy to talk about it as much as possible this week. So the fact that it's not released is not a way of not having a discussion about that in this week, to the contrary. Yes?

Okay, okay. Thank you. So in general, one can say that what we - from an SSAC perspective are nervous about is that deployment of new gTLDs, the actual introduction process and also the change of rate in the root zone with - from (unintelligible), the whole approval process for normal changes, that the service level - (unintelligible) even though there is no service level agreement anywhere on this system that the service level might go down.

So what we have been asking for is a slow introduction and every report says that the root service system as a whole including the (unintelligible) part, absolutely can handle several tens of thousands or whatever kind of domain names - TLDs, that is not the problem.

The problem is that the system - the root service system as a whole needs to have time to absorb and go through the changes.

So what we have been pointing out in a couple of reports several times is that what's important for us is that there is - for example, some kind of measurement to see whether there is an impact on, for example, if an existing registry is requesting a change of a name server record today it takes a certain amount of time before it's available in the root zone.

If - before, during, or after the interaction of those - whatever, 1,300 or whatever number of domain names with new gTLDs, if during that process the time it takes to get the name server record or a change (unintelligible) to the root server increases that is an indication to slow down the introduction.

So we are absolutely happy with an introduction that is as fast as possible so what is most important for us is that there is a feedback loop into the

introduction that is sort of - that can adjust also the speed with what new TLDs are introduced.

Yesterday at the batching meeting it sounded a little bit encouraged presentation as if we, from the technical community, has said that 999 will work each year and 1,001 will make the root service system to break, that is absolutely the wrong interpretation or the wrong implication. Let me phrase it that way.

Instead it implicates that when the technical community were asked, do you think that the amount of risk is acceptable for sort of around 1,000 and we sort of said, sort of yes. Because if you ask - concerned security and stability people, do you think adding 1,000 TLDs to the root zone and the root service system is of no risk, the answer is absolutely 100% no.

So what we need to do is to ensure that we're adding things in a way so that we can manage the risk. And one way of doing that which we are recommending is just to monitor, for example, how long time does it take, how many requests comes to (unintelligible), to when that is implemented in the root zone. That is one example of what can be measured. Various different kind of feedback loops.

So - yes?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn Cade. I remember this discussion. I remember being at the microphone and God knows which particular ICANN meeting, I think it was Singapore, raising these very questions.

So I'm going to ask you - I'm going to say how important it is that apparently for ICANN staff to fully absorb this information we're going to have to do the comic book version that accompanies it as well as write it more clearly.

But this is - I think this is very worrisome to us, the security and stability and resiliency of the Internet is what all of these companies run their business on. So when the paper will be available - when?

Patrick Falstrom: I hope that we can - it will be end of this week or beginning - it's just a process. It's a resource issue. And we just have to concentrate this week on talking to people about it.

And also, which of course, gives the ability for us to fine tune the wording if it is the case of something so we're absolutely sure that it will be - that people understand it. At the moment it's one-and-a-half page long. So the goal is - so my goal in my (unintelligible) writing reports is to write fewer words, not more words. So it's a short, crisp thing, that's the goal.

Marilyn Cade: We have one more question and then - do you - let me ask a question before - do you want to continue taking questions? Do you want to cover a few more things and then take questions?

Patrick Falstrom: I can just mention very, very quickly this report that we have - sorry. You're doing the right thing, I shouldn't mess around. I should let you do the slides and I do the talking, much better.

Yes, exactly, that's (unintelligible). So one thing - one example of the reports that we picked up ourselves was a report in domain name registration data model.

Because the working groups on the International Registration Data and the Whois gave for us an indication including cooperation with law enforcement and others that wait a second, when people say telephone number they don't mean the same thing around the world or business identity. What do they mean?

So what we've tried to talk about is, like, okay, there's probably something in here, a data model that people should use. And then from that data model they could pick, okay, we're using this and this and this and we're calling this. So we get some kind of harmonization of the data that we're using when we are dealing with domain names.

This document does not make any policy assertions at all. The whole idea is that the data model is supposed to be possible to be used when you are building your business model or your policy assertion or whatever.

Now one of the reasons why we wrote this document was to spark a discussion and one of the feedback that we got back from ccNSO and a few other group is, of course, no, we do our things on our own and we don't want anyone to interfere, which is fair.

But on the other hand we also have (unintelligible) who say, no, we need harmonization from law enforcement and from registrars, and etc. So this is an example of a document that we just came up with, (unintelligible) no one asked for it but we picked it up to see what the actual reaction is.

Read it, please, the ones that are interested in these kind of issues, particularly globalization issues and please come with feedback, including comments like, no, this is not possible to do or no, it's not possible to do yet, etc.

So there, I don't think there is anything more specific that I want to say so now we can continue more the questions in general for another seven minutes and probably need to go - like five minutes too. Yes?

David Green: Patrick, David Green from KPMG, I just have a question for one of the rationale for the new gTLDs is to introduce integration in the DNS. And when you combine this with other Internet developments such as IP Version 6,

(unintelligible) whereby - you're not so much concerned about domain names but domain - let's call it domain serial codes within devices.

So there are 110 million domain names in the .com registry, for example, but there's 1.2 billion smart phones shipping this year. So what if in the near future state where manufacturers of those types of devices are utilizing IP Version 6 for connectivity but a unique registry entry as part of the authentication for some degree of automated access to digital services. So you're talking about a massively more complex scale of DNS records.

Patrick Falstrom: I don't agree with that actually. I think there's a resolution that we're seeing quite a lot. You have to differ between the name space itself and what the gTLD process is doing. It's changing the name space and make it more flat. So previously we had more - like, fewer nodes at each level and deeper.

And what is now happening is that we have - we will get name space that is a little more flat in the first step, it looks like 1,600 nodes on the top level instead of only 300. And the second level as you pointed out, .com, has lots and lots of - many millions or hundreds of million records there.

The second problem - so yes, we don't really know what kind of changes that will - or the impact that will get.

The other one - but you also should know is that all IP address in the world including IP V6 and the whole name space is already in DNS, okay, in the reverse tree.

The second thing that we are to look at is the DNS protocol and one of the things that we're looking at, of course, are the various denial of service attacks and botnets and other kind of misuse of DNS - of the DNS protocol, which have various problems because of UDP base, people can't spoof the sender IP address.

You can use it for denial of service (unintelligible) which has nothing to do with the name space or the content of sort of what's inside the DNS protocol.

The last part has to do with evolution of what you are using the DNS protocol for. For example, there's a standard that I wrote once upon a time that take the whole telephone number space in the world and place it in DNS and use the DNS protocol to map a phone number to (unintelligible) to make dialing easier.

So that is - and we have the same kind of implementation for RFIDs where you take any kind of identifier of MSC chips or RFIDs and you use the DNS - you put it in the DNS name space and then use the DNS protocol to make it very quick, sort of look up mechanism to get - do the solution.

So the last thing I think you talked about is that - which I do see and agree with you, is innovation of what you can use the DNS protocol and the DNS name space for that is not the traditional domain name to IP address mapping. And I think we absolutely will see more of that.

And the next big thing will absolutely - I think, be certificates because today the way of handling and naming (unintelligible) certificates for (unintelligible) websites is not really scaling anymore. So that is the first change that we currently see.

Jeff Brueggeman: Hi, Jeff Brueggeman, AT&T. I guess one comment is - I was on the SSR review team and I think we were extremely impressed with SSAC and the work that you do. And one of our recommendations was that it should be - all organizations and work groups in this area should be free to operate without - you know, pressure internally or externally.

So I think one of the key parts of that is having SSAC have the flexibility to frame the issues in the way that makes sense and not - sometimes we ask perhaps overly narrow questions.

Patrick Falstrom: I absolutely agree but (unintelligible) that people must know that what SSAC is witting - just because it's an SSAC document it is not a policy that is shoveled down the throat of anyone in the ICANN community. That is not - the policy development process says if they find it suitable to reference our document and use that in whatever they're creating. So as long as the community understands that difference then absolutely I agree with you.

Jeff Brueggeman: Then a question is, what is a good way for businesses and other network providers, other operators, all of us who use the DNS and have parts of it to perhaps provide input in and interact with the SSAC? Is there - would you find value in there and if so how could that be accomplished?

Patrick Falstrom: There are specifically two ways of doing that - well, let's say three ways. One, to have these meetings that we have today and maybe it is the case that by that - if it is the case that there is specific topics that, for example, the business constituents want to have discussed, I could have more SSAC members in the room here, for example, if we plan that beforehand. Maybe have a longer time than the 25 or 27 minutes that we get.

The second thing, of course, is that many of the members I have on SSAC do actually work for businesses as employees. So you can also do more work sort of internally as well because I know when I was at Cisco, at large companies there are sometimes disconnects.

And the third thing that can happen is that we at SSAC, just because we are running around like we are doing like this, we want - we're a group that have intercessional meetings and one of the things we could do is also to have longer - sort of topic-based - we do what SSAC calls topic-based discussion other venues than at ICANN meetings, at the (unintelligible) meetings as well.

So being able to do topic-based discussions together is something that we do. For example, now in the (unintelligible) we're doing some work together with the (unintelligible) Society. We hope - we'll see.

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible) and we'll take this up in follow up but what I propose is that we talk about identifying a topic and scheduling a two-hour session for Toronto, planning ahead and making sure we have the right people to set the topic as well, and just part - coming back to you if we get enough support from the members.

Patrick Falstrom: Yes, it will of course be a negotiation both from a topic and the amount of time, of course. And I think that having two hours of a goal, I think it might be a little too optimistic, but I do - but why not, why not shoot for the moon and see how far you come.

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible).

Patrick Falstrom: Yes, and you're absolutely right. And take the meetings that we have with the government advisory committee for example. We have - on and off we have meetings with all of SSAC and GAC and then it was only me and GAC and then we sort of work on - for this meeting, and this is why we need to run away, this meeting with GAC we actually do have an agenda that even people from GAC and people from SSAC worked together as a small work group to come up with an agenda. So we do have explicit work discussion items.

And with that...

Marilyn Cade: Patrick, thank you for - and we will work on identifying a couple of topics to come you on and (unintelligible) negations. Thank you.

Now in the next five minutes we're going to do a little bit of room rearrangement. So here's what my suggestion is. If I could get a couple of

gentlemen to help Steve move another table up here, it's not going to be pretty but there it is.

You know, we're doing it, thank you. I appreciate it but I'm - that will take me forever and I'm going to get started. So we're going to move the officers up here. So all of the officers will be up here and that gives seat here where Zahid is and another seat where Steve is and another seat where Chris used to be and some place where John Berard is.

So that - yes, I would like you all here. And I think with - I think we can get everybody here if we fill in some of the - there's Elisa. I was just going to say, oh my God, I've lost Elisa.

So if we fill in some of the empty seats as well I think we can all get crunched up here. And there's a row of seats up here because we have only two microphones and you guys - so you can be more interactive. We're going to need to pass the microphones back and forth. And I'm going to - this means that when I call on you I'm going to ask you to hand the microphone because (Benny)'s driving the slides.

And I appreciate your flexibility and I'd like you to know that on your behalf I've already complained and I'm sending pictures. But you do what you can. Okay, has everyone signed in? And I really do appreciate your flexibility, guys.

And some other - another group rearranged the room without notifying the ICANN staff just as we just did so we're going to live with it, thank you.

We're not walking over there. There will be no one over there. Okay, okay. But we're starting the meeting Glen, thanks.

Okay, thank you. So I'm going to do this. I'm going to put you in charge of if somebody news come in will you give that to them, (Angie)? Thank you.

We're going to do the roll call now which we did not do earlier. And again, I'm just going to thank all of you for being real business people who just solved problems.

We're going to have a really full agenda. Does everyone have a copy of the agenda? Okay, I'll get that while we start the roll call. And (Benny), is it okay with you if I just start here with (Angie) or do you want to go the microphone - is that okay? Okay, and then you'll just hand the microphone.

Angie Graves: Angie Graves, BC member, Webgroup Incorporated.

