

ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
October 11, 2016
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started, you may begin.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you, thank you very much JR. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the monthly NCSG open policy call on Tuesday, 11th of October 2016. On the call today we have Ed Morris, Kathy Kleiman, Rafik Dammak, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Amr Elsadr, Stephanie Perrine and from staff we have myself Maryam Bakoshi. I'd like to remind all participants, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, over to you Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Maryam and welcome everybody. So, with no further ado let's get (the legend) and let's start looking at tomorrow, Thursday council meeting and let's see Maryam, you already have it up so let's go with that.

First (unintelligible) items needs to be the adaption of a proposed final framework principles for future (unintelligible) working groups. Is there any other - respond to comment on this, is there anything we need to discuss about this? Okay, apparently not so I guess this is not something we need to spend more time on. Carlos, you have your hand up, please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, this is Carlos, good morning, thank you very much. This has been very long in the works and I have no (direct comment) to that other than using the opportunity that Rafik is also on the call because there seems to be a very direct wish to wind down the (press community) working group on the Internet governance from parts of the council themselves and I think the agenda for (either of that), so there has been a lot of pressure to discuss the Internet governance (cross) community working group which dates from much earlier.

And then the process of these (new rules) and there has been a lot of pressure on Rafik to report what's going on there and there seems to be a big wish to discuss if this should be (wind) down. This is just a fact, I've been (living) through that, through the whole year these (cross) community working group will develop more time on policy issues. There was a suggestion by (Nigel) for the World (Well) conference and (unintelligible) but (to the end) there has been no such (unintelligible) in there. So, this is just a comment and I don't want to put Rafik on the spot but if he wants to comment, I feel (relation) to what's going to happen with that cross community working group.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Carlos. Rafik, do you want to comment, Carlos suggested that you might have something to say? Sounds like Rafik is not interested in commenting. Okay, Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Hello, can you hear me?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, we can hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Hello?

Tapani Tarvainen: We can hear you fine, please go ahead. Rafik, now I don't hear anything. I heard you say hello but that's it. I think we lost Rafik. Okay, maybe I should - I'll get (unintelligible) Rafik now. Any other comments on this, anybody else? I'm not sure this is directly related to the (CGWGI TI). See you are commenting on the chat but...

I guess nobody else does either so let's leave it at that. We can return to this if somebody remembers something later on. Look at the next item is about the drafting team which we have separately in our agenda, actually later but are we expecting more DT members to join? You actually mentioned that you might (leave) this until later. Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thank you. All right, thanks, I see Farzi is on the call, this is Amr, we're both members of the drafting team. We're only missing (Matt Icie) and Ed and (unintelligible) he's also a member of the draft team. Anyway, this was a place or a motion that was admitted to adopt the final report of the drafting team working on operationalizing the powers for the GNSO as part of the decisional participants in the empowered community (fund), the (cross-community) (unintelligible) ICANN's accountability.

The drafting team hasn't completed - hasn't actually produced a final report yet and it should do so today and so generally I expect this motion to be deferred to the council meeting and we need to have the (SSAC) members have been working together to sort of make sure that the operating procedures, the GNSO's operating procedures reflect how we believe these (new powers) should be exercised within the GNSO and the predominance debates going on.

The drafting team was whether the council should represent the GNSO as a decisional participant in this capacity or whether it should be some other structure. It's been a lot of too and fro on the drafting team but the majority

does wish regard to GNSO council to represent the GNSO in this regard and I think it's basically the NCSG, the non-(unintelligible) representative who is (Ed Morris) and two (contracted) parties; the registry and the registrar stakeholder group, it's really the three commercial stakeholder group constituencies opposed to this.

But anyway, this should be reflected in the report. We're struggling with a bit of the (contents) although the recommendations should reflect what the majority wishes and once the report is finalized we should certainly be (unintelligible) in the NCSG even in the form of an update on the work of the drafting team member there.

But, we'll certainly be seeing this report again before the (unintelligible) meeting. And like I said, I expect this motion to be deferred until that meeting. Thanks. We'd be happy to take any questions and if Farzi or Ed want to add (whatever) please go ahead. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Amr. Ed, do you want to take it from here?

Ed Morris: Yes, thanks Stephane. Excuse me. I think it's important for folks to know that we got basically everything we wanted out of this group. I consider it a major victory for the NCSG. We've been able to locate the powers within council with the current house arrangement, with (anticipation) of the NCA's. Most of the threshold levels are going to be basically simple majority of each house which should allow us to actually exercise the community powers. Many members of the CSG wanted super majority thresholds which would make it very, very difficult for any of the powers to be used since a lot of them we have to work to conjunction with the other (SOAC)'s.

My particular interest has been in getting the inspection right so ICANN can no longer hide behind the walls of secrecy and we've gotten that down to the constituency level. So, with NPOC, our NCSG are very low level of council, similar to that for an issue (record) of a quarter of each house or half of one house, want some documentation, excuse me, from ICANN, they will not have to work with anyone else. NPOC for example, could just say we want to look at X, you submit it to the - our representative on the empowered community which likely will be the chair of council. It goes directly to ICANN for a response.

So being able to get that down to the lowest possible (granular) level. And I understand both constituencies are currently working on charter reforms and I see (Clause) and Rafik are both here. I would suggest that in the reforms themselves you need to work in a procedure for individual members to ask the respective (EC)'s to implement this reform, to ask for documents under inspection so we have it all aligned going forward. This was the only portion of the, excuse me, of all 101 I guess recommendations that received unanimous support from everyone. So I'm pretty sure that's going to go forward.

And the other thing is we did work together really well, I just wanted to thank the other members of the working group. We did a fair amount of time on our own (Skypes) coordinating. I think that showed. Currently this morning, I've been a bit ill, but folks have been working on the fact that the report itself that's been proposed reads like a travel log supporting the minority position and that's where we're having a little bit of trouble right now. We're (one) in the recommendations largely but the chair who comes from the CSG has written the report the way that would make it seem almost as if the minority (review) carried today and that's just wrong and we'll continue to fight that. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Ed, it sounds pretty good indeed. Amr, your hand is still up, do you want to speak?

