Scott Pinzon: In the functional spec we're turning in, we're saying it needs to do what this one does, which is it can aggregate views. So if you just want to see, when is the next meeting of the work group you're on, there's a place you can click and filter out everybody else's activities, and just get a nice, clean view of what you're doing next.

In this particular view, it's everything that's going on aggregated into one view so you can get various slices of looking at what's going on.

One of the other design goals we set, besides making those three tasks easier – finding documents and using the calendar and finding things by issue – we also set out to make it a much more friendly place for newcomers to visit. So for folks who come in and they don't even know what GNSO stands for, we're suggesting that there will be some visitor-friendly stuff here that would have a glossary and explain the mission. So I'll have more to say about that.

I'm going to work my way across these tabs and explain what we have in mind here. So that's the home page. The next page would be this so-called About page. And this is not where any work is done by the GNSO, this is strictly to describe the GNSO. And this is almost a Web convention now. If you go to any business site, you usually see that About tab, and it gives the corporate history, and who the management is. So this is in that same idea.

But one thing I'm suggesting, and would love to get your feedback on whether you agree, is that what greets a visitor are these little videos. And this is basically with recruitment in mind, and orientation. These would only be a couple minutes long. But you could come here and just get a quick sense of what are some of the issues being dealt with right now.

This one I'm calling Community Values, the idea is we keep saying we're a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus-driven organization. It's not intuitive what we mean by that, so that would just explain what that stuff is.

You know, how does the policy process work? And this one, we wouldn't call it The Recruitment Video, literally, but it would just be something welcoming to show why the work of the GNSO makes a difference, and encouraging people to join in.

And similarly, I'd love to have up here a little video from whoever the new Chair is going to be. Just a minute long saying we're glad you've shown an interest, we would love you to participate, or whatever.

So those are suggestions of ways to kind of pull people in and help them get oriented.

In the interest of time, I'm not going to drive down farther down this list, but what would happen if you started going down the list is you would actually get to see pictures of who is on the Council, executive committees, folks that it would be good to know as you get oriented in ICANN.

Moving on to the Ongoing Work tab. Now, this is where you would find things literally by issue. And what we have done, intentionally, is we've divided the workup between what is essentially housekeeping work of the GNSO and how it governs itself, as opposed to actual Internet policy. And the thought here is that these two boxes would express everything that's ongoing right now for groups that are in hiatus or it looks like they're done, or they are done. There would be an archive section. These things are not complete listings. They're just used as examples.

If you clicked on that previous page, you see a list of policies. Let's pretend the person clicked on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery. Then you would go to the kind of assortment of materials you're used to getting right now from the Issues page. But there are a couple of additions here.

One is breadcrumbs. Right now, if you start following a path down the GNSO Website and you realize it's not the path you want, you have to backspace six times to get somewhere. This would enable you to simply go, "Oh, I don't even want this tab." You could, depending on how deep you are, one click later, you could be back to where you wished you were.

Another thing we're proposing here is that by each issue or topic, there's contact lists that shows what staff members are most closely associated with working that issue. If you want, we could also have things like the name of the group's Chair or whoever you would contact to work with this issue.

Over here, we also have links immediately from the issue to the working group dealing with it, to their Wiki to their mailing list – whatever else. And I'll have more to say about this in a second, but for visitors who are really not sure what Post-Expiring Domain Name Recovery is in this example, there's a way that they can link out to a tab I'll describe in a minute called Basics, which basically gives them an orientation of what this subject is about.

Now, before I introduce the next tab, I want to just mention that, as Web users, we use data in several ways. The same person has different needs at different times. So, so far, what I've shown you is kind of using data by what it means. I want to learn about DNSSEC and so I'm looking for anything about DNSSEC.

But we also sometimes, in ICANN, use data for what it is, in the sense that sometimes you just need to see Council resolutions. You may not know what's in them, you don't know what they mean – you just know you have to find the resolutions. So that's what I mean by the "business" of a document. You know, you need to see a charter, because it's the charter. So you should be able to look things up that way.

And then sometimes we don't want data for what it means or what it is, we want it for when it is. This is why we turn on BBC News or CNN. We don't know what we're going to get, we just know it's the latest.

So we try to keep all these views in mind in restructuring the site.

So this next tab that we've called Library is how you find things based on what it is. And what we've got here on the home page of the Library is just a really nice search tool. And it's got a couple of merits to it. Besides searching by keyword, you can filter. You know, a lot of times, you're looking for things, and you remember that it was either correspondence or a contract. You can start clicking by what things are, so it will filter your search results.

We've also got an Exclude button that reverses what this does. So if you're looking around and you go, "I can't remember what I saw, but I know it was not in email," you can click Exclude and click Mailing List, and then you won't get ever time someone mentioned the subject in a email. But you'll get, hopefully, more meaningful documents.

So we're kind of excited about that. We think it'll be a very helpful tool.

Over here to the right, this is part of the fact that the site is now being built dynamically. You can do things like what were the 10 most recently added documents on the site. This could just perpetually update itself. So if you're looking for something, and you know it just went up today, you might be able to find it here without any further search.

We could also do things like keep a running list of what documents are being the most accessed in the last, say, week or month. So, again, if you're looking for something and it's the kind of thing there's a lot of activity around, it might be here before you even have to do any searching at all.

Moving on to the Group Activities page, this is now where we really envision trying to make a front end that will help you do your work more efficiently by gathering resources that you wished you have in one place. However, this being the home page for the whole world of groups, it goes everything from the Council down to the tiniest, newest drafting team in our concept.

This box labeled Publications and Milestones would be a place that groups can list things that they've accomplished that are actually in their charter, or were in their Milestones, so that we can have a running list of the fact that, yes, things are actually getting done.

Group News can be things like announcements, calls for volunteers, whatever you want.

And then here's another idea that we would really love to get input on. Every place I have ever worked in the office, there's been some bulletin board, usually in the break room, where people put things like a picture of their new grandbaby, or the fact that they competed in a triathlon, or whatever.

All that stuff is kind of missing from ICANN's community. Not in fact, but just simply by the idea that we're disbursed and we don't tend to talk in those terms to each other. We're wondering if the GNSO would like to have a spot for that kind of thing, simply to humanize the dialogue that we have with each other. Sometimes, when we begin to relate on these levels, it's a lot easier.

We had this great example of Roberto and Chuck talking about how they were on opposite sides of issues, but they found they could like and respect each other. Maybe this would be a way to promote that kind of engagement. We'd love to know if that's something you favor.

So, assuming you're on the Group Activities page and you clicked on Active Groups and Teams, conceptually, it would go like this. You would just simply get a list of all the work teams and work groups right now. This doesn't exist on the GNSO site, so that would be a victory in itself.

But we also looked at all kinds of ways that this could be sliced up and subdivided and all that. And in the end, we decided, "You know, just put

them in alphabetical order. You can find it fast enough." The thought here is that these are Active Groups, and there's another click for Inactive Groups. So this list should remain more or less manageable using that criteria.

So once again, let's pretend like you clicked on one of these groups and it was the Communication Work Team. Now you're seeing the kinds of resources that you may be used to seeing on your Wiki. We found that most people find the social text Wiki clumsy and they don't like to work with it, so they rely on staff to do it.

If that's the case, then why don't we just commit to it and let staff maintain this page, and keep the data, then, on ICANN's site, where it can be protected, and it can be reliably backed up, and all that sort of thing? You still have a link out to the Wiki page, which, in this concept, is more for engaging with one another on your work group. But you can have the documents out there if you want.

The work group's calendar could show up here, a little explanatory text up here if you wanted to keep right in front of your eyes what your charter is or the five questions you're supposed to answer or whatever. You could have it right there on your team's homepage.

And then, one other thing I'll highlight here. You see these little boxes that end with the word more. One of the things we discovered in interviewing folks is that they really hate the amount of scrolling that the GNSO Website requires right now. So this whole design was set up to minimize the amount you would have to scroll.

So the thought here is, as your group wears on in time – let's pretend that this box is transcripts of your meetings – this list could get very, very long. But it means that if what you really wanted was to go down here and refer to your charter or some reference material, you would have to scroll two, three screenfuls to get to it.

What we're suggesting instead is that these little boxes are always, say, the top four or five most recent links. If you want to go further, you hit the More button, and then you find the rest of them. But otherwise, this always stays manageable so that whatever you're looking for, you don't have to scroll a bunch to get to it.

I am now on the Basics tab. The thought here is twofold. First, there are a lot of newcomers who arrive at ICANN, and it's very difficult to get enough

background information to start actually participating on a subject. So the thought here is that you would aggregate all the kinds of things that we do. Like this week, we have workshops. At-Large, for example, for months has been putting on Webinars and audio briefings.

These are the things that are not policy work. They're the background and the analysis that supports doing the policy work. You can't find them all in once place right now on the site. So the thought would be that for each topic, you just aggregate whether it's a podcast or a video or a workshop or whatever, it's all in one spot for beginners to that topic.