Ayesha Hassan: Ayesha Hassan, ICC, BC member.

Woman: (Unintelligible), BC member.

Man: (Unintelligible), BC member.

(Martin Hannigan):   Hello, I'm (Martin Hannigan) and I'm with (unintelligible) Technologies.

Jeff Brueggeman: Jeff Brueggeman with AT&T.

(Amy Michelin):   (Amy Michelin) with (Reed Smith) and the Association of National Advertisers.

(Marissa Tele):   (Marissa Tele), (AIM) the European Branch Association.

(Joseph Smirnoff):(Joseph Smirnoff), I'm (unintelligible) participant and I'm new to ICANN for the first time, non BC member.

Man: (Unintelligible), Verizon, BC member.

(Shawn Meyers): (Shawn Meyers), (Taylor and McAffrey) LLP and for the Canadian International Pharmacy Association, BC member.

(Bryce Hoffman): (Bryce Hoffman), Fox Entertainment Group, (unintelligible) BC member.

(Janet O'Callaghan): (Janet O'Callaghan), News Corporation, BC member.

(Andy Abrams): (Andy Abrams), Google, BC member.

(Chad McCormick): (Chad McCormick), BC member, (McCormick) ICT.

(Jeff Lowe): (Jeff Lowe), Vice Chair of Finance Operations, BC.

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade, Chair.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco, Vice Chair for Policy Coordination.

Elisa Cooper: Elisa Cooper, Mark Monitor, BC Liaison to the (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), Councilor to the GNSO.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: (Carol), and can I invite people up here to the front row? We have extra seats and we're now sort of organized in a way that I think we can look at each other and start the agenda.

We're going to probably be racing on some of these things. And we'll do the best we can to get to the agenda. We have a very important guest who's coming later today. I say they're important because Jeff Moss has spoken with us a couple of times.

We've been very proactive in reaching out to Jeff who is CSO, the Chief Security Officer, at ICANN. And we have an ongoing dialog with him and with

Patrick Jones. So we'll hear from them. It will be - they'll come at 3:30, be with us for a half hour.

And then we're going to have a closed session where we will be members only so that we can deal with some - a report on our finances and a couple of other quick items.

The meeting otherwise is open and is being recorded and transcribed. What I'd like to do is open this up for a few minutes to kind of process a little bit what happened this morning in the meeting with the Board.

And when I say process there are some follow up items and there are some areas where probably people are happy with the information they received, other areas where they're concerned about the information they received and dissatisfied and perhaps we need to just go through what you heard that you're happy with. I want to deal with what are you happy with and what are you extremely unhappy with and what do you need more information on.

Because I think the whole purpose of us meeting with the Board is for us to make it effective and a good way for us to then take the next step after we go through our constituency meeting.

It may be that we are going to find that this order doesn't work so well because right now we meet at the CSG and then we meet with the Board and then we meet as the BC.

But why don't we try doing the - where are we, what are we happy with, what are we extremely unhappy with and we need to take action on, and what do we need clarification on? And if we need another category we can do that as well.

So I'm going to take a queue because something tells me I've got one. (Unintelligible) we have no one on the phone lines, okay. Okay, like, you weren't happy yesterday about a number of things. So I'll kick this off then.

I have some remaining...

(Nancy): (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: (Nancy), our apologies, we moved one table. We did not realize...

(Nancy): (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. We weren't aware of that.

(Nancy): (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Thank you for coming to tell us, (Nancy). Okay, what I would like to put on the table is the discussion about operational performance and moving to operational excellence. It seems like a good topic for right now.

Okay, back to work. I'm sure you guys are absolutely thrilled at the excitement I - we just created. Operational performance and operational excellence, you satisfied? I don't mean about the room.

So we have no further comments or concerns about operational performance at ICANN and the - how things are going and whether we think we have enough resources and enough focus and enough understanding and that's...

Man: Are we talking about the (unintelligible)?

Marilyn Cade: Well, we may be. Let's - yes, because we've been (unintelligible). We may be. The agenda item is we're going to debrief from the discussion with the Board members and deicide if we're going to make any statements or

whether we're just trying to determine if we have further follow up with the Board or further follow up ourselves.

(Bryce Hoffman): I would just - this is (Bryce Hoffman) from Fox. I would just echo some of the comments that were made earlier today - (Bryce Hoffman) in CSG just about how I think that we're at sort of a critical crossroads obviously with ICANN. And a critical piece of that is, you know, public trust and public interest.

And I think some certain things around operational excellence, in particular some of the technical glitches that have occurred with respect to the gTLD program really sort of undercut that and make it difficult as we serve as ambassadors out in the larger business community about ICANN.

And it makes us - puts us in a very difficult position I think in terms of walking that line.

Marilyn Cade: I think that's generally the feedback that I hear from members and I guess what I didn't hear and the Chairs of the GNSO did have a meeting with our new CEO and with Akram last night and raised this question and asked for a - indications of a plan that would show us how things could get better in the very near term.

And we didn't - we were not given assurances of how that might happen or how additional resources might be brought to play.

Right now what I would say is Akram and (Kurt) are overworked as it is, there's a lot going on. And they're probably both working 70, 80 hours weeks at a minimum.

And now we've just doubled up on work and we are getting over some glitch failures. And we have lots of glitches and (unintelligible). We have lots of other activities and decisions.

We did raise the question of whether ICANN's Board should start - should establish a plan of delaying non-essential initiatives and focusing on the operational stabilization and improvements in absolutely essential tasks.

Right now the budget shows - the budget that's approved shows - there was an indication that might be considered but the budget that's approved shows no indication of that.

And I think that is something that we might want to think about in making our public comments that there are some things that are absolutely essential that must be done.

Some of the things that are in the budget are new initiatives. Some things that are in the budget are things that were not finished last year. And maybe there needs to be a reprioritization for a time.

There's a new CEO. There may be a rationale, very simple rationale, of saying some things - the timeline needs to change on launching or how much resource goes into something that's not essential.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco for the transcript. So with respect to operational excellence, I don't think there's any doubt that everyone in this meeting appreciates the importance of operating with excellence, not only in the future but with respect to the gTLD programs so far.

But I still think that we have a right to ask if - if ICANN has analyzed sufficiently the three issues that everybody's talking about without naming them, right; the one is the takes system review and file names.

And another was the disclosure of personal information after they accomplish the applications, and then another would potentially be the lack of understanding that the digital archery system would perform in dramatically

different ways depending on your distance from the servers in Northern Virginia.

So that it really wouldn't provide for very fair use of the digital archery system.

So those are the three issues that we all keep naming, that's the three elephants in the room. We keep talking about the lack of operational excellence and I think most of us are talking about those three incidents since they are impacting the world's perception, in particularly the government's perception of whether ICANN can operate with excellence and (unintelligible).

You may already have this understanding but I would appreciate an understanding from ICANN at some point whether some of these were due to policy discussions, design decisions that were made when they decided to set up the system. Did they fail to see something in the design because that would indicate that they had a shortage in analysis in the design step?

Did it occur because we outsourced it to a vendor that wasn't adequately qualified or wasn't managed adequately? Was it due to staff efficiencies, either in quantity of staff or skills? And finally, that there's some act of God that happened for which we didn't have adequate risk management and redundancy programs?

I don't even know the answers to those four basic questions that we would always ask when we do a little bit of a post mortem. Instead we're all at a higher level of rhetoric that says that whatever we do we have to be excellent going forward.

But I don't know anybody that would argue otherwise. I feel like we're wasting our breath telling ICANN, whatever you do you've got to get it right, it's not worth the time it takes to go through that. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: So let me just respond to Steve's and then come back to this and ask others to comment, we did ask this morning for the explanation, the analysis of what has led to the glitches. And the response we got was that will be done at some point. That was raised last night as well.

I want to be sure I understand, do people think that aside from the gTLD program that everything else is working excessively well at a very high quality at ICANN? I just want to be sure I understand what we are talking about.

The apparent problems are in the ones that are getting bad press and that are potentially very visible and (unintelligible) are the glitches. And the further possible glitches that could still remain in a very complex - the question of - Steve has made an interesting point.

My understanding is that (TAZ) was developed in-house. So, you know, while it may not necessarily - I don't know if we're going to get into this level of - but I do think that there are points we may want to make about, you know, in order do things with excellence as a business we recognize you have to spend money and put resources into things.

And consequences of not speeding money in the right place and the right time are often that you spend more money or cause risk.

So I do agree that the post mortem needs to be done and it may need to be done earlier than they're planning on doing it at least at a high level to keep them from repeating errors that were engineered into the implementation.

Steve DelBianco: Is there possibility some lack of awareness, privacy, protection laws around the world would it make it maybe not such a good thing to disclose people's personal address? Or did they know that and failed to execute it?

Marilyn Cade: That was a glitch.

(Bryce Hoffman):   But I think just to underscore the point a little bit, I mean I almost think it's not even helpful to even refer to it as a glitch because that almost makes it seem like it's a series of one-off problems. And I think the issues is that after a certain number of one-off problems or glitches it starts to look like a pattern.

And that goes a lot of the questions that I think are right on, Steve, that you just asked, which is what is going on on an underlying basis that's causing all of these glitches?

Marilyn Cade: Since the community repeatedly - in a range of meetings, went to the public microphone and in presentations, workshops and presentations, questioned the implementation plan. And even made statements like, you know, who is this being outsourced to and do you have redundancy? I mean there was a huge amount of input at various times.

I begin to feel like we are sort of in a funnel and there's a lot of discussion and information exchange and then it - and advice is given and information is given about why a particular approach doesn't work. And somehow it turns from information to noise and then to static.

And so the concerns that are expressed about something are disregarded because they're not - it's almost like the staff can't hear them or cannot take them into account whether it's because they think the information comes from parties with conflicts or - I'm not trying to analyze what the issue is.

But it feels to me like valid information - strong concerns about digital archery, none of the things that have been raised about digital archery in the letters had not been said before.

So I agree with (Bryce)'s point and I think your point that we're not going to produce an excellent product with the process we're using right now.

Elisa Cooper: Elisa Cooper for the transcript. Frankly, it seems to me like ICANN just doesn't care. I just get the sense that we tell them things, we express our ideas, we ask for clarification. They tell us what they want to tell us. They acknowledge the questions sometimes, sometimes not.

And that, you know, they've got their agenda and they're going to want to move on with their agenda.

Only, I think, until - honestly in my opinion, I think it was the GAC writing a letter regarding digital archery that that - you know, yes, there was also a glitch, a problem, an error, mistake that, you know, was impetus for putting the suspension on the digital archery. But I really think it was the GAC.

Regardless of the fact that there were many letters submitted, many, many letters submitted by applicants. And so that - you know, that's how it feels to me.

Steve DelBianco: Marilyn, this is Steve DelBianco. You asked about non-gTLD issues and the BC has consistently been disappointed with the level of execution in compliance. And this may not be the right meeting to bring it up at and there's so much attention - all the air in the room is sucked up by the new gTLD program.

But there is an opportunity with the new CEO coming in between now and Toronto to think about structural changes. Earlier we talked about execution improvements, the things that (Bryce) and I were listening. There's a structural change with respect to compliance that may be worth mentioning to get it into the new CEO's queue.

And it might well be to reconsider one of the strangest organization designs you've ever seen. You have a company who does two things. It does policy development. It does compliance. And one of those things is actually not in a line operation to the CEO.

All of compliance is simply (unintelligible) under the general Council as opposed to being under a line operation to the CEO. And I think if you had a company that did two things you would have two senior VPs, one of each thing directly reporting to the CEO.

It strikes me as absurd that we would stuff all of compliance under a legal team who's objectives quite justifiably might be to minimize the risks of being sued (unintelligible) wouldn't be nearly as rigorous as it would be if someone was in charge of compliance as a line function where operational excellence of compliance could be measured objectively for the constitutions that rely on that compliance to the integrity and availability of resolutions and registrations.

So this is not for this meeting perhaps but I wonder if we should think about coming up with a recommendation about restructuring compliance so that it achieves the line priority and focus as opposed to under the staff of the general Council.