Amr Elsadr: Sorry, that's an old hand.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Anybody else? It sounds like we are simply happy the way DT went, (unintelligible) we'll be working on Thursday (with this) (unintelligible) either way. Okay, unless somebody else wants to comment on this, let's move on. Right now the next item on the agenda is the discussion item on the ICANN board letter on new GLTD subsequent procedures. The (center) of the motion is Carlos, would you like to talk, explain on that a little Carlos, assuming your connection is working?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, thank you. This is Carlos speaking on the last council call we decided to create a small group to answer the letter based on all of the comments that had been submitted to date. I happened to notice that there was no (unintelligible) from this group. They tried to organize the letter from the general and nothing is going to happen before the main studies are completed meaning the competition started the right protection activity and the subsequent rounds PDP.

And from there there are some issues that become less and less consensus, some commence if the next round was already approved in the previous one - and some more particular issues that we generally (can't stop the) letter is that there is no shortcut. We have to go through the biggest (unintelligible) first and then some particular comments from some individuals and then in the (annex) there will be a summary upon the relevant (comment). So I recommend everybody to read or to take a look at this table of the different

comments to stay up-to-date on where this is going but it's going to be the general, very general letter to tell them no. No shortcuts, that's my summary.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you Carlos. That's a useful summary. Any questions, comments, anybody else want to... Apparently not so we are satisfied with what Carlos explained in this discussion item anyway. Okay, let's move on. The next item also discussion, the GAC GNSO consultation group, GAC early engagement in GNSO policy development processes. Anybody - okay Amr, I see your hand up again, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr, yes, just some background on this group. This group as set up almost three years ago. It was a small group of six GNSO council members and six members of the GAC as well as (staff) from GNSO and the GAC to sort of work out a process to encourage early engagement of the GAC as an advisory committee and the GNSO's quality development process and this was meant to serve as - on one hand, as a means to bring the GAC into the fold with the rest of the ICANN community and participating in the GNSO's PDP which historically has never gone as well as provide an alternative to sort of disagreements coming up as a result of the GAC advice to the ICANN board following the conclusion of PDP's which often take over a minimum of one year to complete. Since a lot of work goes into these GNSO PDP's and the GAC often has conflicting device which creates problems and the board tries to mediate sort of - mediate a discussion between the two and positions on how to reach agreements.

But anyway, this consultation group was meant to sort of set up a process for the GAC to engage in early phase and to be honest, the group hasn't been active for a terribly long time but recently the mailing list did start to - started popping up on the list and then I believe held a couple of calls among this group but I confess I didn't participate in the last couple of calls that took

place and the group seems to be trying to produce a report that outlines the achievement the group has managed to make or to achieve as well as sort of wrap up the work of the group and I will admit, it has made progress on the early phases of the GNSO's PDP and specific PD issues phase where there are issues reports and opportunities for different stakeholders to comment in those and make sure things they believe in the scope of PDP's would be included.

But the consultation group never got past that, never got past that phase in which is also important. Having the GAC actually participate and provide PDP working groups, that's never taken place and I think some of the consultation group members have commented on this. But this is a discussion item on the council and then update and then I will certainly try to follow-up on it and (unintelligible) where we go - where this group (goes) in the future. I'd be happy to answer questions, thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Amr. Yes, Carlos you have your hand up, please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, this is Carlos, thank you Stephane, thank you Amr. I've been through the last few calls, the report is relevant because it proposes to wind down the group, sort of to be dissolved. There are seven issues with six recommendations and on different issues that Amr has rightly mentioned. It's very difficult to have the GAC participating. We get only individuals now for the PDP, not GAC (provisions). Some regular exchanges with the - between the leaderships should be established, regular context with the GAC secretary (unintelligible).

So it's a very concise document, it's not short but it is very concise with a set of recommendations which are very down to earth, in my view, I think Amr is right, we cannot go much further but the final recommendation of the document is that this group disappears and the quick look mechanism phase,

the (unintelligible) phase, some more formality in the exchanges between the (unintelligible) should remain. But the proposal, the last part of the proposal is that it's over. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Carlos. Any other comments on this ICANN... No? Okay. At least we all know that the GAC is a difficult thing at times. We'll see where this goes. Let's move on. The next item, also a discussion, within ICANN board letter regarding policy implications to the final report of the internationalized registration data, IRD expert working group. Anybody particular about (unintelligible), want to speak about this, is this something we should be concerned about, I don't know in the middle of this. Maybe - nobody has any (more) so - okay Amr, your hand is up again. Please.

Amr Elsadr: Sorry Stephane, this is Amr, I was just looking at the chat and wasn't focused on Item 8, the board letter on international (administration) data, that's for working business, is that what we're discussing now?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: Okay, thanks. Okay, well this was another excellent working group specific as you can see in the title to internationalized registration data which is basically data that is not (activity) based, not in (Latin) characters. So there were three groups that did work in this respect. One was a group called the IRD working group, another was the expert working group on IRD and third was a GNSO PDP on translation and transliteration of contact information which concludes this work a little over a year ago I believe and is now in the implementation phase with ICANN staff.

So basically I think the principle concern here is that the board wants to be sure that the GNSO's, PDP's are taking the expert working groups, the

working groups report and recommendations into consideration and so they asked a brief - they asked both where the translation and transliteration PDP has taken these recommendations into consideration and they've also asked how the next gen registration data services, PDP is going to be taking this into consideration and I know that there is work going on in the latter PDP that will address these and staff have been working with some of the former members of translation, transliteration PDP to develop a response and this is circulated through the council. Just yesterday it was prepared mainly by Jim Galvin who was representing the registries on that PDP and he was coincidentally also the chair of the expert working group on internationalized registration data so he was a pretty handy guy to have on that PDP.

And then he basically I think - I need to go into a bit more detail. I need to read his briefing more carefully but I think what he did was point out where the recommendations of the PDP took into consideration or what the other group was doing but he also pointed out that both groups were to a large extent working in parallel but have been communicating on a regular basis and this was naturally facilitated by (Jay) himself who was on both groups.

So, again, this is a discussion item in response to a board letter and I know that the ICANN board has been following the issue of internationalized registration data and (unintelligible) be sure of the different GNSO PDP's are paying (due) attention to this topic.

Again, I'd be happy to answer any questions if anyone has them. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Amr. Does anybody have any questions, just rather comprehensive summary. (Unintelligible) answer to a question (unintelligible) already, so nobody has any more. Okay.

And please two items in the agenda, first in Item 9, GNSO planning for ICANN 57. (Unintelligible) meeting and we'll get back to the (unintelligible) meeting, now it's been (not a point) but is there somebody who wants to point out something specifically regarding that data that we should - counselors should bring up there, we can go now, let us get back to it later. Okay, and the final item is the results of the newcomers survey. Discussion item, okay I see it, you have your hand up, was it a mistake.