Now, the other thing is that a lot of us have been in ICANN for a while, but on specific issues we might be a beginner. So you could be a veteran ICANNer, but maybe you didn't know what Fast Flux Hosting was when it first came up. Well then, you would have a place you reliably could come to find background information that explains, in this example, how Fast Flux Hosting works, and what a short time-to-live means, and how DNS functions in this context, and some of that good background stuff.

We also provide here, though, in each of these cases, a link to the Work page, the Ongoing Work Issues page, that's related to that issue. So if you get the background, and now you're ready to take the deeper dive, there's an easy way to do it.

And last tab I want to show you is the News page. And this is the when-it-is slice on information. And the one thing I wanted to really point out here is the notion of building more RSS feeds. Does everybody here know RSS? I imagine so. Difficult for ICANN to do right now because it's a static site. But with a dynamic site and things are already being tagged anyway, it's really simple to put very specific feeds together. And all you have to do is ask for them, and we can assemble them.

So if you wished you didn't have to come here at all – that each time the Council passed resolutions, the resolutions just got pushed to you, we could do it. And as we compile more and more of these feeds, you would come to the News page to see the list of what they are, and decide which ones you want.

One of the other design objectives we had was to make the GNSO site less siloed. Right now, if you're on it, there's actually no link right back to ICANN.org. And it can be very frustrating to navigate. So in our design concept, we have things like places to link out to. For example, the Seoul

Meeting Site, a lot of these boxes we have that say To Be Determined, they're meant as placeholders for things that take you to other relevant portions of the ICANN Web world.

So that is a lightning fast overview. We would love to know what you think of it, and if there's items you wish we would fine-tune or whatever, I am happy to marshal those comments myself. My email address is at the bottom: Scott.Pinzon@icann.org. Or if you have questions about it and would love to talk with us more, that's Ken Bauer in the center. He and I will be at the ICANN booth in the lobby at lunch hours tomorrow and Thursday. So if you would like to see more about this or have questions or concerns, you can talk directly to us.

Jeff Newman: So who actually does all the updates in the site? Or is it different?

Male: Good question.

Jeff Newman: Yes. Or is it different for each section? Like, a Wiki could be updated by any of its members. Who's the one who is responsible for updating all of these different...

Male: I think Jeff's volunteering, isn't he?

Scott Pinzon: The beauty of this is that once the tagging is done, it all self-distributes. So basically, Glen would be doing the majority of this the same way she posts the majority of documents now. But she would tag it, and then the logic on the back end sends it off to all these places. So you can see the same data three different ways or whatever. Yes?

Thomas Roessler: I have one quick question, and I missed part of the presentation, so apologies in advance if you have answered this one. I remember the time when the DNSO Website became the GNSO Website, and a hell of a lot of stuff couldn't be found anymore.

Scott Pinzon: Yes.

Thomas Roessler: Are you leaving the old archives, the old documents, all that, alone in the same place?

Scott Pinzon: Yes and no.

Thomas Roessler: Wrong answer, sorry.

Scott Pinzon: Yes.

Thomas Roessler: The important thing here is, this is a lot of really important record of how decisions have come to be. Please make sure that the links remain in place. The links from the mailing list archives to the draft documents to whatever else. You are playing around here with the equivalent of historical and legislative record. Treat it as such. Thank you.

Scott Pinzon: Noted. Any other comments?

Male: I've got to say, it looks pretty good.

Scott Pinzon: Thanks.

Male: It looks like you guys did a really good job. But I agree with Thomas that we obviously need to make sure that those links aren't broken, because sometimes those links are embedded in other documents, so that's a tough job to do. But I think it looks good.

Scott Pinzon: Well, yes. Sorry. I want to assure you, we already made the migration to the dynamic side, and none of you noticed. We did it in September. So, it didn't break much.

Male: Much.

Scott Pinzon: I'm not going to tell you what it did break, because if you didn't find it, don't worry, we're fixing it.

Male: And for Scott, I had recommended previously that he not show the before and after with the ICANN site, but rather, do the before and after with the previous GNSO site, because then, I think you have a better understanding of the stark contrast.

Male: Wait. So you're saying you've migrated. So I'm on the GNSO site. Is it - what do you...?

Scott Pinzon: Oh, sorry. Due to the brevity of this presentation, I forgot there's some things I normally cover and didn't.

                  This goes back to the slide I had with the little yellow flower. The GNSO site that you've been used to seeing, there was really nothing in a database

anywhere. Now all of this is, and it's being displayed by Drupal in the background in response to queries, as opposed to the static way it was.

So the moment we say, "Okay, we can take this live," everything's already in there. And a lot of what I've been showing you is already implemented, but it's not being displayed as the live site yet.

Male: I want to raise a process issue and I want Michael to especially listen to this. As far as I know, this hasn't been approved by the OSC or the Council yet. So should we really be doing all this – and I'm saying that in jest, okay – because of experiences we've had in one working team where a process was more important than getting things done.

But I really compliment you. I've picked up some new things, beyond what I saw on the Webinar earlier that David and I participated in, so nice job.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you. I know you're kidding, but I also will take the point seriously. The reason we're here showing you is because we want the input. Nothing will happen until we get an official okay to make it live.

Male: Yes, and let me just emphasize, too, as I mentioned earlier in the day today, the recommendations of the CCT are going to be finalized. What the recommendations are, are a set of business requirements. It should be a new Website that should be easily navigable. It should have the ability to find documents. Business requirements are very high level. When you get to actually putting meat on the bone, that's the next step.

So, truly, for this working group, our only task was to come up with the business requirements. I think that largely because of Scott and Ken Bauer and others, we did even more than was required by this deadline by getting started in examining what the Website would look like with the wire frames.

So when we got the business requirements pulled together pretty quickly, we thought that it would be a waste of a period of months if we didn't at least get a running head start down this direction. But if we're just flat wrong about any of the business requirements, we can roll all this back, because nothing's actually been implemented. It's for review.

Male: So this all has to wait until the Council votes on it.

Chuck Gomes: It's obviously not waiting. I mean, that's the nice thing about this (unintelligible 22:42) things. But ultimately, the process, they're finalizing

their report that'll go to the OSC. I call tell you the OSC, I don't suspect that they will disagree with much there, and then it'll go to the Council.

David Maher: Chuck, I'm sorry to cut this off a bit, but Greg, our 2:30 presentation is now 15 minutes late.

Male: The group wants me to present. I knew that a focus area is going to be this proposal, and the new gTLD program for mitigating malicious conduct related to centralized zone file access. So I could kind of describe why that provision is in there. If, however, we wanted to do a broader discussion of what the mitigation program looks like in new gTLDs, I could also do that. In which case, I could throw a thumb drive to whichever computer's driving this screen and go through the kind of presentation I use on that.

So in some ways, I want to be guided by the group's need in terms of what information I present.

David Maher: Any votes in favor of either kind of presentation?

Chuck Gomes: Well, having participated in the Webinar on this, my vote is kind of determined by that, but other people may have more needs than me on this, so I'm open.

David Maher: Well, let's start with a more concise presentation.

Male: Okay. Well, I've made a couple of presentations, a Webinar for the community for the whole, an overview at the new gTLD orientation, and then a focus session on malicious conduct yesterday afternoon.

A concise overview of the broad set of measures related to mitigating malicious conduct in new gTLD basically runs that we received input from a wide variety of groups, the Anti-Phishing Working Group, the Registry Internet Safety Group, the First in the CERT community, and the Banking and Finance community kind of being principal substantive inputters as to what sort of measures needed to be put into place.

As a result of that, we identified a series of issues that we felt needed to be addressed in the mitigation measures that we would consider putting in place, which basically make sure that registries are not run by bad actors, that the technical operation of those registries ensures the integrity of the data, and that the data provided out through services such as Whois, and

access to zone files is usable by the responder community. And then there was a proposal for a high security zone verification program.

Again, in the interests of the people here, we could go into any one of those provisions in more depth. What I had kind of cued up to be ready for in terms of a discussion, was I know that – I think it was in the Registry Steering Group call, which I didn't make, but Jeff Bickers, who works on my team, presented these. And there were some concerns raised. I did not get a lot of specifics related to the specific provision about the potential for centralized zone file access.

So I could talk a little bit more about why that provision is in the Draft Applicant Guidebook, what the parameters around that provision are, as it's currently drafted, try to explain not only that we think it's good for the response community to have a centralized zone file in order to lower, basically, their overhead in terms of getting the information they need to identify malicious behavior, but also why I think maybe if they're properly implemented, the new registries themselves may find this something that's valuable.

And then, I want to make sure that I use this conversation to understand any concerns, particularly the detail of those concerns, and mention the fact that if we continue to move forward on this specific proposal that it will probably initiate a working group in short order, to make sure that we're hearing both the Registry Operations' side of this, as well as the users' side in terms of any sort of centralized zone file repository.

So, do you want me to focus a little more on the centralized zone file? Okay, I'm going to do that, but what I want to do is make sure I speak from the specific language that's in the Draft Applicant Guidebook.