Marilyn Cade: We have spoken on this before, the IPC supports this idea as well. When the enforcement and compliance team was removed from an operational side into the general Council and we raised this concern at that time I think it certainly ought to be in our longer term list of things that we're interested in seeing.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, Chris Chaplow from the budget perspective I think we've seen that complication as well because we've had different numbers reported in the budget, both from staffing and cost of compliance and then the compliance director.

So my conclusion, personal conclusion, is the people in the legal department that were booked into compliance and the directed (unintelligible) staff.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, yes, Bill and we have a microphone some place.

Bill Smith: So Bill Smith with PayPal, also on the Whois review team following up on
                  Chris's comment on the budget. The review team requested many months
                  prior to our final report that we get actual information.

                  I've forgotten now for what year. We got it after our - no fault of ICANN I don't
                  believe, they attempted to deliver this information to us, but we got it after we
                  had submitted our final report.

                  And the information that we received was - I was suspicious shall I say based
                  on the information we received, some very strange things, 35% travel
                  overhead, 50% to 70% administrative overhead in certain areas and things
                  like this. And as a budget manager in the past of budgets in the, you know,
                  $5 to $10 million range these become significant numbers.

                  And you - you know, they're red flags basically, which as a review team we
                  chose not to do anything with it but I would suggest someone might want to
                  look at how that money actually is spent.

                  My guess is around 50% of the budget that was - or the actuals reported to
                  us were not directly related to compliance. Also the review team proposed -
                  or certainly we discussed having a very different compliance function
                  independent of the legal team.

                  Right - and so I'm - the review team was very supportive of that. We
                  attempted to clarify that in our final to say this needs to report - you know,
                  independent of the people who are doing contracts. A compliance function is
                  more an audit function, not a - we don't want to be too friendly here.

Marilyn Cade: So what I would say, maybe Steve and Elisa, on this - on that last point in
                  terms of addressing the structure - structural location of compliance and
                  enforcement, we could put that comment into a public comment under who -

on the Whois review team report and still be able to get it on the record now. I think that would probably be a good thing for us to do.

I'm going to take you back to operational excellence for just a minute and when we're going to begin to move on.

So among the other things - before I do that, I invited Akram originally to come and meet with the BC to talk about operational performance because the feeling I had is that externally the organization overall is receiving a lot of expressed concerns from individual governments who are experienced - who are having bad experiences and I'm going to give a couple of examples.

The countries who have concerns about the reallocation of a country code and the interactions around them and communication around it is so fuzzy or unclear that it continues to create misunderstandings.

Now clearly the CCs could raise that question or the GAC can, I'm not suggesting we raise it. But I am suggesting that that in many ways operational execution is also execution about communication.

The communications around the problems that have happened have also added to the risk and threat. The track record of actually fulfilling the delivery of the documents that are - and on the timelines that are required in the affirmation of commitments and establish the BART, there's not an adequate - there's not a satisfactory performance in the timeliness of the delivery of those documents. And that too is an operational issue.

There is an effort to work hard on improving the delivery of documents but I think it - you know, I think it does remain an area where ICANN is still receiving some strong expressed concerns.

I'm kind of feeling like we have a vague feeling that we're not sure that the processes that are in place are up to the demands that are being made on

them. But we can't quite put our finger on what could be done to fix it, whether it's more people, it's different people, it's saying it's going to take automated systems means the solutions are long term.

But I do think there's a very general fear on the part of many of the applicants, in particular the brands, that there are going to be continued failures and disruptions in the process if they go through it.

So what do we say? Remember the point I made to you is do we say ICANN needs to prioritize heavily, identify those things they absolutely must do, and understand that we have concerns about the ability to deal with the - to perform with excellence today with just the workload and demands they have and there needs to be a pause and a reprioritization.

And we may need to move some deadlines out. We're going to need to think about what those deadlines are. Chris and I can look at the budget, maybe it's the outreach in participation initiatives that are not critical to the day-to-day operations.

I'm not sure what I think they are but I do think we can't just give them a vague - we're not sure you're up to it, we need to say specifically and one thing you could do is reprioritize or something else.

Angie Graves: I'm still new so I might be out of line with this but can we invite them - sorry, thank you. Angie Graves for the transcript, thank you. Can we invite them to do a self-examination or an analysis or some kind of search themselves for what that issue might be - the root cause?

Marilyn Cade: Okay, so let me take you back again to - Akram says that they are doing that and that ultimately there will be an analysis and report. I think we can ask whether the - and the place to ask this might be in the - some of the ongoing working groups that take place, the budget or the strap plan or other places that are taking place between now and the public forum.

We can also talk to other constituencies and CCs and see if we think that - the one thing about causing to do that is the automatic - then they have to make an assumption they're going to pause some work.

The thing I think they're unlikely to be open to doing is changing any of the deadlines on the new gTLD program. And today we talked about - and I'll - not doing digital archery. We just heard that there are some potential - further down the line issues about the timing of the introduction.

I think if the BC members feel that we should prioritize telling them they need to understand the root causes first before they go full speed ahead, we can certainly socialize that idea with the other members of the CSG and with some of the other constituencies. I think the registries and registrars, Angie, are unlikely to be sympathetic to their pausing work on the new gTLD program.

Angie Graves: And this is Angie Graves again, that's a risk in and of itself, pausing work. And a lot of times self introspection is difficult. They say it's hard to see the picture when you're inside the frame. So I don't know what the resources might be available for an outside person to perform this kind of analysis but it's a thought, thanks.

Elisa Cooper: Elisa Cooper for the transcript. One thing I think if we're looking for this operational excellence we need to have some measurement and I don't know if we've ever done that.

But it would be very - I think, you know, we have to be careful not to be decisive because we certainly want to be supportive of ICANN but at the same time I think we need to take a measurement of what our satisfaction is as the community with ICANN in terms of the work they're doing to understand, you know, how do we - really where are we at.

And if we're going to have that operational excellence we need to see some improvement, some measurable improvement just to say, yes, we've now reached it.

I mean we don't really know where we're at in terms of level of satisfaction among the constituencies. I mean, look, nobody's really happy but we don't have anything to measure. And I don't know if that's something that we can look at doing or if they've ever done that in the past.

(Bryce Hoffman): This is (Bryce Hoffman) for the transcript. Just a question, do we know - with respect to - for example, communications resources, do we know that if all of the positions are filled, if they have the resources they feel that they need?

I mean I think that's one way we could sort of capture it in a very supportive tone of that. Is that - you know, if there are additional resources needed sort of on the technical side or on the communications side or maybe positions that are in the budget but not yet filled, you know, emphasizing the need to really get those positions filled.

I don't know that's the case. I'm just throwing it out there.

Marilyn Cade: I guess - just a minute before - I heard a couple of things this morning that really resonated with me and that is - and I'm going to use an analogy of someone who once was in sales and marketing and sold products. And I was the account manager and that meant that if the product didn't work or there was a support problem, guess who's problem it was to fix it?

And then I ran a healthcare business unit and so one of the things I did to motivate my product development team was to tell them that once a year I was going to sell one of the products and support it. Terrified me and them. But I think right now we're doing a certain amount of marketing of product but we're not delivering a very good product generally.

And so communications is one problem but I think we've still got a product development problem too. So we can ask the question about, you know, do we have the right communications resources and are we dealing with the communications, that one's probably easier to address in terms of resources. You might turn to John and others.

But I'm not sure communications is our only problem.

Elisa Cooper: And I think that's what (Bryce) was getting at is more that the overall picture - like, our - you know, I love the idea of changing the structure but then within that structure, you know, it's comprehensive. Are all the positions that need to be filled, filled? Do they have the resources? So it's not just from the communications but on the - you know, for the whole organization really.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, once communications are established and a communication flow is established we would have the ability perhaps to examine and identify what the other problems were.

I need to clarify something. When we said communications I thought you meant the people who deal with the media, public relations. Sorry. So I just need to be sure I understand what we're talking about.

Elisa Cooper: Communications with constituencies.

Marilyn Cade: With the media? Okay, all right. Okay, thank you. Gotcha, okay.

Angie Graves: (Unintelligible) I just need to be sure I understand. I think - and maybe I'm speaking only to a portion of the communications that they were talking about but once the door is open - and this is Angie Graves by the way. Once the door is opened then we have the ability to ask further questions after we've established that communications flow and can then discover other things and maybe strategies for dealing with them.

John Berard: Hi, this is John Berard. So I'm really happy to see the diversity that has descended upon this meeting because I think many of us are like the frog in the pot of water that we've been in it for a long time and each year the temperature rises and we don't really see much of a difference.

And then somebody new jumps in and goes - and I appreciate the new people for jumping in because we old frogs may not see exactly the way we ought to.

From a communications perspective, from a professional communications perspective I have sort of - like, I feel like I'm paraphrasing Shakespeare, I have three times offered my support to the team inside ICANN and have been rebuffed.

I just figured it's because they don't have time to manage a wild hair resource that, you know, sort of comes to them out of the blue. But in fact, communications can only mask bad operations for only so long and then you get found out.

So the phrase operational excellence has great resonance but it may be too much - too much of an elevated generality to really distinguish the specific recommendations that we might want to make.

So a persistent concern of the business constituency has been compliance. I have not been in any meetings specifically devoted to compliance yet but the little bits and pieces I have heard suggest that the people who have been in those kinds of meetings, their hair is on fire still, that the water temperature has been turned up another couple of degrees.

And so that might be a point of departure in addition to the new gTLD glitches. And, you know, I - when I was in high school they had us read a book called the Oxbow Incident.

Anybody ever read the Oxbow Incident? It was a deal where a couple of people who shouldn't have been killed got killed and the point was that you can diminish the wrongful murder of people by calling it an incident.

Well, we can diminish the outrageous - you know, misbehavior by calling it a glitch. When I hear glitch it's sarcastic when I hear it because it is taken as part of a stream that we have seen over the last few years, suggest that there is a lack of diligence on the technical - on the part of the technical team.

And so can you take a technical compliant to the ombudsman? You know, maybe that's a place where we can start. You know, I mean structures that exist that we could take advantage of, specific questions that we can ask that actually have measurable outcomes. Anyway, my two cents or four cents.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: I wanted to pick up on John's point. I think being specific is very essential and I also thought there's two opportunities in how we can frame this maybe to get some more attention.

One is we've got a new CEO coming in, I think having a letter or something to the - to him to say, these are things that we think should be in your first 90 day review is a way to create a timely (unintelligible).

I also think in the (unintelligible) our review we looked at the scaling analysis that has been done within ICANN for managing the new gTLD program as well as obviously the security issues.

And I think some work has been done but pushing, again, with some specificity in things that really need to be refined and - you know, and then shared with the community about how are you prepared in some of these key areas. And I think we've identified compliance and security, data security as two of them.

Again, I think just general - I do worry that just general complaining about ICANN or a general saying you should focus on this doesn't get anywhere but, you know, this can help put it on the radar screen of the new CEO would be the best case scenario.

Man: I was going to mention something about this when we do the policy calendar, what the GNSO is going to be looking at in the Council meeting but since we're talking about something related to compliance it may be helpful.

And in the GNSO Council meeting there will be an item on registration abuse policy working groups recommendation that there should be reporting by the compliance team on a uniformity reporting. So there's a report that's being prepared.

I had a look at that report and when you - I don't want to characterize it. I'd like you to look at it if you can. Just the broad outlines of what I could sort out is I couldn't understand what they were trying to get to. It was as if it had been put together very sort of hurriedly, that was my impression. I could be wrong.

Please have a look at it. The reason I mention it is the following, there's an open mic right after and I would encourage those members sitting here who have concerns about compliance to use this as a dovetailing issue to get in there, in the mic in the GNSO Council session, to raise issues about compliance for instance if they can comment because it's on the agenda.

Marilyn Cade: Can I ask you a clarifying question? So we're assuming and counting on, I guess, the compliance staff will be in the - the compliance staff will be in the room?