Ed Morris: Yes, no it wasn't Stephane. It's just really (unintelligible) that meeting, a lot of people are having trouble with Visas. I was. If somebody out there is having trouble or gets rejected and wants a different approach I'd ask them to just email me and I might be able to work with them. I'm going to (approach the uptake) and I just found out this morning it's had some success.

So that's for those who are getting rejected for Visas. I know in the wider ICANN community, it's a real big problem. Hopefully not for our members but, again, if you've been rejected just reach out to me and there's an approach which I can suggest to you might work, thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you Ed. We'll get back to the (unintelligible) meeting later if we have time and I'll discuss it with the scheduling (problems) and other stuff. But, anyway, the visa issue is good to bring up and it's something that you might want to bring up to council as well, it has not been organized as well as it should have been.

And let's talk about the newcomers survey which we - I guess we haven't seen the results yet, so we can't really talk about it much but if somebody has some - of course feel free to raise your hand. Okay, so much for the council agenda. Take a quick look at open public comments. Okay, Amr, you have your hand up relating to (whatever), please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Stephane, this is Amr. I just wanted to raise one other topic before we move off of the council agenda. Recently there was a letter from the board, the council, on discussions but the board has been having with the GAC on IGO protections and this has prompted some - well, disagreement on the council to the boards approach in handling this issue on (PTOD) policy with the GAC and I just wanted to raise that point because (Donna Austin) who is a vice chair of the council and representative of the registry stakeholder group has reached out to a few counselors and has asked for a private call to take place which will happen later today. I just wanted to flag this and this is sort of just in preparation of raising this as an agenda item I believe during the next council call.

I'll get a briefing on that after the call takes place and then would be happy to hear from especially other counselors on this topic. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, thank you Amr, let's see. Rafik, next in the queue. Rafik, the floor is yours.

Rafik Dammak: Hello, are in kind of any other business item?

Tapani Tarvainen: Any other business regarding the council session on Thursday at this point.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, maybe somehow. I saw an announcement that there is - it would be not about auction drafting team. I would like to ask the counselors if they have idea if it's open and so on because it's only in the (counselor) space so this information and don't recall receiving any communication information about it before, so.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Rafik. Is there any Councilor want to reply - respond (immediately) to that? So it seems that is something nobody knows anything about. Okay. But Kathy, you're next in the queue. Please move on and speak up (unintelligible).

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Yes. And I'm glad Amr's in the queue too because I'm going to ask him a question and then respond. Amr, we're using acronyms and not all of them are coming through clearly.

I just want to make sure that you were talking about IGO, the International Governmental Organizations, the special protection that the GAC keeps asking for the acronyms, not even the names but the acronyms of these international organizations. Is that what we're talking about?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Kathy. This is Amr.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: Apologies. I shouldn't be using acronyms on these calls too much. The IGOs are like - I got the International Intergovernmental Organizations and then that's what ICANN Board and the GAC have been talking about. And my understanding is that they actually set up a small group of GAC members and Board members to work on this together. And what is - what has been sent in the letter sort of reflects the outcome of that group. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. And I haven't read that letter. I just wanted to let you know that for a number of months, probably a year, I participated in the IGO/INGO Working Group although I haven't done - I haven't been on there for a number of months because they were moving in the right direction.

If you want to know kind of the general concern, it is that the entire world uses three letter acronyms and if you give them to the IGOs you take them away from everybody else.

And, you know, if the rock group, the Who might actually really want it in a .rockandroll instead of the World Health Organization who believes they own those three letters, which they don't.

And at least when I left the IGO/INGO Working Group, there was a very strong view that what the GAC had been asking for was not legal, was - wasn't consistent under any laws known to mankind frankly.

And we had done the - the working group has actually commissioned a private scholar to look at some of the concerns. The IGOs were concerned about signing on or going into a UDRP even though some of them have. The World Bank has been very successful getting its domain names through UDRP. But there seem to be some concern about that. And then there was concern about the concerns. The scholar didn't seem to share the same concerns.

So the idea that they're going off - that the GAC and the Bard are going off to renegotiate what a working group has been doing for two years is disturbing. So several questions.

First, does anyone else remember the IGO/INGO Working Group? And should I go back to it? Would that help? And how do we respond to this letter? Thanks.

Amr Elsadr: Kathy, this is...

Tapani Tarvainen: (Okay). Thank you Kathy.

Amr Elsadr: ...Amr again.

Tapani Tarvainen: Amr. (Go ahead).

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Thanks Tapani. This is Amr again. Yes. Kathy's absolutely right on everything she said. And I wanted to note that one of the co-Chairs of the PDP Working Group she referred to was Phil Corwin who is also a Council member. And he has been the most outspoken member of Council against this letter.

And I also wanted to point out that one of the reasons why this PDP Working Group has been going on for so long is because it's been trying relentlessly to get input from the GAC so that they can take their views into consideration when producing the recommendations.

But despite multiple efforts and despite the GAC GNSO liaison, Mason Cole's intervention and attempts at assistance in this regard, the GAC hasn't provided any input to the PDP at all.

And so I think it's understandable that members of the GNSO community are quite unhappy with what the GAC and the Board are doing behind closed doors. So thank you Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you Amr.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Amr. Let's see. Next in queue is Carlos. Carlos, please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes. Thank you Tapani. This is Carlos for the record. I agree that we have to pay special attention to this case because there are other similar cases where there are people or groups trying to bypass the policy system.

And I would put everything under the hat of the reserved names as far as the PDP and the subsequent rounds is concerned because the same is happening with the two letter and three letter code country names and (full) country names.

The GAC makes a lot of noise. Then we have to create a group to discuss positions. Then the GAC does not participate because they don't like the fact that those names are not based on international law and they try to block or they create alternative groups; that's the case of the country names. Or they create the small groups outside of the mainstream as the case of the IGOs.

So it's for me the general case is what's going to happen with all these reserved names where there is some jurisdiction or GAC (issues) between call it Red Cross or call it international multilateral organization or call it country names. So we have a systemic problem here. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Carlos. I think Ed is next in the queue. Ed, please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes. Thanks Tapani. I mean I agree with everything that's been said before. The concept that the World Health Organization can take (Pete Thompson)'s - yes. It's just ridiculous.