:   This is from the explanatory memo around malicious conduct. But that memo, for each of the mitigation measures suggested actually also synopsizes or provides the language provided in the Draft Applicant Guidebook.

So the way it's currently constructed in DAG 3 is a similar provision to what I understand exists in the contracts with all the existing gTLDs. It will exist for new registry operators, basically, requiring bulk access to zone files.

What the DAG now does is open up the possibility that ICANN could establish a central zone file depository in that there would be a requirement

for the new registry operator to provide zone file data to that repository. Again, it could be operated by ICANN, or it could be operated by a third party. And then that would allow us to waive the provision that a new operator had to provide that zone file access themselves.

So the driver behind this really comes from the users, particularly the security responder users of this zone file data, whether it's law enforcement, security firms, security researchers, who are very reliant on this data, to characterize malicious conduct that's going on, and to enable a response that currently they have to reach to each registry operator separately. There's separate legal agreements, there's separate technical…

This occurs differently technically with each of the people that they're working with in that that has significant overhead as currently constructed. And in a situation where there are scores or hundreds of new gTLDs, that if this was handcrafted for each registry operator that this becomes an order of magnitude or too great a challenge for them to simply get data that is supposed to be publicly accessible, but the overhead costs would rise significantly just to get that data, let alone try to organize it in a larger new gTLD space or overall gTLD space.

So the suggestion – go ahead, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Didn't mean to interrupt you right in the middle of a sentence, and we can postpone discussing this if you'd rather go through the whole thing. Would you rather me let you go through that?

Male: Let's wait. I think it's probably a good point. So the suggestion was made by that community that in terms of mitigating conduct, that this was both a good idea and I think they believe, an implementable idea in a way that would be viable from the registry perspective, as well. But we haven't had a robust dialogue with the registries about how to do this in an efficient fashion.

Chuck Gomes: So what, and you've heard most of these things before, but if we go that way, what's envisioned in terms of filling in the blanks, filling in the details in terms of how this would happen? Is there a process envisioned? Is that still to be developed?

Male: I do have a process in mind, which is to constitute a working group. This body probably will be this mailing list. Get the interested parties from the registry perspective, also use our contacts in the security response community, form a small working group probably co-chaired by both a

registry person and a user or security responder person. And table an implementation concept paper as a basis for discussion about how to do this. And really work hard on making it something that legally and technically is a viable proposition. That would be the process I would plan to run.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, you'll probably need a legal member of that team, as well, because a lot of the questions that have to be answered, as you already know, are things like who gets access and how do you authenticate them, and what kind of controls are there for the information, etc.

Because obviously, a centralized zone file access in the wrong hands could create as many problems as it solves. So those kind of questions – we don't have to answer those here – but those are all the kind of details. And then, of course, questions like would we, as registries, be feeding ICANN the information like we're already obligated to do, and then ICANN takes it from there? Those kinds of things all have to be worked out.

But thanks for answering the question in terms of your vision of a process.

Greg Rattray: And I do want to address the issue of providing insurance to the participating registries that there's control over the access. So I'm not a person that currently uses the system to draw on zone files. Talking with two individuals who spend a lot of their time working that system right now, they're pretty confident, while there are some higher-grade practices for access control, that in general, the authentication mechanisms in place for the current diverse set of zone file accesses are not particularly strong.

And, from my perspective, one of the things I'd want to ensure is that this had a high-grade control and authorization process that would also provide us the opportunity to actually gather some data as to who actually goes after zone file data, that might provide some interesting statistics.

Chuck Gomes: Now that's probably one of the most challenging things of all, because maybe in some countries or something, you might be able to easily identify what law enforcement officials or something might have that access. But you get into intellectual property, what it's bringing back is memories of WHOIS discussions.

For example, tied access to WHOIS, and how do you define who gets access? They're not trivial problems. And I'm not raising those to be difficult, but that's probably one of the biggest challenges is defining who gets access.

Deleted: Male

Once you can solve that problem, you can probably deal with the authentication through means that are available today.

Greg Rattray: Michael's got a question.

Michael: Yes. I want to say this diplomatically, because I know you have the best of intents. But I'm really disappointed with this process right out of the gate, because the solution's already staring at me off the screen. I mean, we're getting a working group together to discuss something that's already been put in DAG 3. This seems to me to be backwards. Wouldn't it have been better to form a working group and pose the question, how do we distribute the zone file efficiently, and yet not open vectors that allow people to behave badly and use the zone file data in a nefarious way?

Because right now, I can tell you that at least as a registry operator, how we distribute the zone files and how we react to who's downloading them is very much tied to who's hitting our WHOIS, and how they appear to be using that information.

If we see somebody hammering WHOIS servers that we've rate-limited coming from the same IPs, and those are the same IP addresses they've given us to seek permission to download the zone files, they lose their ability to download the zone file, because we see that they're clearly using the zone file to data-mine.

So if we go to centralized distribution, how do we maintain a very, very smart and fair process to protect the registrants against data mining?

Greg Rattray: There's two aspects to the comment. First, the process one. So, fair enough that given more time that we could have worked through the implementation details of this more and decided whether it was a good idea before we put it into the DAG 3. The language up there clearly makes it that we haven't committed to doing this. So we want to do the exploration of the concept because of the strong desire of some of the people who did make inputs on the last version of the Draft Applicant Guidebook that this would be a good idea.

So we're not pre-committed to actually implementation at this point. We need to make sure that their concept would be workable. Again, there's going to be a lot of devils in the details, and hopefully this won't get messy enough that a good concept is basically intractable. And implementation, that's certainly a possible outcome.

What we need more of – because we didn't have it so far – is the types of things that you're currently doing that would still have to be enabled by such a construct.

Michael: Okay. Thank you.

Greg Rattray: Jeff?

Jeff Newman: One of the other things with access, even some of the most well-intentioned security vendors out there – and I noticed this with Conficker and other examples – tend to use this information for commercial benefit, as well. On the one hand, they'll use some of this data to actually do something good. On the other hand, they'll aggregate it, put it into a security report, and make a commercialized product out of it.

So, while you allow some of these good vendors in – and I'm thinking of Symantec and Cyveillance and MarkMonitor, and these are companies that actually do really good things with it – but then they also, when they have access to a good amount of data, they turn it into a commercial product as well.

So, my question is, it's not only providing access to these entities, it's making sure these entities don't use it for purposes for which it was not intended. We're not putting this data out to develop someone else's commercial service.

Greg Rattray: Fair enough. And that's certainly the type of thing we could bring to the working group, and provisions for how the data is used after access could be drafted in that regard. Again, it might tighten down the misuse of it.

But fair enough.   We're not trying to provide commercial advantage to somebody through creating this.

Male: Again, I feel like I'm piling on, but I think we have the same points that we already provide this service today. In fact, VeriSign has an additional service that provides real-time updates. So if you're looking for something that helps protect against trademarks or protects against different types of phishing attacks and you want real-time information to what's being updated in the zone, we have a separate service for that.

Are you advocating that we include that service in this, because you're really, in one sense, impacting the ability for a registry to innovate new services that they would offer, as well?

So I really think that what's important is not figure out how to implement a centralized repository, but to figure out what the problem is that you're trying to solve and where it should be solved, whether this could be something that a third party could go off and create their own service.

So maybe there is a commercial service that somebody is going to offer to the intellectual property community. And I'm just throwing out ideas. But first, let's figure out what the problem is that we're solving, then figure out what the right solution is and whether it's appropriate to be done in this form or some other format.

Greg Rattray: So if we form a working group, we may well quickly put other solutions on the table in addition to the one considered here.

But the problem statement's fairly clear, which is in a situation where there are hundreds, potentially, of gTLDs that will have an obligation to make their zone files accessible, how do you provide those people who use that, particularly from a security response perspective, a scalable fashion, to get that data that does not envision separate contractual and technical connections to each of the registries.

That's the problem proposition put to us. Again, we said one way to do that would be to consider the creation of a central zone file depository. There may be others.

Male: Right. And there could be just a standardized connection mechanism. Because, I mean, once you establish that, it's all automated, right? And even having a centralized repository, I think, has technical challenges because we aren't all going to update our data at the same time. So when do you go get that?

And I think a lot of the types of issues that you're trying to solve, timeliness of the data may be important. And as we evolve, I mean, right now, I think all of us have an obligation to update that zone file daily. If that isn't sufficient enough for the types of problems that you're trying to solve and you want to do it more frequently, then the centralized repository where I go get it as frequently as I want and everybody's updating it differently, you wind up with different technical challenges. And somebody's still solving that problem.

And if I need that data, all I've got to do is write a script that's going to go up and do the connections to the different registries and pull the data back that meets my needs.

So I'm not sure that I really understand how this is solving the problem.

Greg Rattray: If the access is standardized, my understanding of the problem is one way to skin the cat would be if you had a standardized access set of procedures so the user could use one server and pull where he needed to when. But that's currently not the state of the art. Far from it, that there's fairly different implementations that require significant upkeep to make sure that it's accessible at the very procedural level. What I was told was that there's not a significant variation in the legal contracts that surround this, but there's small variations in the agreements around this.