Man: Yes, there's a presentation by them and so the question will be what does the GNSO Council do with this report? What are its views on this? The Council

will speak and then there will be opportunity for people to come up to the mic and contribute as well.

So it might be an opportunity to, you know, say something that...

Marilyn Cade: Sure, so - in order for the Councilors to speak we need to have viewed the report.

Man: I agree. If you - you could go up and say I'm speaking on my personal behalf. But it's an opportunity that the members have to be able to contribute a discussion, not just in this room but outside of the Council session.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Man: And maybe get public participation in a broader view, yes.

Marilyn Cade: Have we - apologize for not - are we going to review this - we're going to talk about the report itself during the next section, right, right. So that will provide the information that members need. I think it's an excellent idea to tie this together and the enforcement - the compliance team will be in the room. And I'm hoping that (Amy) will be as well, that's a great idea.

I'm going to wrap this - Angie?

Angie Graves: Angie Graves. Last comment, was it not last night I got an email from Marilyn that said that the new CEO is asking for one wish from us? So maybe if we talk to the - I think the ombudsman by the way is the best, that's my personal opinion, best way.

But if we say the same thing lots of different places maybe it will get more play, thanks.

Marilyn Cade: So we're going to need the meeting to move along because we're getting into the policy discussion. Let me just clarify, the new CEO has asked the Chairs to give them one item that we are - we would send - I would send ICANN a thank you card on and one item that is the one thing I want for Christmas and I need some guidance from you guys.

But you don't have to do that right now, keep thinking about - Tero and then we're going to need to move.

Tero Mustala: Okay, Tero Mustala for the record. So I think we started this discussion about possible focusing of ICANN activities and maybe we should end it by focusing our message and I would very much (unintelligible) on looking at how ICANN is measured from outside world.

So how is the outside world measuring ICANN? And I think the very simple answer is how ICANN is running this new gTLD program. That will fill the headlines with the bad news or the good news.

And so maybe we should also focus our proposals - possible improvements on that and there - mainly because of my background in R&D I would agree with Marilyn for once that maybe the R&D approach would be the best and including what Elisa said, that actually we don't need very special measures.

My proposal would be that the measure is no more grade sheets. No more grade sheets. Already running fine and if some delays in schedule are needed, okay, so be it. But let's really do that, right, forget the ambitious schedules. How many hundreds of applications, refinements, or something like that?

Because I don't think anybody dies if that would be delayed? And our message should be that really now - ICANN has many things to do, business as usual for the most part. But this is how the outside world will measure ICANN and ICANN's success.

And so we should concentrate our focus or focus our message at (unintelligible) from BC so that this is the focus area for ICANN to improve. And the measure is (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to take that as a great initial draft because I do think we can deal with the enforcement and compliance in this other way. I think that is the measure right now. If we continue to have glitches ICANN is a failure.

John Berard: John Berard, in light of what Tero said, Akram said this morning that new gTLD applicants have been calling to talk to their account rep. And he said that we're a team of three. We don't have a global sales and marketing team. And essentially they're going to have to come to grips with that.

And I thought, my God, that's another cliff that ICANN is about to fall over into. The expectation that companies that operate in a way everywhere else will be comfortable operating in a different way in Playa Vista. I just don't see that as being a basis for (commity) - comedy but not (commity). So that could be a real problem.

Marilyn Cade: I - let me note that and let's come back to that at the end of - because I think that is something else to talk about and I had that on the agenda in another way, and that is identifying the expectations of the brands are coming, the brands are coming keeps me up at night.

I think we need to go to policy discussions specifically and Steve, I'm going to turn to you and to - make sure you and John and Zahid, and we're going to - I know we're running a little bit late but I think we can pick this up because we talked maybe about a couple things. You've got the mic.

Steve DelBianco: The agenda that - I'm confused about the agendas from time to time here. Great. All right, so the first thing on there though is for Elisa to talk a little bit about Whois. So Chris, if you could go to the Whois slide.

So Elisa Cooper handles on the BC as our sort of lead (unintelligible) on all things related to Whois, particularly based on her expertise at (Mark Monitor). And a lot of folks in the BC work in Whois. Elisa's taken the lead of drafting several recent comments on this so we ask you summarize some of that for us.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Steve. So I kind of wanted to give just a brief overview of where we're at, talk briefly about the comments that were recently submitted. There are currently a few items that are open for comment right now. And I thought also it might make a little sense to just discuss the impact of the RAA negotiations on Whois.

So if you move on the next slide, in terms of recently submitted comments we did submit comments on the Whois Policy Review Team's final report and we broadly endorse those findings for the most part. It's obviously - you know, it was an incredible job that was completed by that team. It represents an incredible amount of work.

I think the concern now is sort of how does all of that get accomplished and something that we need to continue to watch closely.

We also recently submitted comments when VeriSign's renewal for .com was put out for comment. And we supported their renewal of the .com agreements but we did ask for the provision that Thick Whois be added to the agreement. But that did not happen. The Board just recently approved the .com renewal agreement really with no changes.

So, you know, kind of going back to asking for things and not being heard is kind of, you know, an example I would point to where we were not the only ones to ask for that. There were a number of different groups that had asked for the inclusion of Thick Whois.

Chris Chaplow: Do you know of any rationale (unintelligible) for that?

Elisa Cooper: There is a couple of sentences that I saw written. I'm actually not sure where I read it but basically it said that the information was evaluated and reviewed and that was the decision that was made. So I'm not quite sure what that all means.

Marilyn Cade: Let me just speak - okay, a rationale is not just a statement that I received information, I reviewed it, I made a decision. A rationale is I received information, I (unintelligible) things into account, for the following reasons I decided not to follow the advice you gave me. That's rationale kind of, roughly what it is.

                   Okay, well, maybe we ought to put that in our public statement. We need to - maybe we ought to look at one other example of two and explain what we expect in terms - when you provide a rationale it needs to include the following: I received the information, how many piece of it did I get so to speak, how many comments, and then what did you take into account, what didn't you take into account, and why.

Elisa Cooper: I think they maybe lacking on the why because as I recall they said, well, we received - whatever, 40 comments, and, you know, these things were asked for. I think maybe the why is not there. At any rate, definitely - yes?

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco, this discussion came up at the last meeting at ICANN and some of the rationale that showed up at the Council discussion was there are multiple ways to get to a Thick Whois and that one way is to impose it in the contract negotiation and that is what the BC requested.

                   Another way was through policy development process, that it was examine this transition from all these - 800 or 900 registrars to turn that information, push it into a - the Thick Whois under .com.

And it's my understanding because it's not part of the contract renegotiation it will be part of a PDP and work on that can be commented on by Zahid and John.

So I do think at the public forum we ought to express significant disappointment from the BC's perspective that the shortcut, the fact track wasn't used in terms of contract.

But then also express a willingness to work on the PDP as part of the working group if necessary and if our Councilors participate actively, and I hope yourself, so that we can very quickly turn around what should be a slam-dunk PDP so that it becomes policy development that changes the way the registrars interact with VeriSign.

So I hope we can express disappointment but be committed to actually participate in the process and get it done.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, I think that makes a lot of sense. So moving on to the next slide, there are currently a couple of Whois issues that are open for comment. There is current a feasibility setting related to proxy reveal and relay which is out for comment.

The reply period for that closes July 16. We haven't yet discussed whether or not that's something that we want to review and comment on, and that's something that we'll need to do.

Then there are also these draft technical requirement survey which is also out for comment. And again, that also happens to close on July 16. That I'm not sure is something that we would want to comment on.

Marilyn Cade: Depends, I'm trying to understand what it is as it relates to (FA CO 5.1)?

Elisa Cooper: I don't know. It's a technical survey regarding Whois and I'm not exactly sure.

Marilyn Cade: But I think we ought to look at it enough to know what it's about because if it's - and maybe we can do that and then make the decision.

Steve DelBianco: With respect to the first one on there before you move your slide, I was one of the designers of the relay and reveal study.

And this is an opportunity for us to comment on and get moving on a study that really does measure operational excellence, not just of the ICANN organization but the contract parties, that is to say the registrars and privacy and proxy providers to see whether when they're given a properly formed request to reveal or relay information on Whois do the privacy and proxy vendors do it quickly?

Do they do it thoroughly? Or do they drop it on the floor? So the best way the BC can participate will, of course, suggest that the feasibility study might be something that you comment on.

But BC members are needed to participate in the study because the study itself will ask people at companies just like all of you in the room who routinely make Whois requests of a proxy and privacy nature and you have to ask the proxy and privacy vendor to relay and/or reveal the information back to you.

You'll be the ones that will actually make the study work because you'll have to report for a six month period of time, we've tried it, we're getting a two-week average. On the outside case it took six weeks.

There were 14 instances where we got no reply at all. And I think you have a lot of experience with this too of what we'll need to drive participation. We'll need somebody from News Corp who does it all the time.

We have Facebook who's going to participate because companies will volunteer to participate and basically just keep a log for six months about your satisfaction - customer satisfaction with using Whois inquiries on privacy and proxy.

Marilyn Cade: Can I - this is (unintelligible)?

Elisa Cooper: No, this is a feasibility study so this isn't the actual final report.

Marilyn Cade: Well, that's what the feasibility, that's...

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, there's - how many of you have read that study, that report? Okay, I think maybe what we might do is I'll take a few minutes to - I read it. I'll take a few minutes to - there's - and I'll find (Lyman) and spend a few minutes with him, he is here.

The feasibility study that was done was done because they couldn't fully determine how to do a study. So then they did the feasibility study and there's some really interesting findings in it about whether or not it's going to be - so the information will not be statistical if they go ahead and do a study.

But let me try to find (Lyman) and I think one thing that might be helpful is even if we could get him to agree to do a conference call with us because it's really interesting information. And maybe the easiest thing to do would be to get (Lyman) to agree to do a conference call with us about the report and then quickly try to make up our minds about the comment.

Elisa Cooper: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So I'll just introduce you to (Lyman) and we could pursue that and then anyone who's interested in it can hear from the guy who did the study - his team did the study.

Elisa Cooper: Okay. All right, if we can just move to the last slide, in my opinion of the work that's going on, what has the greatest possibility of having an actual near-term impact are the changes to the RAA, the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, which is currently being negotiated between the registrars in ICANN with the input from law enforcement.

And so this agreement is currently being negotiated and in principle there are a number of things that have been agreed.

So it has been agreed in principle that there will be cross-field validation, that means if you are in the United States that your postal code is entered and has five digits, that means if you are - you know, in Canada your country code for your phone number is one that would match.

It's also been agreed in principle that there will be some data verification either by phone or email or both, that will occur after registration. And that the registrars will only use - if proxy and privacy services do become accredited in the future that they will only use those providers which are accredited.

Now it doesn't - the changes to the agreement don't say - and don't necessarily include what the provision for the accreditation for the process or privacy service providers would be. So - I mean it's definitely kind of a gap. But it does say that if they do have that accreditation that the registrars will only use those proxy and privacy service providers.

The other thing that has been discussed heavily is the fact that - and this kind of data verification would not occur in the case (unintelligible) proxy and privacy service. All that said, this does have the potential impact to improve, in my opinion, Whois data quality.

I do think if it's a criminal that they will continue to - you know, they will commit fraud, they will obscure the data, that they will steal identities. There's no doubt about that these are criminals. But in the case where you're just trying to get accurate information this, I think, has the potential for improving that.

So that in a nutshell is where we're at with Whois.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Elisa. And Chris, if you put up the Wednesday slide on Council agenda and the first item up there are motions on Whois access, motions on International Registration Data.

So Zahid Jamil and John Berard sitting here at the end of the table are our elected Councilors to GNSO Council and they're going to talk us through both the motions and the reports. And we'll try to also talk about the discussion.

This is for the Council meeting which will occur from 2:00 to 6:00 pm tomorrow, Wednesday, in one of the Congress meeting rooms downstairs. And the Council sits up front for those of you who have never been there. But on each of these topics there's opportunities to go to the microphone for public comment.

So a lot of us from the BC will sit in the audience and interact with our Councilors via email or Skype while they're up there looking for ways of working with each other. We'll coordinate going to the microphone and make key points. And they will do some voting tomorrow.