One thing I want to point out is with our new accountability reforms, we should be looking at this closely because the way this whole GAC, Board relationship is working in this issue, I think arguably could be a violation of the new bylaws.

And in these situations and just as Carlos is suggesting, new PDPs, et cetera, et cetera, one of the options we may have is if the Board decides to do what the GAC is asking, which again we're not at that point yet. But if they go in that direction, one of our recourse at this point under the new bylaws will be to file an IRP against the Board.

So although we're nowhere near that stage yet, I do just want to mention it so people have it in the back of their mind that in the ICANN if the Board chooses to ignore the time tested PDP procedure and do things, as Carlos has said, you know, you know, sort of behind the curtains in procedures that aren't part of the bylaws, we now do have a recourse that we should consider using.

And I certainly am following this with that in mind that if the Board just sort of does what they want or what the GAC wants, we may have the ability to file an IRP in this. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Ed. I see Amr you want to speak up maybe, you know, (unintelligible) this one. Either way. Please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Tapani. This is Amr again. And yes, I had raised my hand actually before being asked to comment on this. And I had raised it to address a point that Rafik raised a little earlier.

He asked to - he was asking whether participation in a process to comment on the Cross Community Working Group's draft charter for - the draft charter for Cross Community Working Group on using the auction proceeds whether that was open to all or just Councilors.

So I just wanted to note that I will ask. But I also wanted to note that we have two members of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group who were appointed by the Policy Committee to that drafting team. And we haven't gotten any updates from them at all on this.

So I'm speaking for myself and flying a little blind. And I would like to hear more about what the Charter Drafting Team has come up with. I believe Klaus was one of those two members. And I forget who the other one was. But it would be great to hear from them on this. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Amr. Any comments? Anybody else want to pipe in at this point? Okay. Klaus, I see your hand up. Klaus, the floor is yours.

Klaus Stoll: I'm just very simply straightforward to reply there's nothing I'm aware of that leads to that direction. That is why I have nothing to report or say (on that point).

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Klaus. That was short and sweet on this point. Anybody else before we move on? This was the Council agenda we are (plan), so. (Related to) that? No? Okay.

Let's have a look at the open public comments. There are three at the moment - no, two at the moment that's open at the moment. And neither of them - okay. The first one (at least) doesn't look so critical to our interests; proposal for Georgian Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules. Somebody wants to comment on that, please go ahead.

Second one might be of some interest. Latin American and Caribbean DNS Marketplace Study. Anybody - has anybody taken a look at this study? Okay. Carlos, I was kind of hoping you would. Please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (Unintelligible). Thank you. We want to take some of its time today to finally thank you. This is Carlos for the record. The study was presented the end of August in the Dominican Republic as part of the mitigation plan. It was of course (hyped) a long time ago.

And there is a follow up meeting this week why the main message of the document is that area is badly underserved with the exceptions of Mexico and Brazil.

And the picture they draw is in an area where ccTLDs are dominant. In the case of Mexico, Columbia and Brazil they have 70% of the market. But in all other countries the ccTLDs are very weak. They also talk about the lack or the difficulty to have ICANN accredited registrars since the new (contract) came into place.

And it - recommendations are really, really weak or general. There is no - there's no clear path. So we can put it in the same shelf of the underserved areas without a lot of down to earth recommendations. It's the same or more or less the same with the other (unintelligible) studies done before in the Middle East and one that is being developed right now on Africa.

So I think they are spending a lot of money. There is a lot of numbers in those reports but there is little result of recommendations that can be easily applied either now or in the next rounds. We're creating an ALAC in LACRALO, a working group for commencing on that because it's very close to our hearts. But in terms of priorities for the group, I think only if somebody has a lot of time, I will recommend to go into that. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Carlos. Ed, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes. Thanks Tapani. I had on the list a few weeks ago when this first came up suggested we do respond to this. We have gotten some positive response from (Renalia) for example - not (Renalia), sorry, (Renada), my apologies. That she wanted to be involved in this.

So how do we - how can we form a group to try to do this? This isn't in my narrow area of expertise or interest. But I do think it's important for us particularly since we've been having a lot of discussion on the list in how to involve those members from South America in our policy process.

Is how do we actually try to crank something up here in our current structure and actually try to make sure we do have the input in this public comment? I think we need to do so. But I'm just not sure how we can organize it.

I mean we can just say gee, it'd be nice to respond like we're doing now. But unless we have a plan going forward, we won't get a response in. So is there some way we could put out another call, have - I see (Marilia) is here. Have the PC say we're going to do this. Who wants to be part of it? Or try to get something proactive going so we don't miss this deadline.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Ed. It sounds like much of the group and I see Carlos volunteering to be part of the group. Carlos, could you perhaps consider forming the group? And so (as to) call anybody else wanting to join so we can start - get started with the group? Perhaps to...

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you Tapani. Thank you Tapani. I - this is Carlos again. I can take the lead in calling the group. Nevertheless, I have to recall that there are many efforts that are related. I mean we have for the last two, three years the discussion on special support for the application process. Then there is a news

group of underserved areas. Then there is ICANN throwing good money in these studies.

I just want to - if we call a group, we should collect all these backgrounds of the failed applicant support program, the underserved areas, maybe the auction proceeds and then the regional studies and put them all together. Because what I see is some tactic to every time there is a need the underserved areas, okay, throw a little bit money, throw a new group, but there is no consistent effort.

So I'll make a call based on the Latin American market study, which I understand better. But I would recommend that we take a broader look to - in all these area and try to bring it in.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Carlos. That sounds like a good plan to me.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Keep it into the (work plan) Number 2 of the subsequent rounds, which is the one in my view that...

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Carlos. Ed, is that an old hand or you want to speak at this point? Okay. (Seems to us). Rafik, you're next. Please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. So I think Carlos gave us some points I want to emphasize. But regarding those reports, it's important to understand the context. There was some effort within ICANN to have additional strategy and they started with the African Working Group and then the Middle East and adjoining countries and now the Latin American's one.

And it was kind of individuals from the community from those regions working on the strategy. And DNS industry was one of the main topics. And that's why you have those studies. The first I think was for the (mena) region.

And we can discuss about the methods and so on. But I think usually there is - that's quite interesting because they (raises) a lot of question regarding (reality) in the state - in those regions for DNS in (these three) and beyond.