Male: I think the contracts are almost identical. It changes the name of the TLD from one to the other.

Greg Rattray: There were some small variations. And I guess the other point to make clear is that this is envisioned for new registries isn't an obligation we're seeking to address with existing registries.

David Maher: Anyone else? If not?

Greg Rattray: So I think we've started the discussion about the viability of the idea and the challenges to good implementation. Again, my approach will be to create a virtual working group. It really is more a forum for discussion and making sure that all the concerns about how to do this are identified. I try to get both sides of the equation in to people with knowledge of it from a registry perspective. And both challenges and why individualized zone file access has some specific advantages. And then have those on the other side who need some scalability explained, how that would work, and maybe some alternatives will come out of it.

As the guy leading the mitigation measures in this area, I'm not committed to any specific approach. I'm committed to addressing the question at hand.

Thank you.

David Maher: Thank you. We appreciate your taking the time to inform us.

Deleted: Male

Deleted: Male

Deleted: Male

We actually have a couple of agenda items that didn't get entered into the list this morning, and this is probably a good time. We're waiting for David Giza, but he said he'd be late. He won't be here until 3:45, which is 40 minutes from now.

So Chuck, is this a good time to handle those issues?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. I sent a URL link around to the list sometime in the last few days with the motions that are on the table for the GNSO Council meeting tomorrow. And we've covered a couple of those already.

There are actually two motions related to the GNSO Council operating procedures that Ray talked about earlier. One of them is an amendment to one part of those procedures. And then there's the approval of the procedures itself.

And the feedback I receive this morning, basically because there was no feedback, is that the three of us as councilors should support those motions. If anybody needs to talk about that more, we can, but otherwise, I will go right on to a motion related to the secret ballot for the Chair election.

Now, what I saw on this list, most people seem to be opposed to a secret ballot. But again, for the sake of Edmon and Jordi and I, we just need to confirm, should we oppose the secret ballot? Should we split our vote? If we can just spend a couple minutes on that, that would be helpful.

So, just to give the background for those that aren't aware of it, Cristina Rosetta proposed that we have a secret ballot for the Chair election. It's not totally unprecedented, because our ballots that we do via email for Board members or so forth, those things are really secret. Only the person who votes knows what they did.

But I'm not advocating it being secret. I would personally rather it be open. My view as I expressed on our own list was if somebody's uncomfortable, it's fine. I can respect their concerns and have it closed.

But a lot of you made very good points in that regard, with regard to openness of the ballot and so forth. So the three of us just need to know how we vote on that particular motion for a secret ballot.

David Maher: Any discussion?

Greg Rattray: Just a question. When the Board votes, isn't that documented who votes which way?

Chuck Gomes: It's an interesting question. I think in the public meetings, yes. I don't know that that happens in their telephone meetings that they have in between, every month. I'm not sure. I don't know if anybody knows that.

Greg Rattray: I think it does show. But a lot of them are sort of unanimous. And then just the ones that are abstaining are being identified. I think you're right.

Greg Rattray: So if those are indicated, then why would the Council operate differently?

Chuck Gomes: It's not so much the Council is advocated operating differently.   Once councilor requested in this case that it be a secret ballot, and that's why the motion's on the table.

Jeff Newman: I think most of the people commented that we didn't see a reason for it to be secret, so I think given that, we should oppose it.

David Maher: Yes. Jeff?

Chuck Gomes: And by the way, Jeff, I interpreted the same thing from the comments on the list. All I'm trying to do right here is confirm that. And should all three of us vote against that, I'm fine with that. I just want to make sure we have the direction.

Jordi Iparraquirre: I fully agree on being open on the vote, I believe maybe this is because I missed something that happened in Sydney is that she does not want to vote secret just for the sake of it, but because of something happened in Sydney that make her feel uncomfortable. And then the answer is okay. The solution for that is not to vote secret, but to prevent that thing that make her feel uncomfortable to happen again, which I understand was something happened with the public. I was not there, so I cannot judge.

But I'm fully for an open vote.

Greg Rattray: So I think that's right. And I think when this discussion happens; I think our reps should say, "Look, we're going to oppose this." But we also want to admonish anybody or anyone that held anything against another individual councilor for the way they voted. And simply make the point Jordi made. The solution is not to have this in secret, but to admonish the party or parties that have done whatever it is that has been done.

And we are an open and transparent body, and that's the way things should be done.

Chuck Gomes: Any other comments? Anybody disagree with that? Okay. That one's done.

The next item is a brand new one, and I'll tell you right up front, this is one that the motion was made less than seven days in advance of the Council meeting. We recognized that practices – and in fact, the new procedures call for getting it done in at least seven days.

But because of the very short time frame we have for the Board's request for the GNSO to review the URS, the Uniform Rapid Suspension system, and the Trademark Clearinghouse ideas that the IRT put forward, we have just until December 16, I think, if I remember the date correctly, maybe it's the 14th -- It's the 14th? Yes, thanks. I keep mixing those two up -- for the Council to respond to the Board's request.

And so as I think a lot of you are aware, quite a few people interested in participating in a drafting team to see how we proceed on this volunteered, and we held a meeting on Saturday afternoon, I think, where we tried to come up with a process.

Well, out of that came a motion that's on the link that I sent to you. But basically, the resolution – I won't read the where-as's unless somebody wants me to – but basically it says that a GNSO review team will be comprised of representative designated as follows. And I'll explain how we got to these. I'm sure you'll be very curious.

"The registrar and registry stakeholder groups with two representatives each, the commercial stakeholder groups and a non-commercial stakeholder groups with four representatives each, and the at-large with two representatives, and one representative from the nominating committee appointees."

Now, that's the first element of the resolution. Let me go ahead and read the other two, and then we'll come back to them. Number two: "Each of the stakeholder groups will solicit from their members their initial position statements on the questions and issues raised by the ICANN Board letter and the ICANN staff proposed models for the implementation of the Trademark Clearinghouse and Uniform Rapid Suspension Model, and will

deliver their initial position statement on November 4th, and with final position statements to be delivered by November 6, 2009."

And then the third part of the resolution: "Such position statements will be summarized by ICANN staff and distributed to the GNSO review team to evaluate whether a consensus can be reached on the ICANN staff implementation models or other proposals for the protection of trademarks in the new gTLD program."

And then there's a concluding paragraph: "The GNSO review team will conduct its analysis, identify those areas where a consensus has already been reached and seek to develop consensus on those issues for which consensus could not be determined. The GNSO review team will provide a final report to the GNSO on or before the GNSO Council's meeting in late November, 2009."

And the idea there was to allow, then, for constituencies to review it and then get back to the Council for the Council to make a decision so we can finalize it by that deadline, the 14th of December.

Now, let me go back to the first part of the resolution. Stop me at any time you want to ask a question, but let me talk about the makeup of that group. Why registries and registrars two, and the others four.

Well, I think those of us that were there from the registers and registrars were relatively comfortable. But we're pretty good at going back to our constituency members and getting feedback. We don't need numbers to be able to do that and to get the views. Obviously, if something like this goes forward, it's going to have to be approved by the Council, and it's not as if you're giving any particular group an advantage on the Working Group.

In the case of the non-contracted parties, though, the debate that occurred – and some of you were there and heard this – but the debate that occurred was that the commercial stakeholder group really wanted the membership to be based on constituencies. The non-commercial wanted it to be based on stakeholder groups.

Now, when you understand the structure, you now where they're coming from. One of the things that came out of the restructure, of course, is there's a balance between the commercial and non-commercial. And, of course, the non-commercial wanted to make sure that they still had that. And obviously, they have different viewpoints on these things.

The commercial didn't want to be underrepresented. I'm actually the guilty party of proposing the solution that's here as a compromise, and I was trying to reach something where they would both be comfortable. I wanted to have at least three – I don't know why I didn't just go with three; that's still puzzling in my mind – but at least three so the commercial stakeholder groups, each of their constituencies can have at least one, and now, they've got one extra that they can throw in their. And the non-commercial, then, they have the same number, so it met their needs.

Interestingly enough, this compromise was accepted by both, which is really where the difference was. And the overall group there on Saturday really wanted to keep the numbers as small as possible for effectiveness, because of the short time frame.

So that's the basis of those numbers. And for the group that was there Saturday, there seemed to be a comfort level in that.

With regard to number two, at first, we talked about the fact that it would be really nice, because of the short time frame, if we could get all of the statements by each of the groups...

Male: Can I ask a question?

Greg Rattray: Sure.

Deleted: Male

Male: Something that was brought up to me is why did we say okay to two At-Large reps? I can't remember that. Someone had asked me that, and they were saying, "Well, the At-Large isn't even a voting member of the Council, but we gave them two reps." I think that's why Stéphane later responded to the Council saying he didn't understand, and wanted more members and…

Chuck Gomes: You know, I don't recall too specifically, but...

Male: I think **Alan** just asked.

Chuck Gomes: Following a principle that we use ourselves oftentimes, it's nice to have two people in case one can't make a meeting.