And then Zahid and John will walk us through what's on the agenda and what the current BC stand is.

John Berard: So the Whois motion seeks to - think of it is grout in a bathroom, tile bathroom. The tiles are the larger initiatives that are ongoing related to

Whois, things that Elisa was just talking about plus the negotiations with the RAA. And there is an assumption that when all those other things are knitted together they will cover what we seek to cover in this Whois access motion.

And it's possible that Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, who made this motion, may withdraw it before it gets to the floor. We seconded it because two years ago we made a commitment to create - generate as much data about Whois as we could because we felt that was one of the ways we could break through the logjam of decision making on Whois.

If it moves forward think of it as a belt on a pair of pants that already has suspenders, all right. I mean we are trying to continue to create a matrix of initiatives that will lead to three or four specific things.

One is accurate information in Whois. The other is accessible information in Whois. And the third, of course, the big one with the RAA is that it all be verifiable.

So I think that if it comes to a vote tomorrow we certainly will be foursquare behind it, after all we seconded it. If it doesn't come to a vote we may, I don't know, bang our fist on the table for the theatrics of it but understand that the elements in this motion are in fact covered by ongoing activities that have not yet been resolved.

And so we're just trying to - as I say, put a belt on a pair of pants that already has a pair of suspenders on. I know it sounds like a pretty explicit description.

Zahid Jamil: Very graphic, absolutely. There's a second motion, this motion is already seconded by BC, John seconded the first one. I seconded the second one.

It's safe to say that it's, again - you heard the presentation by the SSAC with respect to internationalization - international registration of domain name data.

And this recommendation basically takes the report that Patrick was mentioning earlier today and what it does, it basically sends it up to the Board and says that the GNSO will continue to review the report and provide its feedback.

So it doesn't really do much, all it does is takes the report and says, we're sending it to the Board so that they have communication of the report. The reason being the SSAC has sent it.

The GNSO has not sent it and GNSO SSAC were working together on this report. So by way - you know, to have consistent logistics, both these should report out to the Board to let them know the report has come out.

But in the meantime GNSO reserves the right to look into it to review the report to provide some sort of feedback. Basically just recapping, the issue was what about registration data which is being handled by ccTLDs for instance.

What about the fact that that registration data is in different languages? What about the fact that that data could be in transliterated forms? And should there be a consistent mechanism in which that data is handled and kept so that people have consistency when they are able to access that data? So that was the purpose of that.

The BC's going to be seconding that motion. We don't see any problems of that going through. We haven't heard of any opposition and that motion should go through, that is the second motion.

So the next item is a set of reports. This is a report - the registrar abuse policy working group, in one of it's recommendations it said that it's important that contractual compliance basically provides reports to the GNSO on uniformity of how it reports out.

And so the compliance report is providing a report, that report is available. You can click on it and have a look. This is the one I was mentioning earlier. It's interesting because it's fairly short and if you try to make sense of what they want to do in the short, medium, and long term it's very, very basic.

The greatest amount of complaints they say in that report, they've been receiving after the Whois inaccuracy, 55%, that's interesting. And consumer services only 27%, which (unintelligible).

But the aspect - the purpose of the report was to sort of give guidance to the community as to what are the changes that are being made by the contractual compliance department and how are they going to be - sort of what is the forward looking plan.

When you read it - my take on it was that it was - it seemed like it had been put together pretty quickly, doesn't have too much depth in it, doesn't explain many of the aspects that it mentioned. So I encourage you to have a look at it.

As I said, apart from the fact that you can comment on the report in the open mic session or right after this issued is discussed by the GNSO tomorrow you can also probably bring up other issues related to contractual compliance, a staff member from contractual compliance will be in the room apparently to make a presentation. We don't have a name yet though.

Steve DelBianco: Zahid, so I wanted to ask a quick question about that. The discussion for Council will be what steps if any to take with this report. Sorry, I wanted to ask you about what are the range of possibilities, especially for newcomers here, what is it that Council can do with this report that will be discussed tomorrow?

Zahid Jamil: So with the report that is being provided there are a couple of things. I mean if you wanted to go towards a policy development process because you saw something that needs to get done that comes out of the report you could first - the first step is to ask for an issues report on a specific issue.

The thing is when you look at that report it tends to be very operational. You don't see many policy aspects and - because as I said, it's very (unintelligible) on those issues. So the GNSO Council will try to have a look at what it can do. And as I said, it just doesn't really read very well.

Steve DelBianco: And this report is coming from the compliance department.

Zahid Jamil: Directly from...

Steve DelBianco: And they should be in the room and earlier we reiterated that the BC has had consistent complaints - sorry, complaints, concerns about the compliance department's ability to categorize, report, and follow up on complaints and compliance matters.

They actually still don't have a database or even an Excel sheet. They literally log the complaints that come in as emails and track them in the folder of emails. So it's not even possible to do database analysis.

The compliance staff understand that's not state of the art and they're just moving at a very deliberate pace at figuring out what kind of a package to buy, whether to build or buy, or to preclude a vendor.

But a lot of us in the BC have expressed impatience that the process has taken a little longer than it should for what we argued earlier was one of ICANN's two core functions; contract compliance and policy development, that's the key (unintelligible).

Anything else on that?

Marilyn Cade: I have a question. Could I ask you guys - the two Councilors and Elisa and you maybe to talk to the IPC and the ISP Councilors on the following question?

We've all been very tolerant that these 65-page PowerPoint presentations from the compliance director that lay out the long term plan.

I just want to check - I could be wrong but I was under the impression that you could do an Excel spreadsheet in a fairly quick period of time while you went ahead in parallel - in parallel did your analysis of your longer term database, etc., etc.

I could be wrong but is it really - is it possible we should be saying, look, you know, you really need to have a short term tool. This is an example to me of the things that might need to be reprioritized.

Do they need a short-term tool? Because it may take them so long to get their complex system, which we need, in place.

Steve DelBianco: All right, the other two items under reports we pretty much covered, right. We discussed this Whois study of relay and reveal and - Elisa talked about the RAA negotiations.

I did want to say at the microphone tomorrow - if there looks as if there's any doubt about the willingness of corporations to participate in this relay and reveal study you can't know how valuable it is if we got - we got AT&T or Verizon or New Corp or Facebook, somebody to go up to that mic and say, I need to run it by the rest of the folks at my company but I'm here to say that Verizon is interested in participating in your study.

Put together the study together, companies, customers of this (unintelligible) will participate. Some sign to show that companies do want to participate in the study so that we get ICANN to move to the next step, so helpful.

Next up are four items for discussion that John and Zahid wanted to cover. So for discussion means that there will be a General Council discussion, the Councilors themselves are the ones to talk about it and do you believe that - is public comment going to be allowed at each one of these discussion topics tomorrow?

John Berard: Based on the way Stephane ran the last meeting in Costa Rica I would expect yes, that there will be Q&A at each point.

Sure, the first one has been - (unintelligible) for the first three days of this conference which is what's the organizational effect on ICANN of the introduction to new gTLDs. I didn't attend but did anybody go to the (End Tag) meeting today?

Marilyn Cade: There were - I know (unintelligible) was there and (Amy) was there.

John Berard: I was just curious if there someone in the room who could give us a view of that.

Marilyn Cade: She's here but she's not in the room right at the moment.

John Berard: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: We (unintelligible).

John Berard: But the new top-level applicant group, is that what the (unintelligible) stands for? I - imperceptible, I guess that's pretty good. They probably have an imperceptible acronym machine that they used.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

John Berard: Do they? Anyway, the - it has come up at every conversation. It came up with the conversation the Council had with the Board. It's come up with the conversation that the CSG had with the Board.

It's come up with the conversation at the GNSO Council had with the ccNSO Council and it is a subject I think that is on the minds of many of the people in this room because of the mantra that Marilyn has been using which is - you know, here come the brands, the brands are coming.

So we all know that the organization will change. We're not really quite sure how the business constituency has been - as an entity holding conversations at least at a leadership level, maybe even deeper with regard to just how it might be effected by the expansion of interested parties and ICANN.

Marilyn, I don't know if you want to say anything about that but I really don't have much more to say other than watch this space.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to mention to all of you that the - I guess I'm really interested in what else the Councilors would say about this beyond what has been said and - as it's being said throughout the day as the Board meets with the various groups. Because they're asking that question of the various groups as well.

So I'm wondering if the focus of the Council should really be pointed specifically at what does this mean for policy development since the broader restructuring - structuring questions, I think of ICANN antitrust concerns or any other kind of questions, as it being - definitely being teed up and was the focus of a question that every group was asked by the Board.

But understanding maybe the - two question. One is should the focus be on policy primarily? Two, what is the role of the Council in dealing with the

implementation challenges of applicants versus - and the reason I'm asking that question is the Council's about making gTLD policy.

Now some things do come back to the Council because they're implementation issues. But I'm really trying to understand, you know, what are we burdening the Council with and what part of this work definitely belongs at the Council? Some of it does but I'm also wondering - I don't think application glitches belong at the Council.

And what I was hearing a fair amount of on Saturday and Sunday is one of the registry representatives who's company is a - has applied - is a backend provider for maybe 300 applicants - top level domains, was speaking from that position of information.

And while it's very interesting it seemed to me that it was perhaps taking the time away from the gTLD work - the current gTLD work.

Well, I'm not trying - I'm just thinking, there needs to be something value-added about the discussion at the Council versus the larger discussion that's going on more broadly.

Zahid Jamil: Just another point here was discussed over the weekend in the Council, there is a review of the GNSO - which means the structure that is supposed to come on before the Council or just generally the GNSO.

And what the discussion was that maybe it's too early considering the fact that there's so much - this is a suggestion put forward by a registry representative, that maybe we shouldn't have the review next year.

Instead, we should wait until we have more data as to what this whole new world looks like and then maybe conduct a review. I thought that would be helpful for members to know that that had - the reviews (unintelligible) push,

you know, ahead in time and what would be the views of members about something like that.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, I was just (unintelligible) this morning with the Board on this already by some of the conversations we've had. And do we need to talk more about that, do you think? Because I kind of think the position we took with the Board already had the support of the members.

It might be useful to think about there could be two approaches to this. What I heard this morning was there wasn't a good understanding of what the review actually is. And I think that was very helpful for all of us.

There's a certain amount of kick the box, that is we were required as consistencies and SGs to do certain things and I think somebody who might be familiar with the GNSO restructuring in the back of the room, one of our former Board members, welcome.

One of the criteria was you need to do certain things. You need a website and you need - you know, active email list and a variety of other things like that, there's much more to that.

That assessment...

John Berard: I was pleased to hear what (Ray) said at the Board meeting because over the weekend Wolf who led our work on the structural improvements committee presented a more extensive look at those matters when really what (Ray) said this morning was that we don't - all we're looking for you to do is to count not determine the value, you know, what that count might mean.

So do you have the website, have you done this, have you done that? And so that kind of approach will take a lot of the pressure off the need to even delay the structural improvements committee's work. So I don't see it nearly as a burdensome as it was presented or thought to be over the weekend.

The - the reason I think that will the GNSO - what could the GNSO look like after the dust settles with the new gTLD program is so top of mind is because each of the counselors are going to be affected, each of their constituencies will be affected.

And so it is - it's much more a personal matter than it is an organizational matter and that drives it to the top of the agenda. I just think that's human nature.

Marilyn Cade: (Mike), tell me if this is the - the view of the BC is administrative checking, accounting and checking is okay and ICANN staff should be able to help do that doing anything of more substance in terms of use which takes time is not a good idea and possibly should be...

(Mike): But what it calls for.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, right, right and then the whole question of if there were restructuring we would be reassured by the Board that that will be undertaken in a different way and it's not - that's not really part of what we did.

(Mike): Right.

Man: All right, thank you, next item up is stake renewal notices and what if any next steps of the council will take on the policy development work there? Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Right, it's in - it's in -- I mentioned this anything helpful for people to have a look at this report. It's sort of the survey they did came up with some interesting statistics that said that -- and just by way of explanation the report is when you get an email saying that this is a domain name would you like to renew it or would you like to register, then it's really not -- you have no relationship with that as a solicitation, sometimes that could be completely fake.