So I would encourage that we try to have regional group of individuals working on those topics. And as Carlos highlighted, that should be linked to existing (defaults) like for example the (whole) recommend the underserved region, which (go beyond) the history and cover having (more registrar) in the developing countries.

For example, also the discussion too - it will be at the table again in the New gTLD Subsequent Rounds Working Group regarding the applicant support. NCSG was leading in that topic years ago and we have to continue the work (then) and to see how we can do better.

So there are many areas. It's better to I guess having some interest group regional basis and they can coordinate together to work about all those problems and really to focus in the local realities.

For example, for me there was a lot of questions. People questioned a lot about having a TLD in (unintelligible) but it doesn't sound or seem that's getting a lot of traction there. So it's better to have some discussion at that level. And if the Latin American, Caribbean members can (work), they can show us the lead here.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Rafik. Any other comments on this point? Okay. Sounds we'll be moving forward hoping - waiting for Carlos to get that group started.

Let's move on with our agenda. The next item (unintelligible) is GNSO Bylaws Strategy Report, which we already discussed because it's on the Council agenda as well. Is there anything else we need to add to that? I guess not. We covered it already.

Then have concern about the IAG report and Whois conflicts with local law. I hope - Stephanie, are you on the phone or otherwise able to speak?

Stephanie Perrin: Hi Tapani. It's Stephanie calling. Unfortunately I've lost connectivity to the screen. So I can't see what's going on. So I don't know whether you're hearing me. Are you hearing me?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes we are hearing you. There is an echo though but it's (unintelligible). It's annoying. Otherwise...

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. I've got a big black screen. So I'm not quite sure how to turn my sound off. So I moved into another room. Is it better here?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. The echo went away.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay. Good.

Tapani Tarvainen: So please go ahead and tell us about Whois conflicts...

Stephanie Perrin: Well, there's not much to say. Basically I tabled a motion at the last Council meeting. There was not much support. Practically nothing. The registrars don't want a new PDP. I guess nobody wants a new PDP.

(Volker) has suggested that what we need is another IAG property constituted to try to come up with something that will work. I mean I was a member of the IAG. We argued for I don't know - it felt like years but I think it was only about a year to get the report that we did.

The group was scoped only to see if we could come up with a mechanism. Any other implementation group will be scoped only to come up with a mechanism. And the problem is that the policy is very narrow in terms of what you can do.

So I don't quite understand and he hasn't provided any explanation. I don't quite understand what he has in mind in terms of a differently scoped Implementation Advisory Group.

So I have put questions out with our registered pals. I haven't heard anything. Perhaps they're talking to someone else. The - what was supposed to happen between now and Hyderabad is that we would form a small group and try and draft something for a new motion. However, apart from hearing that Donna Austin wants to join that group and that (Mary) will assist us, that's all I've heard.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Stephanie. That sounds a bit - that group with two people joining and nothing else happened. But I see Kathy, you have your hand up. Kathy, please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: Stephanie, other than forming a PDP -- this is Kathy -- what else would you - what would you like to do? Is there any part of the working group report that could be embraced to go forward? And there's so many, you know, we talked about this among ourselves. I'll share it with everyone else.

There's so many things going on with Whois, it's insane. But I know that on the thick Whois they've stopped work on implementation because of questions about the privacy shield.

Obviously the RDS is doing its work. Is there any way to use a resolution to kind of delay implementation of this working group's report or whatever it is that doesn't make sense in it and kind of queue this up for policy development maybe after some of the current work on Whois and privacy takes place. Kind of a broad question but, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: ...unfortunately that leaves the - the registrars are really the key people - registrars and registries. Because they have no mechanism that works, right. And so they're basically stuck breaking the law at the moment.

We need the policy revised in my view. I mean the policy basically says break the law until you can persuade ICANN legal that you're going to be in trouble. And ICANN legal can't be persuaded.

So I mean really it's kind of a logical fallacy here. I mean how on earth could we come up with something? So really it's - I think it's up to the registrars to say okay, we're not going to do any of our obligations in the contract until we revise the privacy policy or strike a PDP to revise the policy.

I mean I wish we were getting better cooperation with the registrars in terms of how to resolve this problem but we're not; at least I'm not.

Kathy Kleiman: Thanks for the background.

Stephanie Perrin: Now the other thing about the thick Whois, and I've been hearing rumblings from some of the registrars that they would just like to rush to implement thick Whois and then the problem belongs to VeriSign.

I don't quite understand how they come up with that logic. Because they're still the ones collecting it and they're still the ones disclosing it. It's still a valid complaint in the EU system.

The fact that VeriSign then is the actual mechanism through the thick Whois is irrelevant because the interface between the individual and the whole ICANN DNS implementation of the ecosystem is through the registrar, right.

Kathy Kleiman: Right.

Stephanie Perrin: So, yes...

Kathy Kleiman: And they're the ones transferring the data to the United States out of the EU. That's a data flow issue.

Stephanie Perrin: Exactly. And they're the ones doing it. So, you know, I talked to one of them who thought this was VeriSign's problem and I said, "Well, I don't know how the hell you think that." And, you know, I'm going to see if I can get some input on that particular problem from the International Working Group on Data Protection in Telecommunications. But, you know, don't hold your breath. That takes a while, you know.

Kathy Kleiman: Well, my sense was that people were happy to see your motion at the last Council meeting and that there is some support for doing something. I wonder

if it's not our job to lead but I'm not sure what to do. That said, I have no idea what to do. So...

Stephanie Perrin: Well the problem...

Kathy Kleiman: ...but I volunteered with it.

Stephanie Perrin: ...I don't mind taking the leadership on the privacy aspects of this. But the actual logistics of how the registrars do their business I really think - I'm reluctant to play that role, you know. First of all, I don't know enough about it even though I can superficially look from the outside. I'm not a registrar, you know.

Kathy Kleiman: Right. Right.

Stephanie Perrin: And it's their contract that they're breaking. So really it's up to them to join arms with us, you know. As far as I'm concerned they're getting free privacy advice here. Come on. Help.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Great. Thanks Stephanie.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay. Thank you Stephanie. Kathy, you still have your hand up. You want to (carry on)? Okay. Amr, you're next. Please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Hi. Thanks. This is Amr. Yes. I just wanted to add a little more context to what are some of the contractors (or these) have been saying over the past few months while working with GDD staff. GDD is the Global Domain Division. And they're responsible for sort of implementing consensus policies that are developed through the GNSO processes and adopted by the ICANN Board.