Jeff Newman: Right. So we have two ALAC and one nominated committee.

Chuck Gomes: Well, you've only got three NCAs total. So, at one point I think we were taking about, should we invite in all of the NCAs? But again, to keep the numbers down, that was the idea.

Again, if you look at it in the direction we're supposed to be going in terms of rough consensus and things like that, votes shouldn't really matter on this. You're going to try to reach positions that the majority will support. And so, I don't remember specifically Jeff on the nom-coms, but that's kind of where it's at.

So we first set November 4th as a deadline, and I think that's a week from tomorrow, Wednesday. But a lot of people are traveling some days after and so forth. So the target was kind of, let's see if we can get them in by Wednesday, but at the absolute latest, Friday the 6th. So that was just to give a little bit of leeway there, but we'd like initial reports in on the 4th so that this review team could go ahead and start its work even before they get the finals.

Greg Rattray: Chuck, can I just weigh in there for a second?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Absolutely.

Greg Rattray: I appreciate the short time lines, and I've been looking at a calendar, working out all these dates in my head. But if the first step here is to gather in position statements from us, basically accurately, I think trying to push that for Wednesday is pretty unrealistic. Because at least I know from our side, the odds of us getting our act together and getting any important things that we have to say about it back to you in that time frame is pretty unlikely. So I don't know that we'll get a good representation.

Chuck Gomes: I understand. And the same point was made in that meeting. But we need to get something in by the 6th. And keep in mind what that is. It's to facilitate the group getting started and to see where we're at. A quick view. It's a quick perception of where we're kind of together, and where we're not, and hopefully kick-starts the review team in seeing where we may already be together, where we're not, what direction we can go. So it's not as if it has to be terribly formal, but informative enough that we know what our different positions are.

Greg Rattray: So if we came up with a point or a realization on the 12th or the 13th, that would be okay to inject it at that point?

Deleted: Male

Deleted: Male

Deleted: Male

Chuck Gomes: Well, sure, because we're going to have two representatives on there. Absolutely. Obviously, the better picture we can give right out the gate, it makes the work go quicker. Our big problem here, it's a very short time frame. At the same time, if we just start asking for more time, then there's a possibility of delaying new TLDs even longer. So there's arguments on all sides.

So we're at least going to do our best to try and meet the deadline that the Board set.

Greg Rattray: I appreciate that. I just think it's a really big, important issue to the entire industry. So given the choice between expediency and accuracy, I would go for accuracy.

Chuck Gomes: I understand. Now, obviously, if we have any time today, it'd be very helpful if on those two issues, we could at least get an initial poll of where we're at in terms of the Clearinghouse and the URS.

Now, we've responded. We do also have constituency statement, I think, that we submitted for the IRT on these things, so it's not as if we're starting from scratch. And, of course, today it'd be really good if we found a person or two who would maybe take the lead in helping us do that.

Any other questions on that?

So the first question is, is it okay for Jordi and Edmon and I to support this motion? The second question is, we need to identify two reps for that group. And the third question, then, is identifying a couple people to get started on our draft statement.

So, first question. Do you just want me to lead this David, or do you want to do it? Okay. I didn't want to step on your toes, there. Is there anybody that's opposed to us supporting this motion? So is it okay to do it that way? We don't need to poll everybody, right? Okay.

So the next question – now Jeff and I both volunteered for this. I'll be right upfront with you. I don't have to be one of those two people. I'm perfectly comfortable with anyone else. So if there's someone else that would like to participate with Jeff, I'm more than happy to have someone else do that. The reason I put my name forward at beginning, I wanted to make sure at least out the gate, that we were constructive in this. And as it turned out, I was

| Deleted: Male |

there. And because I was Vice Chair and Avri was in the other meeting, I kind of led that first meeting.

But I'm perfectly comfortable with someone else. Is there someone else that would like to participate in this group? I certainly encourage you to. I thank Jeff for volunteering, because I think he's a real good person to have on there.

David Maher: Would you rather that I do it?

Chuck Gomes: If you're willing to do it, that would be just fine with me, David. Yes.

Jeff Newman: Yes, I think that would be good. I mean, you have an IP background. I think this group is going to be a lot about IP.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I'm really comfortable. In fact, I'd prefer that., okay?

David Maher: Actually, I invented IP, but…

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I know.

Jeff Newman: Some of us don't go back that many years in age.

Chuck Gomes: So now, is there any objection from those of us here to having Jeff and David as our representatives on this review team? Okay, two down, one to go.

Now do we have a volunteer to be the lead? And there can be some people that support the lead, too, with regard to pulling together just an initial draft position of the Registry Stakeholder Group on the two issues.

And by the way, there are a list of items with regard to the clearinghouse that we may want to respond to, and just a general idea of our level of support for both of those.

I think part of that's going to be in our previous statement, but is there a volunteer to take the lead on that? Jeff, thanks. I was hoping you'd do that, although I don't want you to get overloaded, because you're involved in a lot of stuff. Of course, you're a natural for it, too.

Is there somebody that wants to work with Jeff on that? Okay. **Nacho**? Excellent.

Now, did I leave anything out, there? Did we cover our bases, there? Very good.

Now, David, do you want to take a little bit of time right now for the help of Jeff and Nacho, just kind of get a quick survey of where we're at on those two concepts, generally? Is that helpful, Jeff?

Jeff Newman: Sorry, on the Clearinghouse and the URS, or do want to go through…

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Not the detailed questions, just the general, I think…

Jeff Newman: Well, we have to answer the questions. That's what's...

Chuck Gomes: You want to go through those? I'm more than willing. I think that the more we can get done today, the easier it becomes to develop that statement.

Jeff Newman: Yes, I mean, if we can spend a few minutes, that might help.

Chuck Gomes: Is that all right, David?

David Maher: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Then go for it, Jeff. Why don't you take the lead on that?

Jeff Newman: I'm trying to find the best place to get the letter. Let's see.

David Maher: It's under Correspondence, I think in the...

Chuck Gomes: It's also...

Jeff Newman: On the ICANN site under Correspondence?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, if you're on that Motion page, there was a link to it on that Motion page, in the Whereas'es, the first Whereas.

Jeff Newman: Here it is.

Chuck Gomes: There you go.

Female: I think the Motion (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I think so. Because the stakeholder groups were pretty broadly represented in our meeting the other day. So I think it will. Yes. You never know. There can always be surprises. But there was good representation of the various groups there. And there seemed to be no objections to the contents of the motion. Adrian wrote it. And by the way, he made the contribution in terms of to get this moving quickly, to have each group do this in the first week and a half or so.

Jeff Newman: Okay, sorry. I was running to grab my notebook, here.

So the first set of questions are on the Clearinghouse. And the first question is the impact of a Clearinghouse notice on a registrant. "Is there a potential chilling effect on registrations if a trademark holder contacts a registrant before the registration is made?"

So this is one I've pointed out as kind of an erroneous question, because in the IP claim process, which is what this is really referring to, I think the Board confused the whole notion of what an IP claim actually is.

What happens in that system is that when a registrant applies for a name or a perspective – sorry. So, all of this is all pre-launch. None of this happens after the registry is live. What happens is that when someone applies for the name, a notice is sent to the registrant or prospective registrant that says, "Look, you're applying for a name. That string that you're applying for is identical to a trademark that's been claimed by" and it lists the party. And they'll say, "That trademark owner is claiming rights based on this trademark with this trademark registration number, and this class of goods and services." Whatever it is, to provide that information to the prospective registrant so that the prospective registrant, called applicant, could decide whether or not it wants to proceed, knowing all those rights. And then the applicant proceeds or doesn't proceed, but that's what happens.

The issue with the question is that the trademark owner doesn't know who applies. The trademark owner, at no time, knows how applies. So the trademark owner only finds out when someone actually registers the name, not when they get notice of the claim.

So the question is kind of a misnomer, because it says, "What is the chilling effect if a trademark holder contacts a registrant before the registration is made?" Well, there is no chilling effect, because the trademark holder doesn't know who the applicant is. It only knows who a registrant is. So there's no way that number one could ever be true. There could never be a

chilling effect, because the trademark owner does not know who applies for a name.

So it's kind of a bizarre question. And what it shows is that the Board really doesn't understand the service.

Male: Well, as I said, Jeff, I just came back from the Business Constituency. It was getting ugly, because their interpretation of this, because Mr. Rodenbaugh said this makes no sense just to have it start up. It must be an ongoing obligation for the existence of the operation of a registry. Because otherwise, people just wait till after the startup and register infringing names."

And I'm like, "But Mike, do you understand the scalability of a massive registry? You basically want every add in the entire DNS to go through this database and get verification before registration?"

"Yes. And not only exact matches – substrings, typosquattings."

And I just said, "Guys, I note my objection. This is really not a useful discussion or a use of your time. I'm out of here." And I had to walk out.

But, you just need to know what's coming over the transom, because they're drinking some seriously messed up Kool-Aid.

Edmon Chung: That's sort of what I wanted to clarify, as well. Jeff, you mentioned that this is only in Sunrise. Is that clearly written somewhere, or...?