And that was the issue that was brought up, some people thought it was coming more so from China or other places. The report basically when the data survey interestingly enough came up and said that 47% said that this wasn't a significant burden while 5% said it was an extremely significantly and 37% said significant.

So something like 53% saw our significance in - in the kind of burden they were having to bear because of this. It was interesting also to figure out who was responsible for this and there was some -- what I saw as conflicting figures.

For instance, it said is this coming from an entity that is connected to ICANN? And the response was no, zero percent, nobody said an entity connected to ICANN were sending these fake renewal notices or had any connection to ICANN.

But 37% said that its registrars were involved, so transfer sort of reconcile sort of two aspects. In any case it sort of says that in the responses 79% of these sort of notices were coming from the U.S. and it would - although it was odd because most everybody thought it was from China.

But we didn't really see that sort of statistics. What's useful to know here is that the - there were different options suggested by -- in the document. The first one was, there needs to be registrar accreditation agreement can actually address this aspect through business practices by inclusion in the RA about how registrars should deal with this sort of situations.

The second one that maybe this could be exerted into the IRTP PDP's and the third is that it could be, you know, included as an issue in the upcoming PDP RA's or in the Whois PDP's or maybe you can just initiate a specific PDP just on the issue of fake renewal notices.

A lot of people didn't support that one. Some said that maybe you should have the ALAC just do better awareness, since it's an awareness issue. And give the ALAC the - the responsibility to do that.

And the last I found interesting was the raise the issue with the FDC in the U.S. to see the registrars in compliance with relevant law because a lot of it was coming from the U.S. and maybe the FDC could look into this issue.

Anyway this aspect is going to be discussed in the Council. There will be discussion - the council will have to decide what to d with this report. Do we proceed to a PDP? Where do we - which PDP should this be included or should that be a PDP on its own? And there will be an opportunity to speak at the mic if people are interested in this, thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Can I just ask a question quickly? The ALAC is not responsible for consumer awareness and education. So if - if somebody - if this needs to be dealt with through consumer awareness and communication, that's an ICANN responsibility not an ALAC responsibility, would be one point higher than ALAC.

I was just kind of curious and I prefer not to give the budget from ICANN to the ALAC to be responsible for consumer awareness and education.

John Berard: So -- this is John Berard again -- you know, I have a handful of domain names registered at Go-Daddy I don't know if anybody else has domain registered at Go-Daddy. And I have them on an automatic renewal.

And I still get a fake renewal notice from my legitimate registrar at least once a month reminding me, you know, suggesting that I need to extend or enhance, so I - I took advantage of being at an ICANN meeting and spoke to my Go-Daddy rep and I said, "Please, stop the madness."

Because a lot of fake renewal notice noise comes from the over zealous marketing that registrars engage in and it's, you know, so it's not coming from some criminal in the Ukraine.

But really from the people you are already paying money to so if they just clean that up a little bit, it will go a long way. Now there -- I mentioned the structural improvements committee, there are two bits of activity that they are into that I think are pretty interesting from the council's perspective.

The first one is a policy development process the iniquitous PDP that you hear about can take between 18 months and three years to authorize to - to - to come to any conclusion.

And circumstances can change over that longer period of time and it's become a subject of some conversation that what do you do when you're looking them down the barrel of a PDP that was designed for a time before the one that you're in?

And so we're contemplating some new rules governing voting requirements for terminating a PDP. So we often talk about getting PDP started. We are now actually talking about terminating them if they have out lived their use on this before they have even become useful.

Now the other thing is that there is a - a professional courtesy at the Council that any constituency can request that a motion be deferred for a meeting. And historically, that has been a little used device when a constituency is confronted with a resolution that it has not yet had the opportunity to socialize among it's membership.

So the thinking was that that had become a bit more of a - a weapon then a courtesy. And so the Council is considering moving to formal voting requirements for deferring motions. So those are two technical points that will

have an affect on getting things through the Council once they come to pass in the future.

Angie Graves: Angie Graves, with (Ron) and I am actually two members of the BC and worked through these discussions. And although we don't have hard and fast determinations at this point if anybody has any thoughts or comments about it, they're certainly welcome as we continue our communications on them, thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, I was just going to say Angie, Angie we need to get you and (Ron) more formal guidance so we're going to come back when we just get the questions back from the -- after the discussion -- get the questions back from the - from the SOI folks to the members but for the follow-up.

Bill Smith: So Bill Smith with PayPal, to unload fake renewal notices I think I've mentioned this before somewhere within the - within the ICANN ecosystem. It seems to me that there are - there two places, two main categories of places with these fake renewal notices come from.

One would be from within ICANN registrars the other is outside of ICANN. If they're inside of ICANN, we should already have policies in place or in agreements or whatever to prevent this from happening or deal with it in some acceptable manner that the community agrees to.

So I don't understand why we're having the, you know, a big discussion about what - how this happens. And if it's outside of ICANN, there's absolutely nothing we can do, right.

We have no -- we can - we can invent all the policy we want around this and no one will pay attention. So to me this - this is a - an example an awful lot of effort it seems a discussion around something that should be addressed pretty easily either by a contract amendment to preclude registrars from doing this.

And otherwise it's going to be a matter for law enforcement whether in the U.S. its FTC or, you know, Federal Competition elsewhere or whatever. Thank you.

Zahid Jamil: On that point I'd even categorize it at three different levels. One is, it's within as you currently define the ICANN space which is registrars who have a direct contract with ICANN and what would they do about it and so you need contractual updates of amendments or a PDP one or the two which - which takes longer.

And the - the other is that they are resellers and one of the talks within the report was that resellers could be, you know, you could put in a contractual obligation of registrars but what do the contracts they have with resellers downstream, they try and control that.

But you're absolutely right, if it's somebody else out there who has no official or relationship that we keep in track or not, that's - there's nothing anybody can do that's through law enforcement.

Steve DelBianco: Zahid, would you cover the election topic?

Zahid Jamil: Yes before I get to the election topic let me just say a little bit about the deferral issue for members who want information. Those who of you were in Costa Rico participated in the GNSO Council call of Costa Rico you would remember that there was a huge bang up and that's the only way I can call it between the non-commercials and others meeting the CSG etc on certain issues.

And there was an emergency resolution that was brought to the Council to vote on and the NCSG used that -- the opportunity to do a deferral saying that we would like to defer to try this, you know, just run out of time to make it practically useless to even have a subsequent vote on that issue; that

became the problem that this SIC deferral issue was trying to deal with now just so you know when you do read it and we'll obviously have to come up with our own guidance etc, etc.

On the Council leadership time is sort of coming close and there will be discussion on the Council as to who will be the next chairman or chair of the GNSO Council?

That will be discussed in the Council though, we should within our constituency and also in the NCSG consider, you know, who do we put forward as candidates from our part of the house and be the Vice Chair or Chair and start organizing ourselves in that respect.

We have found at times sometimes, you know, we're running out of time and haven't had time to actually organize ourselves. So we have - we should really take you know time to try and organize that.

Now currently the Chair of the GNSO Council is Stephane. His term is limited. He can't be re-elected so he will have to be somebody else. It's seems to me from - from discussions that Jeff is - is maybe interested in actually putting in.

Jeff is a new star registry to put himself forth as one of the candidates and we may want to think about it. Do we want to support that or do we have our own candidate from the - from our part of the house?

And if we were to put someone forth from our part of the house, we would need to have some sort of consensus agreement or an election processing validating with the other side of our house as the non-commercials.

And there have been challenges in doing some of that previously so I thought I bring it to the table, that's pretty much it Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Zahid. Any questions on Council? Great, let me move to the next topic which is a list of the public forum topics which will be on the agenda for the Board discussion on Thursday afternoon.

Now Marilyn I know that you suggested we could have Jeff Moss intervene now and do his presentation, but your in the obstructed view seats. I can't tell if he's here.

Great, I can quickly run through the public forum topics then. Yes, it's only about 30 seconds. What the public forums are about for those who haven't seen it yet is an opportunity where the audience in a very large room queue's up on the microphone on specific topics that have been approved by the Board and all other businesses of course.

So I put down six of the topics here and these were collected by the Board soliciting input of the community. And on each of these topics the BC has various degrees of positions and statements made over the past.

The key is to contextual the prior positions to what is really relevant to today's topic. And there will be many people at the microphone giving comments but the Board much prefers to hear questions, questions that are directed to a particular member of the Board or Board Subcommittee.

Each speaker's given only two minutes to speak and they put a big clock up there and you and see from the structure of the comment they allocate them 20 to 30 minutes for each one.

No surprise, the new gTLD topic will be a real catch all at the end of the day. But the BC is going to have an organizational meeting tomorrow. We'll send another email to each of you to let you know it will be a quick 30-minute meeting where we walk through and solidify what we'll say at the mic on behalf of the BC.

But all are welcome to go to the mic and speak on your personal behalf or for your company, on any of these topics and we encourage you to do so. That's it for the policy agenda.

So Marilyn let's turn things over to Patrick Jones, Jeff Brueggeman and then Jeff Moss will join.

Jeff Brueggeman: The Jeff Moss's not here.

Marilyn Cade: Would you go ahead?

Jeff Brueggeman: Yes, I'll just start and then when Jeff's here you guys can take over. We worked on this SSR review for so long that I feel like I've given the summary multiple times to the group, so I'm not going to start over. And (Martin Hannigan)'s here from (Orkney) who was also on the team.

Let me just conclude with some high-level thoughts about what we found based on the public comments and then the final draft of the report that we issued last week.

So that has now been submitted to the Board at least informally. I would say we got generally very supportive comments on the draft reports of the final versions did not change much.

The BC comments as with the earlier were extremely valuable and the most substance that we received and a couple of points I think it helps us to set some of the priorities sustainably from where ICANN should focus.

And it also I think reiterated a point that we clarified in the final report that when we are given direction to ICANN that didn't need a top-down approach but we did want to try to be specific about what we thought the ICANN Board and Staff could assume responsibility for in enabling what may end up being community process.

So we tried to walk that down so not just wanting to say that this is something that all of ICANN needs to work on but try to give specific guidance to what ICANN as an organization can help to promote.

So a couple of thoughts on the final report. I think one, you know, we tried to make sure that our approach was a balanced approach that both didn't set up ICANN for failure, so we wanted things that were implementable but also didn't want to just have a laundry list of 20 new things that ICANN should be doing.

And again the BC comments pointed out there are budget constraints for our resources and so prioritization was one of our themes in the report. So we tried to have this be a constructive walking that line between those - those two extremes.

I think we ended up getting a lot of support for some of the process improvements that will improve transparency on - on the budget. And on the operation of some of the security function.

And I think we consulted with the staff along the way to have these really, you know, we really did want this to be something that could be implemented. And I actually think we've seen even in the latest SSR framework a lot of the things that we've been discussing for the past 18 months are already being incorporated into the process.

To flag a few things that we would say would be the near-term priority looking ahead. One is, the risk management report and process of the Board working group led by Bill Graham is currently working on.

We acknowledged that that was pending but we flagged that as an area where we think that's something that needs to be a continuing area to focus on. I think there's a pull up meeting on that on Thursday.

I think as I said we've seen already the incorporation into the SSR framework of some of our recommendations. We're really like how that is structured in terms of ICANN's levels of responsibility building out from operations to areas where coordinates and then out to engagement.

I think the planning and the budget process is something where we thought some work for clarity would be helpful and that's probably, you know, a general theme.

Some focus on compliance, planning for the new gTLD programming is scaling impact that that's going to have. So all of these things that a lot of which we've been talking about today I think we - were identified in the report.

The - the one thing that we did get some questions about was well what about these, you know, issues that happened with the application process? And we didn't want to react quickly to something that is still being analyzed, so we felt like fit into our broader recommendation of operational focus on security as well as really looking at the scale in requirements of the - of the domain.