And they also I believe manage sort of the ongoing relationship between ICANN and contracted parties. So I've been involved with the Implementation Review Teams for both translation and transliteration of contracts information as well as thick Whois.

And what I'm seeing - there actually have been a few attempts by GDD staff to do this as efficiently as possible. And it is - and they do it (given) instructions from the ICANN Board to implement policies that the Board adopts making them ICANN policies.

But I think what we've been seeing from contracted parties repetitively over the past few months is a resistance to implement these policies. I think they're concern is one of cost and effort to do this especially if they are aware that following the mega PDP of the next generation on registration directory services that a significant overhaul of the old system is going to become necessary and isn't likely to begin in the next couple of years.

And so right now they are - it seems to me that they are hesitant and would prefer not to implement or make any significantly large implementations of - with other policies until the next (GEN RDS CDQ)'s is complete and they have been pushing back on this so.

So for example there was a proposal from GDP staff to emerge the implementation of (unintelligible) only in that (Type B) scoped portion of both PDP's work concerning some consistency in labeling and display of contact data and just consensus policy across both PDP's with some relevant to both PDP's and then GPA staff was from an efficiencies prospective was trying to support that away where they would be implemented together but again contracted parties objected to this and then it really seemed like they just didn't want to do too much of an overhaul on their current systems until

they know what they are going to end up with because they didn't want to do the same work twice.

I am just trying to add some context to this and I wondered what extent that same thinking plugs with the IAG's work but I don't think that the IAG's recommendations or implementations actually require contracted parties to do anything internally - it is just a process for them to use with ICANN to get waivers on some of the risk policies. Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you Amr that was useful bit of background especially for newcomers and maybe some of us old-timers as well.

Anybody else want to comment on the (unintelligible)? Okay, if not let's move on. Like to have the next ten days to (unintelligible) and working group progress - Kathy would you like to bring us up to date on that.

Kathy Kleinman: Sure, thanks. The Rights Protection Mechanism PDP Working Group is - has just moved - is just wrapping up the post delegation dispute policy which is the procedure for yanking new detailed - the new top level demand and we are moving on to phase - for the next section which is the Trademark Clearing House so we had some overview presentations and if anyone is interested I can point you to the slides or any other member can point you to the slides on the Wiki where we spent three weeks going through the Trademark Clearing House, the sunrise period and the trademark claims.

And now we are going into the Trademark Clearing House for non-commercial questions there is a lot and the big one is and Robin, Wendy, Constantinos and I when we were on the (SCI) were very concerned about this.

The biggest problem is that the Analysis Group found that 93.7% of people who encounter - of registrants who encounter a Trademark Claims Notice which means the going - in the first 90 days of general availability of the new GTLD they are trying to register a domain name and they get a notice that says, someone out there has a trademark, and in fact the notice says more than that because we didn't want to just to say that - it says, here is the trademark, here is the country, here is the category of goods and services and then you decide whether you want to go forward or not.

And what we were hoping frankly was that they would see, okay, it is, you know, an app - it is a trademark for inline skates and you are using it for a non-commercial organization - you should be able to say, okay, I agree. You know, I understand they are out there but I am using it for a different purpose. I want to register anyway.

It turns out that 94% of the people are not doing that. There is a massive chilling effect of these trademark claims notices so - and also some other problems as well in the Trademark Clearing House so if you want to join the fun come join the working group and we are creating subgroups so we actually need lots of people out there and it is really important stuff but we are going to be - if we are going to be doing it for a long time but we are in the new section and it is hard so thanks. Happy to answer any questions people have.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks Kathy. Any questions - anybody want to announce that they are going to volunteer on to some of these working groups. Please consider and so it was Kathy - thank you for the summary. Okay, Ed do you want to be the operator please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, first I want to thank Kathy for her leadership role in the RPM. I mean there are times we go into the RPM calls there are 50 people, there are (unintelligible) of us fighting the IPC and the (introductual) property (unintelligible).

Without Kathy's leadership we would be sunk and she has done a fantastic job in making sure that we are heard there. I just wanted to thank her.

When she brings up the 93.7% non-proceed figure to those of us who live in the reality based world that would indicate a problem. To show you how tilted things are our conversation has largely been about wherever that in - there is no data showing it is a problem that for some strange reason the 93.7% were all cyber-squatter (unintelligible). I - the explanations, the fightback about even investigating that number is absolutely amazing so if anybody out there has any interest in the RPM in rights protection this is a great time to get involved. This is going to last for a few years and we really do need your help but again I just wanted to thank Kathy for her leadership because without her as one of the (unintelligible) we would be sunk. Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you Ed so people do consider joining this - anybody else? Okay, I see people are typing but I see no hands up other than (unintelligible) an old hand. So let's go on. We have one more or two more items but the next one concerns about private rules being misrepresented in (unintelligible) remodel and that was - Kathy again, could you please bring us up on what exactly this was about?

Kathy Kleinman: Sure and apologies to (Fargi). She was asking in the chatroom about this earlier but I was driving my daughter to school so I couldn't answer, although I was listening to the meeting so one of us should fill her in on this.

Okay, so this is what I raised in the NCSG on the list serve. My concern is about Helsinki but they have grown - they have grown so I am going to kind of give you the full view which is that we are seeing private rules of registries being created and what concerned me initially was hearing (Mason Kohl) use his seat as the GAC GNSO liaison to present the private rules of a private trade association called the Domain Name Association, the DNA and he presented it to the GAC.

And even though he used a few special words in Helsinki that kind of implied that it was private ruled that is not how he presented it and that is not the forum and the space. He was in front the GAC as a GNSO liaison so it came out sounding like a multi-stakeholder process that this group DNA is creating best practices for registries but it is private. They are doing it privately and they are doing it without us. They are doing it without non-commercial representation.

Why is this bad - because they are coming up with really horrible private rules. Donuts has signed to deal with the motion picture association for rapid takedown of content based on the idea that the motion picture association is a trusted notifier. What - there is someone in public knowledge, a professor, (Ann Marie Brittey) who has looked at this closely and contacted me and she is furious.

She can't understand how certain things that within the context of the United States law and the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. There are some balances, there is some protection. The trusted notifier can be challenged and removed. There is none of those protections in this Donuts thing. If Motion Picture Association makes the accusation chances are that content is going down.