Jeff Newman: Well, it was clearly written in the IRT report. A Board member actually said, "Well, it wasn't clear in the IRT report." And then I pointed to the exact sentence that said, "This only applies pre-launch." Those are the words. So I thought that's pretty clear.

Chuck Gomes: Now, Edmon, you raise a good point in the sense that what the team is tasked with doing is reviewing the staff implementation plan that they have, which isn't necessarily identical to the IRT. But there's nothing to prevent the team from referring back to the IRT as appropriate.

Jeff Newman: And by the way, the staff report also says it's only pre-launch. The staff wasn't even able to explain its own paper to the Board.

Chuck Gomes: You probably basically have your response for the first one.

Jeff Newman: Yes, but I think Mike points out a good thing that we need to emphasize, that it is only pre-launch and that it is only with identical matches, and anything else would not be feasible.

So number two is the requirement that the Clearinghouse be separate and independent from ICANN and not be operated by ICANN, and clear and distinct from ICANN. It's to operate based on market needs and collect fees from those who use its services. ICANN may coordinate or specify interfaces used by registries and registrars and provide some oversight or quality assurance function to ensure rights protection goals are appropriately met.

That's what it says. I think that's a distortion of what the IRT said. I think the IRT said that ICANN doesn't have the capabilities to actually run it, but ICANN should oversee it and oversee the selection of it, and should make sure that it lives up to certain standards. And that it not be necessarily market-based.

But be that as it may, I don't necessarily have too many problems with this statement. It's not really a question.

Male: (Unintelligible 1:12:14)

Jeff Newman: Right.

Male: So again, the Kool-Aid drinkers upstairs, they view registrars and registries as the users of this service and...

Jeff Newman: Thank you. The IRT report said clearly that the users of the system are the trademark owners. So the people who are filing IP claims, or filing the things into the Clearinghouse, and it specifically said – unlike the staff report – the IRT said that it should be free of charge to the registries and registrars. That it should only be charged to the people entering the data in here. In fact, in went so far as to say – I know, because I wrote this part – that the Clearinghouse should provide consulting services free of charge to the registries in order so that the registries could build the interfaces without being charged a fee by the Clearinghouse just to do that.

In other words, I was worried that the Clearinghouse, with the monopoly power, would then say, "Well, okay, new registry A, if you want to hook up to me, I'm going to charge you a certain amount of money to do that hookup. And I'm going to do it not by charging that money on the hookup, but in order

to consult with me to get the specs in order to hook up to me, I'm going to charge you for those consulting services."

So that was not reflected in the staff report. My suggestion is that we go back to the IRT report, cite that language in there, and make sure that, again, the costs are not borne by the registries. After all, the registries are being forced to do this. It's not the registries' choice. And if the registries are going to be charged, what that really is going to mean is that it's going to be ultimately charged to the end user or to the registrar.

Chuck Gomes: Let me take a little bit different position, and I'm not necessarily advocating this, but I'm trying to think it in another way.

First of all, I think trademark holders, themselves, should help fund this thing, because it's going to save them money, make it much simpler. But also, I think the same argument kind of applies to registries of new TLDs, because if a registry elects to do a Sunrise or some other mechanism to protect rights, it will be a lot easier if we can refer to this, I think. And we've never done a Sunrise period, as you know, so you guys know it better than me.

But there's some savings. Now how do we put a cap or a control on that? I think there could be some value to us in helping to support the thing. Not the consulting; I agree with you on the consulting, totally.

Jeff Newman: The whole purpose of doing the Clearinghouse was that the IP owners were getting annoyed at registries marking up. They understood that registries needed to charge for validation of their trademark rights. They get that. What they didn't like is that registries are or were marking that up substantially, so that they never understood - they believed that registries were not charging the actual cost of doing the validation, that they were marking it up substantially.

What they envision now is that now that there's a Clearinghouse, in theory, the registry would not be charging for that validation, since it's the Clearinghouse that's doing it. And therefore, there not only wouldn't be a charge for the validation, but there wouldn't be a markup of that charge by the registry.

What you're saying, though, Chuck is that if you're saying that the registry should pay for the access to the Clearinghouse, then the registries inevitably will be marking something up, because we're not going to just absorb that

cost. Registries won't. New registries won't be able to, because they'll have no income yet.

Male: I think your proposal is just a very dangerous slippery slope with the Kool-Aid drinkers upstairs who...

Jeff Newman: Wait. I'm sorry. Let me just stop for one more thing. Remember, this was envisioned not that the registries would be collecting the money and giving it to the Clearinghouse. It was envisioned that the Clearinghouse itself would be collecting the money.

In other words, unlike past Sunrises, the trademark owner goes through the registry to get the Sunrise registration and get the validation. In this case, the trademark owner's going to go directly to the Clearinghouse to get the validation, and it's only going to go through the registry to get the registration.

So there's really no attempt that the registries are going to be charged any fees. There's really even no way you can mark that fee up unless you mark up the registration fee itself. And you're going to get a lot of ill will from trademark owners if you do that, because it's going to look deliberately like you're trying to take advantage of them.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm not opposed to your position. I was trying to take a different point of view just for the sake of discussion. So, I'm not necessarily uncomfortable with what you're suggesting.

Jeff Newman: The third one is, is the Clearinghouse use optional or mandatory for new registries? If optional, must the registry provide something as effective or better?

This one obviously has gotten a lot of debate, and IP owners, most of the community, except for the non-commercials, are up in arms on this one that they believe it should be mandatory. I think Kurt and ICANN staff have a practical view, which may be correct, but perception is not very good.

In other words, Kurt believes, and ICANN staff believes that most people, when they apply to be a registry, they're going to want to maximize the number of points that they get. And even though it's optional, you actually get a point for including it in your proposal. So the theory that ICANN staff has is, "Well, we're going to say it's optional to satisfy some of the non-commercials." But really, most of the registries are going to volunteer for it because they want to maximize their points.

And, of course, the IP owners are saying, "No, why would a bad actor registry want to sign up and care about the point, because it's only one out of who knows how many?"

I think both are right in this case. I think ICANN staff is right that most would include it in their proposal -- most, but not all. I'm not going to say that all of them would. But I think the perception of not making it mandatory is much worse. And in fact, the IP owners are going crazy on it, and businesses are going crazy.

I'm not sure we have a skin in the game here. Or maybe we do. Maybe some registries don't...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, what if you came up with something that was totally different, that protected rights, and you didn't need the Clearinghouse? I don't know if that's going to happen, but would that be bad?

Male: Where's Ray?

Male: Is Ray here?

Male: He just went out? I mean, Dot Jobs is a clear example of how they launched with minimal complications. I think Dot Cat also did some...

Edmon Chung: Yes, that was what I was going to say, that some of the community TLDs might be using something that is as effective or even better than this global IP Clearinghouse.

Male: Yes. And this just goes back to the other point is the slippery slope of "you must pay" is here's someone who would be forced to pay for something they don't want, and does a less effective job is the insanity of what some people are proposing.

Jeff Newman: So help me understand what Dot Cat did.

Edmon Chung: Well, what we did, regarding Sunrise, you mean?

Jeff Newman: Yes.

Edmon Chung: The Sunrise was a structure in three different tiers. The tier one, we had a list of all those entities related to the promotion of Catalan language and

culture. We did not create those lists. We used preexisting lists from the governments of the Catalan-speaking territories.

Some of them were not strictly related to culture, but culture in a wider sense. Sport, not only the territory, but media and sets. These ones were the ones that had the highest priority.

Then we had a tier two, the second tier, that enabled people who had already content in Catalan online, in other Websites, legal persons, to apply for a domain name that was exactly the same or similar to their commercial name, to some of their trademarks, or some name related to their commercial activities.

And then we had a third tier in which the people who gave support to the bid could also apply for their names or the combination of names and surnames. It really presented no kind of threat to anything.

Then we had the defensive registrations, which allowed the trademark holders who did not want a regular domain name to get their domain name protected. And the fee was higher, but the only reason for that was that we wanted to encourage them to use a domain name in Catalan, not that we wanted to get money out of them.

Jeff Newman: On the fourth stage, did you verify the trademark rights?

Edmon Chung: Yes.

Jeff Newman: Yes, so the Clearinghouse, what it would be saying is for that fourth stage, that's where you'd be required to use the Clearinghouse, so that a trademark owner didn't have to have their names validated for each new registry.

What they're trying to avoid is trying to have to go through every 200, 300 new registries to have their trademark rights validated. This proposal would not stop you from doing exactly what you did. It would just say for that fourth step that you've chosen to do, you would have to do it through the Clearinghouse instead of validating it yourselves, and charging a fee for that. That's all that this proposal would say. That's how it would apply.

Edmon Chung: Well, is it free, the IP Clearinghouse?

Chuck Gomes: That's what we were talking about earlier.

Jeff Newman: Right. So that's one of the things I put into the IRT report is that to registries, it should be free, yes.