You know, I think just as Jeff Moss said the last term he would - he met with us in Costa Rica, ICANN recognizes that there are managing a lot long and formation a lot of money, a lot of, you know, potentially sensitive information.

And so that's going to raise security challenges and I think the security staff is well aware of that. We had a meeting with the GAC on Sunday about the final report and I think we had that engagement and questions from them, didn't get any pushback or challenge in terms of where things were headed.

So I think we feel like the, you know, the overall the reaction has been very positive to the report. So just to be clear there is an open comment on the final version of the report now.

And that is not comments to us or the review has done. The report has been submitted, those are really comments to the Board. So any comments about implementation, about what business would like to see in terms of how to follow through on the report, this is the opportunity you need to, you know, to have your say on that.

You know, one of the things that we recommended generally was that there be a dashboard for the SSR framework to help the community see how the SSR framework is being implemented.

And I think those are the types of things that are also helpful for the review team process as well. So whether it's substance of a process the comments to the Board can be a helpful - helpful thing.

And then, you know, one last thing I wanted to mention and then see if (Martin) has anything to add in, is, you know, we also talked about something that came up in our discussions.

Perhaps having a review of the reviews but now that we've gone through the first level of agency reviews before the next round launches off I think we all feel like we've learned some hard lessons.

But also maybe some, you know, some good areas that we can - we might be worth discussing and sharing before the next round of review teams go through.

And I think in our case one thing that we talked about yesterday was the fact that the staff really had to do a lot of work to - to take some sensitive information and get it us in a way that we could put into a report.

So we dealt with confidentiality as a big issue in ours. I think those types of practices are going to continue to be ongoing issue. (Martin) you have anything?

Marilyn Cade: One question, do you happen to have top of mind when the comments are due?

(Martin Hannigan):   We can look them up quickly.

Jeff Brueggeman: And also, I guess the FY'13 SSR framework comments are also open right now as well. So...

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to do one quick thing and invite Jeff and Patrick to come up here and join us at the table, while I'm doing one thing that I can just simultaneously while you come up here.

So here's what I would like to say, long ago in 40A there was no such thing as review team and the review team process was a established as a result of the affirmation of commitments and there are before review teams established.

They have all -- the first one the ATRT is in the process of substance of implementation not everything is done, there's a session on that as well and I hope people will go to that.

But the representatives to the review team are appointees of the stakeholder groups and we have been very fortunate in the BC. On the Whois review team we had one official BC representative Susan Kawaguchi and then two independent experts we chosen. And that was Lynn Goodendorf and Bill Smith.

So we had a terrific amount of person power dedicated to that, we've had Jeff Brueggeman appointed by the CSG to represent the interest of the CSG and

(Martin Hannigan) is practically acted like -- and we're very pleased to him to come join us.

But it's been a terrific amount of work for that, I know how much work it is because I know how hard it is for me to find Jeff on the phone sometimes. So I'd like you to join me in thanking with a round of applause the review team folks that are here from the SSR because they have done a terrific amount of work on our behalf and we plan to give them more.

Let me turn now to introducing a team that is becoming very familiar to the meetings that the business constituency and they're so familiar that I automatically think about including them on every agenda that we have meetings.

Jeff Moss as some of you know had a -- had a very interesting background and is presently Chief Security Officer for - for ICANN. He's joined today by Patrick Jones who has been a - an ICANN staff person working in a variety of spaces before he joined the security team.

And is a long standing go to guy for us as the BC when we have specific questions and other issues. I just want to say that's it's been such a pleasure to have the opportunity to work with you too and to have the -- we owe -- I owe Jeff one more thing which is I promised him a larger business discussion in Washington on the framework.

So I just need to make the commitment when we do that we'll do it in a room that has conference call access so any of the BC members who are not in Washington can come. Let me turn this over to the two of you now.

Patrick Jones: Well, first off I wanted to thank, yes, Jeff and (Martin) for the tremendous amount of work that they did with the SSR review team and with the report. The business constituency really reflected some of the key drivers of that

group and it was - and we were really lucky to have such good people to work with. So I want to start with that.

This really continues the dialogue that we've had since I think the San Francisco meeting. Definitely at each ICANN meeting but, you know, we've been listening over time to make sure that security team reaches out to the greater business community and that includes those businesses that are key to the internet that don't always come to ICANN meeting or start coming to ICANN meetings now.

Either because of their interest in the top-level domains or in just the changing of the landscape of things that have been occurring. So one of the things that we've done over time is posted in annual framework.

We have currently out for public comment are FY'13 SSR framework. I really don't want to talk about that and then Jeff and I want to use this as an opportunity to engage in dialogue to ask questions - to get questions from this group about the draft statement on ICANN's role on SSR.

Yes, and that's really based on Recommendations 1 and now it's 4 used -- that original draft was Recommendation 3 of the SSR team report. And we want this to be the start of a longer dialogue that really gets to the foundational questions for ICANN and what it's role is and is not in securities, stability and resiliency.

We spoke with the ccNSO earlier today. This is going to take some time and what the review team did was sort of provide us some direction that we needed to have a clear and enduring statement sort of higher level.

And we recognized that - that's not something that staff we can't really drive that but we can initiate the conversation, so right now this is sort of what the beginning of that conversation.

This is a document that that will comment now through the 16th of July. We really posted that on the 17th of May, already run through 30 days and continues through this week. We have more time tomorrow, there's a security team session from 8:00 to 9:00 in the morning.

But from the conversations we've had that that time and opportunity to comment on that document is going to continue much further than July 16. So I want to turn it over to Jeff as well.

Jeff Moss: You know, some of the - the questions I'm really happy with the way - the review turned out with all 28 recommendations. This is really giving me something to work with like Patrick mentioned we can't just go and implement things.

We need to know the sense of the community and what really crystallized it for me was back when the threat against the route from anonymous, some of us might have heard about, really focus my attention on well what are my roles and responsibilities? What are my authorities?

And when you start looking at some of the things I find that maybe we've got responsibility with no authority, maybe there's an expectation that ICANN as the coordinator of the global GNS system but what does that mean to coordinate?

Does that mean if there's an announced attack against all the routes everybody -- to some governments that means, "Oh, it's ICANN we'll pick up the phone and call them." So the route operators doesn't mean anything sometimes.

So it's hard to explain to outsiders who don't know the community, what does it mean to be the global coordinator? And so that's -- some of these questions go to that, so what I'm hoping to do is have a very high-level conversation

about at the highest level what does it mean? And then from there we work down.

So I think that's why the first question about defining a clear statement that everybody can agree on and from there all other things will start to flow for us. So that's what I'm hoping to get out of it.

Marilyn Cade: So I'm going to make a kind of a broad sweeping statement right now that I think it's - generally Jeff I think -- this is Marilyn speaking -- is very much on my mind, the question of what is ICANN's role and how does it do it?

Jeff Moss: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Who does it do it with? And - and how does it enable others to play their role effectively? Is really on my mind a lot right now because of the amount of time and work I'm doing in the internet governance areas and the discussions about increasing the role of the ITU in certain areas.

One of the proposals that's in -- very active at the ITU and includes study group work and the T-sector as well as the proposal over a couple of governments that the ITU's and that the proposal went directly into the UN as well proposing that there needs to be some kind of global governance in the Cyber Security area and that the ITU ought to do it.

The - the thing that I look at when I meet with developing countries which I do a couple times a year very actively in Washington in a training course on Cyber Security is that demand -- if I can call it that -- that meets the need for information and somebody to call coaching, mentoring, training.

And how to deal with ads, how to deal with attacks, how to plan in a country that is increasingly wireless in its communication? And where increasing numbers of users are coming online but there's not a strong base of knowledge within the government, within the - the industry.

So we're getting, you know, we're seeing the spread of the internet, that's good; the spread of commerce, that's good; and the increasing dependency on the - the elements that ICANN is responsible for.

So I'd like to talk as well about -- besides the stuff that we're directly responsible for or we're coordinating or we're influencing, what sort of responsibilities are there education and awareness?

Patrick Jones: Yes, one of the things that we've done with this draft statement is to look back not only at the By-laws and the affirmation of commitments but we went back to foundational documents such as the green paper, the white paper and tried to pull out, you know, if we're supposed to come up with what it means to coordinate, we ought to look back at the original documents that go into the heart of ICANN and say, "Well, maybe there's something, you know, in the history of the organization to help explain what it means to coordinate."

What it means for ICANN technical mission. We're often told that ICANN has a limited role and a limited technical mission but it seems as if there's some either not a common understanding of what that means.

And this is an effort we thanked the review team for putting - posing the question and we that developed draft of what we think the technical mission means.

This is now where we really need the community feedback to say, "Well, that either looks right or you've missed something." We've already received some feedback particularly from the ISP community who have suggested that while on the one hand the statement may look at ICANN from a corporation or an organization aspect.

It may not look at what the roles and responsibilities for ICANN the community are in security and stability and you've heard from (Alise) this

afternoon from the ccNSO community where they think the emphasis should be.

But now it's really the opportunity for the business community either if you're not a single entity if you represent other stakeholders who aren't here and you as part of a larger umbrella organization tell them that there is -- now is the time to provide some feedback to ICANN.

And this helps not just us from a staff perspective but I do think that this helps community understand especially with events coming up later in the year and having a clear understanding of what ICANN's role is may help strengthen the multi-stakeholder model.

Jeff Moss: Well, I would like to talk but I would like to hear from those that are here, but and that's fine, but asking questions would be a good thing.

Marilyn Cade: Well, can I ask -- I will ask a question. I used to know a lot of the views of the cc because I did spend a lot of time with them. I'm -- I wouldn't say I'm that current but at one point the cc's done a huge amount of training themselves.

And sort of self-capacity building -- they still do a tech day I think and various other things. But that doesn't mean that it's reaching ISP's and developing countries for, you know, other key players web host's, etc.

I would -- are you free to tell us? It's an open meeting so you can tell us -- give us a hint of what the cc's where the cc's think the emphasis should be?

Patrick Jones: I'm not sure that would be helpful...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Patrick Jones: ...because the discussion wouldn't...

Marilyn Cade: That's okay, so I'm driven -- I was there both before the green paper and during the green paper and during the white paper. And I probably wrote a good many of those words.

My view has changed from what it was then on what - on what it means to coordinate? It was a much simpler world and I know it was a much simpler world because there's companies sitting in this room who's industries and companies didn't even exist.

I also know it was a much simple world because I don't know (Martin) 40 million users at the time or something like that. I mean it wasn't, you know, it was a little simpler.

And we didn't have so many of the uses and dependencies from a commercial perspective and a government delivery e-services delivery perspective. It's a very different world.

We did not complain about not having internet access like we do now. I mean it's just -- you can't run your business, you can't run your personal life, you can't do your banking, should I go on. It is such a different world.

And - and we also did not have the level of sophisticated tax and risk, so to me looking at it and I mean I was heavily emerged in this. I think somebody else in the back of the room who was as well. We thought coordinate - we thought coordinate, I think we thought different because we - differently because we also had a different world we were living in.

So I - I would probably say there is a much greater need today. I used to be credibly opposed to ICANN taking on a lot of things. Today I would say there's probably a very important role for ICANN in education and awareness and offering the kinds of training and support that some of those entities are getting from another place that I hang out more than anybody else does, you know.

And if we don't help them, they have no place else to go or somebody else help them.

Patrick Jones: So an area where interaction with the business constituency and - and this community would be helpful in advancing that. It's particularly around encouraging the adoption and awareness of DNS SAC so we've done training at the ccTLD level and particularly even before, you know, two weeks before this meeting we had - we did a training in Trinidad.

We still want to reach further into the ISP community and also to enterprises and so we can provide to the extent that if there's an interest in the same kind of encouragement to make this available, turn on the validation for your customers and that - that might be one way to help improve security of the greater internet.

So that protected thing we're conveying a message and encouraging and hopefully that's a point where the business community can be helpful to carry that further to - to your clients and your customers.

Jeff Moss: Back to Marilyn's point about -- I think even when you talk to people inside ICANN there's sort of a divergent view of what it means to coordinate. And I think that must be because it meant one thing but one point it means something different now.