We are not just talking about links the way we do in traditional copyright where you take down the link. They are taking down the whole domain name. That is multiple web pages that is listed, so it is email, you know, that is yanking something out by the roots that we have always protested yanking a domain name out by the roots because of all of the speech and free expression that comes down with it and yet this is all being negotiated privately.

We are also about to see the Trademark Clearinghouse just publicize that Donuts has created its own blocking rules. We know about the Donuts private protected marks list where they use a Trademark Clearing House to block - they charge trademark owners more and they block the one string in all 200 of their top level domains but they have just come up with a new and improved version of this, also negotiated privately behind closed doors without our participation and yet ICANN is publicizing it for them.

So I am not sure the balance of this but this is huge, this is an enormous problem and so I wanted to present it. There seemed to be some interest on the list. I wanted to see what we do from here but my guess is we are only seeing the tip of the iceberg.

But I don't think private rules should be - I think we should discount and we have a multi-stakeholder process - let's use it. This is a horrible way to do things, these shadow agreements, thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you Kathy. Comments on this - Ed your hand is still up or is an old hand?

Ed Morris: No, new hand Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay, go ahead then.

Ed Morris: Okay, this is serious. We are at the embryonic stages right now in terms of what Donuts is doing and if they don't get blowback now we will see other registrars - we will see other groups copying it and in the end I am not sure how much impact our bottom up multi-stakeholder policy development process is going to have if all of these private agreements are used to subvert what we are trying to do here.

So I guess what I would suggest in terms of what we have done in the past during the (SCNG) I don't know how others would feel about this is why don't we put together a small group, assuming Kathy would be willing to be part of it because she has expertise that at least none of the rest of us. I would be happy to be a part of it and let's try to craft some sort of resolution, trying to shine light in this problem though that the PC would be able to pass and then use the resolution as a way of shining light in the (unintelligible). I think that in some ways is the best way forward for us at this point is to just try to publicize what is going on because I don't think a lot of people know about it.

So I guess - my - Kathy had said, what could we do about this? My suggestion would be let's try to put together a resolution stating what is happening, stating our opposition and then trying to get some publicity for it and (unintelligible). Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you Ed. Forming a little group on this sounds like an excellent idea. Kathy are you volunteering to (unintelligible) group?

Kathy Kleinman: Absolutely I would love to work with a few people. I think Ed's idea of a resolution. I remember we did that in the old days. We would create resolutions on our views on the UDRP and other things. That might be a really

good way to put it before the stakeholder group and then if the stakeholder group agrees to put it before ICANN. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Kathy. Okay I see Anna Loup you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Anna Loup: Yes, thank you. Yes, I am in complete agreement. I know Donuts has a history of doing things like this. I go back to the (dot wine) issue of sort of behind closed door's agreements so I would be really excited to join any group Kathy so thanks for bringing this up guys.

Kathy Kleinman: Oh terrific. Thank you Anna.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay, Anna that sounds very good. Amr, you have your hand up.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Stephanie this is Amr. I was just going to make a suggestion on this and then I think I hinted, point that in the chat on why don't we as the non-commercial stakeholder group first approach the registry stakeholder group and ask for some clarification or their position on this and based on how that goes we can start escalating the issue first perhaps to the council and then (unintelligible) but I think it might be helpful if we try to first approach the registry's stakeholder group before...

Kathy Kleinman: Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yes.

Kathy Kleinman: Amr it is Kathy. Why are you using a process that they are not using? Donuts did not ask the Registry Stakeholder Group whether they could make a deal, a private deal on content takedown with the registries. They didn't - it is not

part - it is nothing that has ever hit the multi-stakeholder model. They are using their private group, the Domain Name Association, they are organizing meetings with ICANN through it and they are misrepresenting it. They are really, really trying very hard to misrepresent it as multi-stakeholder stuff.

I am not sure, you know, this isn't Verisign, this isn't Public Interest Registry, this is a few new portfolio applicant players. I am not - I think we will lose time actually if we go through the Registry Stakeholder Group because that is - they never use the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Kathy. Well to answer your question why - for one thing I think it would be helpful to try to see eye to eye with them first in terms of using profit to get these sort of things done and I expect - I don't expect us to succeed in doing that but I am - I think it was helpful because whatever response we get from them would help us prepare internally when we want to escalate this process to the GNSO's - to the GNSO level for example at council so instead of going straight to council with this I think it would be worthwhile to try to hear them out, see what they have to say and take that into consideration before we escalate the (unintelligible). This is just a matter of taking a stepwise approach to being as fully informed as possible on what the hell is going on. Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you Amr. It is just my (unintelligible) to suggest that if you start the working group why not at least just notify the registries we trust that we are doing this and if you want to have some input before we move forward we welcome to it but not wait for it because it might slow us down.

Anyway Kathy, your hand is still up.

Kathy Kleinman: Until we have a position and a set of questions for the registries I wouldn't approach them. I think it is pre - they know what is going on. They see the announcements. They don't regulate each other - they can't and that would be an anti-trust issue.

It is our job to flag this. I agree before we go to the GNSO council of course I think it is a great idea to go to the registries but right now there is something that is going on completely outside the ICANN process by a few players and somebody has got to flag it so I guess I am - I am agreeing with Amr but I wouldn't go now, I would go after we put together our ideas and concerns so that there is something kind of coherent that we have agreed on that we can take to them - that is what I would recommend.

Stephanie Perrin: That is a really good plan. In any case let's form that little group to work on this and there we can - you can - I might even join you if I find the time and we can work on at what point we can approach the registry (unintelligible).

Okay, so we are leaving up to call that group up - anything else on this subject? Okay, since we are - that is good enough so far and hoping for that group to get things done.

Okay, the final item I have on the agenda is the Hyderabad preparations. First I want to know that there are a couple of things that organizing that have not been well organized so to speak. This I assure has already been mentioned that we are missing some people because they couldn't get visas. Other (unintelligible) that the schedule is still a mess. We still don't know exactly what is going to happen and when things - we will not have a (unintelligible) in one day as we used to instead we will have two half days and so the high interest topics like seven of them maybe at - will be conflicting with whatever else.

Okay, Rafik seems to be concurring with that. We are - anyway we are working with Rafik and Klaus trying to sort this schedule out so that we can somehow fit everything we want to do without overlapping too much.