Male: That may be Ray. Did you understand Ray's launch without the Sunrise? I always found that...

Male: (Unintelligible 2:23:17)

Jeff Newman: Well, okay, wait. So before we go into the different ones, it's only mandatory if you're going to do a Sunrise or an IP claims. But, the Sunrise and IP claims are not mandatory. According to neither the staff report. So if you can show that there's no need to do a Sunrise, because everything you're doing is so much greater than that – in other words, you're doing true verification of something other than a trademark, and you're limited. Like, you're a community-based TLD, and you're limited in the restrictions, you're not going to have to use it.

                 It's saying if you are doing a Sunrise or if you're doing some intellectual property protection process and that process requires the validation of trademark rights, then you need to use the Clearinghouse instead of doing it yourself and charging money for it. That's really what it's saying.

                 And we can make that clear in our response. I think that's important to make clear in our response. But that was the proposal, not that everyone has to do a Sunrise or that everyone has to do an IP claims.

Male: Just a slightly different question. Does this include image marks?

Jeff Newman: It did not in either proposal. It was only the word mark.

Male: It's related. So there are cases where we would have to use some other mechanism in parallel with the IP Clearinghouse. Is that correct?

Jeff Newman: You can. And you may be actually able to use the Clearinghouse to help you do that, as well. In other words, if you wanted – go on with your – sorry.

Male: I guess the real question is if there are situations where I can't rely totally on the IP Clearinghouse – which is quite obvious, given image marks – the mandatory and optional part becomes very unclear, because in the same period, I would have to be using two. And I couldn't ask one particular applicant to force them through the IP Clearinghouse.

Or even not just image. If somebody wants to come direct, are you saying that they cannot go through a process that doesn't go through the global IP Clearinghouse? So I just want to clarify, because once you say mandatory, then the registry does not have the option to have in parallel other procedures.

Jeff Newman: You're allowed to add on top of it. In other words, let's say the Clearinghouse collects all registered trademarks, no matter what it is. That's all in the Clearinghouse.

If you want to be a Dot Shoes, and you want to say, "Look, I don't care that all those marks are in there, I only want trademark registrations that are in class whatever it is for shoes," you're going to be even more restrictive than a general Sunrise would be, you can do that. And you can use the Clearinghouse to do that. The Clearinghouse is going to help you do that.

And even if it's something new and innovative, the instructions were that the Clearinghouse would be flexible enough to help you to do that. But, the Clearinghouse can't do those extra things, then you are able, as a registry to - this is the bare minimum. It's not supposed to be the maximum.

Male: So I guess the question is really, I understand that. But with mandatory, it means that anybody who could go through the IP Clearinghouse must go through the IP Clearinghouse. The question is if one applicant, they could go through the IP Clearinghouse, but they want to choose to go direct to the registry, what happens there?

Male: A trademark owner would want to go through the…

Male: Here's an example. I launch a new registry. I want to invite common-law marks, too. I don't know if this database catches common-law marks, but I'm watching my new registry, and I want as many people to feel they have trademark rights to come on in and play. So I'm saying I want to allow common law; anybody who feels they have a common law, they can come in.

Jeff Newman: Right. And in the proposal, it was that this Clearinghouse would have the ability to validate those rights, as well.

Male: But the staff report just said trademark, right?

Jeff Newman: The staff report...

Male: I think they changed it.

Jeff Newman: Staff changed a lot of things.

Male: Because, again, this would be the mother of all databases, because it was
                   kind of like with the .eu. If you have a book title in Germany, that somehow
                   is a protectable mark. And then the other thing I was concerned about here
                   is when they were talking about rights there would be some governments
                   that would come forward and say, "Well, here's a list of geographical
                   identifiers.   In our country, they're protectable.   Input them into your
                   database." And I'm sure the governments are going to pay a fee to get in the
                   database. So how do those costs get subsidized? Are us truly**?**

Jeff Newman: Well, this is a trademark database.

Male: But remember, it's a trademark. But originally, in the IRT, it was an IP
                   Clearinghouse.

Jeff Newman: That was the name of it, yes.

Male: That was the name of it.

Jeff Newman: It is a trademark database. I hear what you're saying. Okay, so I got some
                   things in there.

Male: A couple other what...

Jeff Newman: Yes, so...

Male: Databases here (unintelligible 1:29:12).

Male: So I think the real question is what qualifies to go into the Clearinghouse?
                   And are you really gaining any efficiencies? Because if the Clearinghouse is
                   doing all of the things that would happen in individual Sunrise periods, and
                   I've got to pay to get into that Clearinghouse, am I opting in for specific TLDs
                   that may or may not exist in the future? Or is it just generic? And if it's
                   generic, then that IP Clearinghouse, or the trademark Clearinghouse, or
                   whatever you wind up calling it, is actually having to essentially validate for
                   everything that is out there.

Jeff Newman: No..

Male: Even though it may not apply...

Jeff Newman: No, it's only validating that you have a trademark registration and it validates - in other words, you submit certain information to the Clearinghouse saying, "I have NeuStar as a registered mark in Class 38 for telecommunication services. The registration date is December 8, 1999" – God help me for actually knowing that – and the number is so-and-so. That's all it's validating. It has nothing to do with the TLD.

                      So that when someone applies through a registry for the TLD, the registry can go, "Okay, this person applied for this string. Check the Clearinghouse. Does that person actually have a trademark registration? Yes. Great." Done. That's it.

Male: So the assumption here is that it's more efficient to have a centralized repository of that information rather than do it in each individual field.

Jeff Newman: Well, it's more efficient, and each trademark owner doesn't have to have it done 200 times for 200 different registries.

Male: Even though it may not apply. I mean, the Dot Cat example, it may be very specialized, and that's all I need. I don't need to go through and have my mark protected in a global registry.

Jeff Newman: Right.

David Maher: Sorry to interrupt and cut this off, but we invited David Giza to speak, and he's been here waiting patiently. This can go on forever, so let's let it go on forever – later on.

Male: One other question. The registrar meeting?

David Maher: The joint meeting is at 4:45 in the Crystal A, on the other level.

David Giza: …and, unfortunately, I didn't have the opportunity to speak with you in Mexico City, either, because I knew that you had a very hectic schedule, quite frankly. There's a lot happening in your world, and I think many of you have talked to me individually. So you've had the opportunity, as we both have, to obtain some update on the enforcement work that we've done.

I think, in a nutshell, what you've most likely noticed is that over the last 10 months, we have either non-renewed or terminated 16 registrars, which is more than double the number in calendar year 2008. And actually, almost double the amount of registrars that have been non-renewed and terminated over the six years in which we've kept statistics.

So our team has been working, I think, very aggressively, very proactively, and we think those results speak for themselves.

So when I approached the stakeholder group, I asked what topic would be of interest. And the topic that came back was the concept paper that's been developed around the voluntary high security zone program. So I was going to spend about 10 minutes here with you going through a few of the details of that program, because it's important that this stakeholder group take a position on whether that program will become part of our future or not. And when I say our future, I mean the community's future quite frankly.

We understand that malicious abuse needs to be addressed. And we do believe that this tool is one very effective way to begin to mitigate the impact of malicious conduct.

Excuse me just a second while I take my password off my computer. So what does that mean? Well, at the moment, the way the program is designed – and I think you've heard this from Greg Rattray if you attended the Malicious Conduct Session yesterday; you also heard from others – that this is a opt-in or elective program.

And the program, because it's in concept stage, by design has many unanswered questions. And, in fact, if you've had the opportunity – and you may not have – but if you've had the opportunity to actually look at the document, at the very end of the document we have about 10 questions that remained unanswered as we worked over many months to develop this concept paper.

And many of those unanswered questions, we're going to need to rely on the community to provide assistance and help. But not surprisingly, we are going to be forming a working group to move forward, as most things move forward at ICANN, in order to get community input and support for this program.

And one of the reasons I came here today was to make sure, number one, that you understood just how important this program is to contractual

compliance, in terms of how our team manages our enforcement responsibilities when the new gTLD program is initiated.

We clearly believe that with the potential rapid expansion of registries that this tool will allow us to do some pre-delegation and post-delegation work very constructively. And so you might be asking the question, "Well, what work?"

Well, auditing, for example. When applicants submit for, literally, the privilege or the right to operate a new registry, Mike Salazar and his team will be deploying very well designed, and I think, very effective processes, and we want to be in the middle of that. We actually want to have, perhaps, two or three Compliance Team Members embedded in Michael's organization. And those Compliance Team Members would do some pre-audit work in the pre-delegation phase, and actually go out and visit the operational headquarters or location of the proposed registry applicant to actually interview some of the employees, if not many of the employees that work there. Do an examination of their IT systems, operational planning, and general operational readiness to run a registry.

Quite frankly, it's one thing to say you can do it. As many of you know, it's another to actually do it. And we think that by auditing on the front end and then providing that information to Mike Salazar and his team, they'll be in a much better position to make good decisions with respect to the applications that cross his desk.