And - and so I think everybody -- my sense is people are waiting for consensus to form for some. And so we're hopefully using this - this report to sort of force that discussion.

And that's why we're going around to try to encourage really to participate because if it doesn't happen, I fear it will be lack of liquidity. It's going to be used against us.

Marilyn Cade: So it occurs to me that maybe I'm just going to try this. So maybe our role in coordination may not have changed as much as what we have to do to enable our ability to coordinate more changed.

So maybe - maybe we have to do education and awareness so that there are fewer risk in the ecosystem that make our ability to fulfill our coordination role.

Patrick Jones: Yes, so one example -- I'll just use this as an example to illustrate the point. So let's say a route operator for whatever reason decides that they don't want to run their route anymore.

And they turn to ICANN and say, "You know, we're done here take it." Right, well there's no process for us to accept the route and there's no process for them to give up a route.

And the minute somebody says that out loud there's going to be 1,000 countries in line wanting to run that route. So we know that's going to be a problem if it ever occurs. So is it - is it that coordination?

Jeff Moss: I was thinking, you know, one thing that might be helpful for us as the business constituency is to articulate to ICANN what are the types of responsibilities that we assume ourselves and we don't expect ICANN to do?

And what can ICANN - what do we think we can both and mutually do with ICANN and with a larger community as Patrick pointed out to improve security.

I think, you know, for me personally and I think this is kind of reflected in our report, you know, we don't want to buy into the notion that centralized control is the solution to security.

And I think we all operate parts of the infrastructure and one of the things that we really rustle with whereas ICANN's deal with it as now as a very complex landscape where the infrastructure is very diffusely managed and controlled.

And I think we all -- it's up to all of us to articulate that that is a design strength and not a design weakness that needs to be modified. And so, ICANN can be a great enabler of a lot of different parts of that infrastructure in a way that I think that no single entity, you know, could control.

But yet, take advantage the expertise and the relationships that do exist kind of through the ICANN process. So I think we have an opportunity in this to really articulate kind of both a world view but also some practical suggestions that don't look like we're holding ICANN as you said responsible for things that doesn't have authority for, that rather recognizing that there's a lot of strengths here that can be built on to it.

Marilyn Cade: So when did the other thing -- oh, did you want to speak (Mike)?

(Mike):   No, that's okay.

Marilyn Cade: One of the other things that make certain places very attractive to come to is when they offer free training and free skills development. And the kinds of things that then strengthen the ability for someone to do their job.

Corporations don't think that -- they don't -- that's not how they approach it, but small ISP's or small entrepreneurs and others in developing countries maybe be very attracted to the - to a place a case and their governments may be very attracted to a place that brings this kind of resource together.

But right now our workshops are all for experts. And even if it's DNS for Dummies it's still all for experts. I don't know, you know, I don't know whether the -- and I don't recall the review team went so much into thinking about how do you deal with the - the risks that are developed - that are developing and

emerging from the poorly configured - the systems that are poorly configured and they are bringing the risks.

So training on the DNS sect maybe one thing Patrick but I don't know if that's going to totally deal with the just sort of the accidental risks. I was going to call it the stupidity risks but that sounded bad.

Sorry, is training and awareness and education one of the things that - that you think could fall into the role of the coordinator?

Patrick Jones: Well, right now training education awareness those are one of our core areas from the team. One of the things that we do is provide a bridge between the technical community, the operators, the -- between the enterprise side and - and registration side.

And particularly this week is a good example with law enforcement, law enforcement doesn't necessarily have its own constituency structure within the ICANN structure.

They do fit within the GAC, but we've tried to facilitate law enforcement participation and started out by in space at ICANN meetings. At this meeting it was a workshop with training and at the Toronto meeting it will be a workshop that may end up being more open to other participants in the community not just law enforcement.

And this would include everything from DNS 101, routing basics, careers so it's more of an education and when it's for them and they have a second day to organize themselves for today going out and meeting with the other constituencies and stakeholder groups, that was just from providing a conduit for law enforcement.

And the operational security community to the other actors that are involved in the ICANN space, but that's scenario where security team could play a role but I mean would be good to, you know.

Marilyn Cade: I - I'm going to go back to the maybe a harder question because I see some others coming voluntarily for training and ccTLD managers. When you get into the question of dealing with the route server operators it's a - it's a very tough question I -- some people in the room here understand that.

But for those of you who aren't familiar with the route server operators this is -- and I'm going to say this in a more sophisticated way -- but this is a core of volunteers that have carried a huge amount of responsibility and maybe even a huge financial commitment in some cases in terms of the fact that they are always there, always ready, always doing.

They are deploying their servers, they are, you know, they're really a phenomenal community. Has - have they considered working together to come up with such a policy?

Patrick Jones: With such a policy it has.

Marilyn Cade: So what have -- if you can't leave the route server operator in your will to your grandson...

Patrick Jones: Right, which you might be able to do.

Jeff Moss: Yes, you can leave them IP addresses.

Patrick Jones: Yes, so - so I think our perspective is the route operators like to be diverse and they predate the creation of ICANN. And so they sort of exist outside the system but -- so that's why when you read the ICANN Bylaws it gets confusing.

Because they are very coordinate the global DNS yet they predate us. So I heard that Cy -- it's complicated. So -- I guess what we're trying to do is what are your concerns? What -- I don't want to direct the conversation too much -- I just hope to get a sense of the room as to do you think it's useful to get clarity around this?

Do you think this drafting of our, you know, clear concise statement as to what - what the technical role of ICANN should be? How would that help you? How would that help your constituency group? How would that help in the conversations you have or, you know, is that a terribly useful thing for you? Or do you never bump up against it?

(Martin Hannigan):   This is (Martin Hannigan) for the transcript. I think that it would helpful to us so that we can actually what I think that we're supposed to do and practice some oversight to give you guidance as you go forward.

So for example, the route server operator issue was a pretty good one to use. There were a few recommendations around that not just specifically that but around the (RSAC) and the (NSAC) that said, "Why don't you go off with them and define what they're actually supposed to be doing?"

And at the same time there's other recommendations around having them develop best practices and you guys kind of help them to do that and encourage it.

And I think that - that's the best of both worlds when, you know, you can encourage those things and make the people that are actually subject to them responsible.

So in the case of route operators whether it's a bankruptcy or a complete failure or breakdown or I don't want to do it anymore. You know, I think that the recommendation at least here and your definition should probably harvest some of those situations by empowering them to cover them.

Patrick Jones: Yes, one of the other things I want to call attention to is this recommendation - now is the Recommendation 4 is that we need to document and define the nature of the SSR relationships that we have within the ICANN community.

So we're now undergoing a process where there will be x number of new top level domains in a certain amount of time. Currently some of these actors are members of our businesses but not necessarily contracted parties.

How does that change ICANN's relationship with those parties? And - and some of those parties may be governments; some of those maybe ISP's or - or so this clearly documenting the nature of the relationships may be helpful in that evolution as well.

Oh yes, so if we have anything helpful, making no comment about whether an applicant will be successful or not but we are entering a world where ICANN may become the contracted party at the Vatican or that's an example. There are others like that, so that's a different world than we're in now.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks, Chris Chaplow, from a small business point of view to give you feedback one can debate the technical role and the limits and the boundaries of ICANN.

But I think I would leave that to other people and say from a small business point of view where you embrace education and material and collateral and things that at the lowest technical levels are useful to me, are useful to other small businesses and things (unintelligible). I think I'd add colleagues and clients.

Marilyn Cade: I think also if we were, you know, if you - if you book the proper survey of the 400 companies - how many companies?

Woman: (Unintelligible) different brands and there are 400 (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: So the company- so if - so if you thought...And that's pretty much corporate America so if you - if you add -- you have to mark my questionnaire to them to help them to break it into something that say you couldn't really ask them if the route servers are important to them. But we all know that.

But I think the -- you could easily think about how we ask the question of, you know, on a scale of 1:10 how important are certain predictability to your successful business practices?

But I don't know if that's exactly what's going to help you. I think - I think we ought to just go with an assumption that the fact that the internet works as reliable and predictable is now a core assumption of business and governments.

And say, "What part of it needs to documented?" And Jeff it may be that parts of it need to be documented just so nobody - so people know who to go to, to ask or to help.

Because there's also this question of who do you ask for help? If you're, you know, I remember the (Estonian) situation, I mean we all did right.

Jeff Moss: And to that point when the anonymous threat emerged a lot of countries were like get me the internet. You know, and then the internet looks like ICANN. You know, so if you look at our Bylaws it looks like it's us.

But in reality it's some of the route operators and we just happen to be one of them and so I would like to clear up that or get some clear understandings around, you know, situations like that when they emerge.

And so it was a great learning experience with everybody we worked with, so Interpol, we worked with various governments and so everybody could figure

out well if a large attack occurs, who's calling who? Who can, you know, what are our roles and responsibilities?

But, you know, we did that on the fly. It would have been nice if there was more clarity in sort of the expectation. So...

Marilyn Cade: ...that might help today but I - I think we ought to try to find more technically oriented types Jeff and Bill and a few other folks and put a call out to the - the BC and reach into (unintelligible) from AT&T and some others to do this follow-up call and discussion.

And try to get you more - get you some people that have maybe some more day to day responsibilities in the - in the security areas.

Man: Two points on DNS and I've talked to (Steve Croker) about this and, you know, we were part of a working group that (Steve) chaired at the FCC. And we had - we may be the most skeptical at least some of our security folks on the technical issues.

And I think we need to find a place to have that discussion technically. And then I think the other issue is, you know, what's the business case for DNS SAC and, you know, we'll do it when our customers want it.

And so I think that's another part of how do we pull the demand and create those business use cases that will help, you know, those of us on the business side who want to invest in it.

Jeff Moss: And so on that to answer your second question it's something we've been working on it, it's not ready for primetime yet. But we've been gathering documents and trying to get some studies kicked off to provide businesses and companies.

We've met with a number of large companies and asking them, "(Steve), are you planning to turn on DNS SAC and if not, why not? And if yes, why yes?" And trying to gather that feedback to understand a lot of it turns out that it's lack of really good documentation and APAC studies to show, you know, this is what other people have learned when they turned in on their networks.

So we're hoping that companies willing have an implementation experience they'll share it with us and then - and we can (anonymize) it or we can turn it around so other people can learn.

But it's pretty clear as we try to go about educating people on DNS SAC. We need specific examples as what you said.

(Amy Michelin): And this isn't a question but just kind of an offer of advice in the potential route for you to get more to the security community within the business community.

The chief security officer of it's executive network is essentially the same membership, you know, not, they're not affiliated organizations but the same companies belong to it. And use all of their C-So's and CIO's and CPO's that generally get together once a month throughout I think it's eight different cities. So to get to global multi-national brands is a very, very, very good resource.

Marilyn Cade: So we're going to take you up on -- you're working with us to do outreach to them - to participate in this. Thank you (Amy). Let me...Yes, its on you Bill.

Bill Smith: I'd also suggest first as a - a place to certainly consider appointing people. ICANN cert is a member first and so its -- as far as I know it is an institution that actually -- in addition to and helping with response does outreach education, etc.

It's got good global presence acceptance in Africa. Africa is, you know, I think the one or two countries that are covered there, so it's pretty spotty there.

Marilyn Cade: And we're going to wrap up. I just want to thank both of you for coming in and joining us and we will be seeing you -- some of us will be in the rest of the sessions that you all are going to be in.

I will just say that we take information very willingly and we will be participating in the budget and operating plan discussions and the plan and Chris Chaplow actually chairs the budget working group that cuts the cost of three constituencies, the ISP, the IPC and the - and the BC.

And one of the areas that's particularly interesting and important to us and not a topic for today. But it's a topic we would like to have more on with you and force some of compliance and their input and stuff.

And not just the trademark protection but also because that's a risk and thoughts and problems back emerge because a domain name is being abusively registered or abusively used. So that's a high priority for us and maybe something that would like to - to think more in talking with (Ritchie) about.

END