I am not sure if there is much we need to discuss here but if you have any questions - okay Kathy you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Kathy Kleinman: Yes, quick question to (unintelligible). When - I mean do we know when those two half day sessions are currently scheduled for? Is there anything - have people seen a schedule because I haven't - thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Well people don't have a schedule because there isn't one but there would be Sunday and Monday (unintelligible) Rafik. I think I have it some - so it is a plan somewhere but.

Rafik Dammak: Hello, yes, this is Rafik. Yes, we don't have a schedule yet. It is a quite a mess because of this year for this meeting we don't have a full (unintelligible) day and it is split between two days and this creates really a lot of (unintelligible) for us to fit (unintelligible) within the two days and including also the meeting with the board. On the other hand for this meeting (unintelligible) we have except for the high interest of the (unintelligible) so things are still moving on and we don't have a clear idea when our own (unintelligible) so probably we will get some update in coming days but still have to work out on the planning so I - just please bear with us for the coming days. It is - for my own experience it is very (unintelligible) to have such difficulties in three years so we will see how it will end up for Hyderabad.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, thank you Rafik it is (unintelligible) because it is a new meeting - ABC Meeting System seems to be making things much more difficult than they

used to be. Well maybe it is just growing pains so - well let's hope it will get easier later. Anyway at the moment it is being a major pain to sort things out. (Kay) your hand is up - you want to speak or is it an old hand?

I guess we have seen several scheduled versions that seem to be old but the time (unintelligible) out. Okay, I think Kathy that must be an old hand because you are not - picking up anybody else want to comment on this. Okay, I just note that we still don't know much and will try to keep you posted as soon as we get things under control.

Okay, that was the list item on my agenda. Anybody else - any other business related to - well anything (SGST) is up to - Ed please go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, thanks Stephanie. I hate to screen this to people at the end but within the past week James Bladel was just nominated for another term as the Council Chair and, you know, I certainly would support James. I just want to know whether we should be taking some sort of formal action on the PC or individual councilors themselves to suggest whether we will support him or whether we want, you know, a non-commercial party's house to nominate a candidate to oppose him. The last few was obviously a bit of a disaster so I just wanted to get it out so we are starting to talk about and get up in front of this.

Stephanie Perrin: That is a good question Ed. Is there anybody who thinks we should try to find an opposing candidate to run against James Bladel or (unintelligible)?

Ed Morris: I actually would propose that we don't do that Stephanie and that it - just to get this thing done so we can move on whether - like all of the councilors or whether the PC should actually state that we are pleased with James and we

want him to continue his chair and we don't want to support any candidates who oppose him.

We also need to - I know David in the last call said he was going to get to work on this and we need to figure out what we are going to do with the Vice Chair for next year as well. This stuff is coming up real soon so I think we need to talk about it and get a unified position.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you Ed, yes, it seems that we have pretty much a consensus about supporting James for the second term. As for the Vice-Chair issue I understand there is also a fair consensus that we could support Heather for second term but with some kind of a understanding with the CSG that it should roughly alternate between CSG and NCSG but not formally tied to any of (unintelligible) that they get to nominate whoever they want and we will have to live with that or vice versa so the process would be something along the lines that the Vice Chair usually would serve the second term unless objected to strongly on that point and then if not, the same stakeholder group would nominate a (unintelligible) for the second upcoming term but that would be (unintelligible) test for one year and after that and of course that again would be subject to review and approval by the others (unintelligible) and after two years when one (unintelligible) would be at least (unintelligible). The first chance will be to the non-income (unintelligible) so to speak at the (unintelligible) after that the first nomination opportunity to be - to come to us and again the others would have a chance to oppose and so that kind of process would be appropriate.

I guess that is the kind of process we want - well I think we discussed this last time. Anything else - anybody want to comment on this or any other business? I see people are typing - nobody has their hand up.

Okay, so I guess we are done.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie can I jump in?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes this is Stephanie Perrin calling and I will try and kill my sound here. I have asked Maryam to note that the call quality is really bad for some of us. I would like to know how many people are having difficulties with the new Adobe Interface and I would certainly like a solution if somebody can come up with it.

I am going to have to listen to the call again because the call disconnects so frequently that I have only heard about - well I guess I have heard three quarters of it. So I am really sorry because I wanted to participate in this call. There is a number of very important policy issues that we need to prepare for - for Hyderabad and unfortunately I missed most of the discussion on some of the important ones.

So please can someone convey to ICANN that we need this problem fixed before Hyderabad and they are not moving too quick on it. Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you Stephanie. I will certainly take that in but it would be really useful indeed if everybody who had trouble would let us know say me or (Mary) an email or write in the chat or whatever. For some strange reason it seems to be working quite well for me. Ed, you have your hand up.

Ed Morris: Yes, Stephanie Carlos is (unintelligible)>

Stephanie Perrin: Tell us what your configuration is because I would go out and buy a new Acer if it was my Mac - if it is - like I don't know what it is, you know. This is a nightmare and I think it is a nightmare for Carlos and he is off the call now so.

Ed Morris: Yes, I was going to mention that. On that I - Stephanie are you having trouble - are you going in the Phone Bridge has well or just trying to do it on (unintelligible)?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, you are hearing me over the Phone Bridge but it is important to - like it goes in and out every couple of minutes.

Ed Morris: It is not just Adobe, it is the phone as well because they haven't change the phone provider.

Stephanie Perrin: No, no, no, the phone is fine but I mean it is not (unintelligible)...

Ed Morris: Okay, the phone is fine - okay so the phone is fine...

Stephanie Perrin: ...to run a call when you are trying to follow the text on the screen and read the chat. It means that you have (unintelligible)>

Ed Morris: Yes, I have been knocked out twice on Adobe in this call. It is because - ever since they switched to the participate icon (unintelligible) it has been a bit of a nightmare. The Phone Bridge has worked fine for me recently though but I agree it is a problem not just here, it is a problem in the working groups I am in.

Literally I can't recall the last call that I have actually been able to stay in Adobe for the entire call so add my name to the chorus of folks that are having trouble.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay, thank you Ed so Maryam try to collect all the names who - the people who complained so we can get at least a count showing how many people but it seems like rough count like it is half of the participants so have complained so it is just pretty bad. I am just lucky - any other comments - any other business? Okay, let's close this call. Thank you everybody for being present and councilors have a good meeting on Thursday and close the recording and thank you everybody.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you everyone for attending the call. JR you may now stop the recording. Thank you very much.

END