And then, at least for now, if an applicant chooses to opt in and become verified, for now, that won't count in the scoring process. But that could change. Quite frankly, with the input of this group and others, this program could become mandatory for certain high security zones. It could become mandatory even perhaps at a much broader level. That would have to be determined by the community, with input through the working group.

But should the program become mandatory at some level, we believe that that verification, then, would essentially have market value that would enhance consumer trust and generally place registrants in a better position. And I think many folks in this room would agree with that principle.

So what do we need to do to make this happen? To make this happen requires the support of the stakeholder group, and the commitment to have at least one member from your team join the working group to help us move forward.

The other night, Ray and I were having some drinks, and I was soliciting Ray as perhaps a potential person to work with the working group based on many of the successes that you've had in your business model. And so it may be that Ray and/or some others will participate. But if and when that decision is made by David and others, we would like to move quickly, because the working group needs to be formed within the coming 30 to 60 days. T

Here's much work that needs to be done before Nairobi in order to present an updated concept paper, and have some of these key questions answered, such as voluntary or mandatory. The cost structure behind the program needs to be fully explored. The criteria needs to be fully vetted to make sure we haven't missed anything in the concept paper. And, importantly, we need to know if there are business issues that have been fully addressed in that concept paper.

I will tell you that we were fortunate at ICANN to have the assistance of a consultant who helped us prepare this. And I worked closely behind the curtain with a consultant as we developed the concept paper, with a tremendous amount of input and assistance and leadership from the Security Team.

The Security Team really stepped up to the plate, here to do the right thing. And in my judgment, this program represents the right thing for all of us. But to make that happen requires a lot of hard work going forward, and that hard work requires the investment of at least person from this team.

So I've said it twice. I'll probably say it three times, just to make sure I've told, told you I've told you, and told you again, because it's important to compliance to have this type of tool in our toolbox if we're going to be successful in doing our job. And that requires good planning.

So that's what we're trying to do now as part of Compliance's operational readiness approach, is to do our planning now, have our toolbox literally filled with tools and ready to go, so that when a decision is made about the future of the new gTLD program, that we're not playing catch-up, and that we're ready to deploy this tool, and some of the other tools that Greg Rattray has described, in order to mitigate malicious conduct.

And we think that this will be very successful. And one thing I'll share with you is that the sooner we can develop the tool with consensus through the working group process, the sooner we can Beta test it. Because until you

Beta test it, you can't be absolutely certain of how effective the tool will be. And certainly, if the tool is not mandatory and it's elective, there will have to be financial incentives or other incentives for applicants to choose to opt in to this program, and that presents a whole host of problems, as well, as you can imagine.

So these are the kinds of critical questions that need to be discussed in the working group and that need to be sorted out so that when we're ready to move forward with this tool, we have a tool that we're confident will get the job done.

And at this point, I'll just pause and ask if there are any questions, comments or anything else that I can answer about the work of the Contractual Compliance Team at ICANN. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I think I have three questions. The first one is it seems to me that if ICANN did this, they would be in direct competition with commercial entities in the security field, and maybe even with registries and registrars who could work with some of those security companies in terms of putting forward a TLD that had a lot of these factors. So have you guys thought about that?

David Giza: We have, and that's why you'll see in the concept paper that we've provided options. One option is that the entire program, itself, could be outsourced to a third party that would deploy the criteria, select the independent assessors, and then ultimately, operate, manage and report on the success of the program to ICANN and to the community. That is one option.

The other option is if we do it ourselves, we haven't fully vetted all of the anti-competitive effects of that. And I think we'd have to clearly, perhaps with your help and the help of others, actually, do a deeper dive into that to understand its impact.

Chuck Gomes: Well, in your first solution there, whether you do it through a third party and not yourselves, it seems you're still competing with commercial entities – other ones than the ones you pick to do it. So I'm not sure that that eliminates the problem.

David Giza: It wasn't our intent to compete with them. I'll say that we've been looking for a solution. And so we've talked to WebTrust. We've talked to ISO. We've talked to others who have done this, and we're not trying to reinvent the wheel. We're simply trying to find the right wheel that can be deployed...

Chuck Gomes: I'm not questioning your motives at all. But I think the reality of the matter is registries that want to bid on a new TLD could work with those people directly and wouldn't necessarily need ICANN in the middle to do that. But anyway, we don't need to belabor that.

David Giza: That's a fair point.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. My second question is, is this really in ICANN's charter to do something like this? I think that's a real legitimate question to ask.

David Giza: That is a very fair question. And my view – and I'll just speak for my team at the moment – is that we are looking ahead, as everyone, I think, in this room is, and we are trying to determine what the future of contractual compliance or compliance will be at ICANN. And we're actually trying to build our plan and strategy to get aligned with the future now as opposed to waiting for the future to catch up with us.

               So although this isn't precisely within the domain of the Contractual Compliance Team, we believe that malicious conduct as a topic isn't in the domain of ICANN.

               Now, how it gets addressed is really the question. And one way to address that could be through potential changes to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And there is, as you know, a GNSO Council RAA Working Group that's meeting tomorrow afternoon to sort of kick off potential future modifications or changes to the RAA...

Chuck Gomes: Hold on a second. I thought you started off talking about registries and then you talked about the RAA.

David Giza: Yes. I brought that up only because I wanted to just make sure everyone was aware that there is a working group on that topic.

               But again, getting back to registries, I do believe that our team has looked at this HSC program as one potential tool that security, contractual compliance, the Registry Liaison Team and of course, Mike Salazar and his team could find useful in their efforts to combat malicious conduct.

               Now, to look precisely into ICANN's bylaws or into ICANN's charter to find where in those documents this type of work is clearly described or permitted, there I think I'd have to rely on the legal team or somebody else to answer that question.

Chuck Gomes: And this may be the most important question of all. Could ICANN do something like this and really remain neutral on issues of security and stability, especially with respect to the RSEP and consensus policies?

David Giza: Well, again I would ask Greg Rattray to answer that question first and foremost. I would postulate, or at least speculate, that our best intentions would result in our best conduct. But I wouldn't guarantee that, because no one can guarantee that. But I think ICANN's motives in this regard are pure.

Chuck Gomes: Like I said, I'm not questioning your motives at all, but the bottom line, if you're doing something like this, it seems like it would make it more difficult to be neutral on issues of security and stability. And obviously, just let's take the RSEP for example. One of the issues that comes into play is security. Security and stability is obviously one of the two issues there.

                 So I'm not asking you to give me a definitive answer on this, but I think it's another issue that comes into play on something like that.

David Giza: Fair point. Patrick?

Patrick: I just wonder how the RSEP funnel process fits in with the question that you raised, because I'm not seeing how it's linked together.

Chuck Gomes: Well, ultimately, you have to make a preliminary decision, first of all, on a new registry service, whether security and stability comes into play. So it happens right there. If you do send it to the RSEP and they come back with their report, there's again a decision on security and stability, and whether it's an issue. That's how.

                 Now whether that's significant enough, I haven't given it that much thought. But that's one area that it could be a factor if you're involved in offering a seal on security. That's where I'm going. And whether I'm right or not, I don't know. I think it's a legitimate question to explore.

David Giza: Agreed. It absolutely is. In fact, they were all legitimate questions, Chuck, and that's the kind of input that we need as part of a working group. Because whether it's Contractual Compliance sitting here in front of you or Greg and his team, we just don't have all the answers.

But we think that there are enough intelligent, thoughtful folks in the community who can help us work through these questions and then determine what type of program we have.

And I say that I hope in a definitive sense, because I am a proponent of the program. But I cast perhaps one vote for Contractual Compliance, and I think the recommendations from the working group will be determinative on whether a program is created or not.

Male: Yes, David, I guess, as we're all trying to button down the Draft Applicant Guidebook, make our way through all of the overarching issues, everything else, it seems that this one added an additional matter that had not previously been in there that makes it more difficult to come to conclusion on the rest of things. As you've just noted, it may require working groups and further discussion, and thinking through all of these issues.

I'd just like to state that I think it's challenging to shoot at a moving target with the Guidebook, as additional things are added on.

David Giza: No, it's a fair point. And we really thought long and hard about how to best develop the concept and then present it. And the decision was made to do so through the Draft Applicant Guidebook Version 3. And I guess we'll find out through the comments we receive whether that was a good decision or not, but at the end of the day, those comments will be constructive in terms of the next steps. And certainly, our goal is to form the working group, presuming there's broad community interest in moving forward.

So again, on behalf of the Contractual Compliance Team, I do want to thank you for the brief time we've shared this afternoon, and welcome each and every one of you to reach out to me and the other members of our team any time we can be of service to the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Thank you so much.

David Maher: Thank you. We, I believe, have one more issue to discuss, but the person I want to discuss it, Jeff, has disappeared momentarily. Actually, it's an issue that we can't really do much about. It's the question that selection of a registrar to take over for de-accredited registrars. Who's the staffer that is not with us?

Male: That's primarily Mike Zupke's job and Mike is not in Seoul, which is the reason I thought it would be good to have a conversation about this at

probably the next conference call of the Stakeholder Group and have Mike participate in that.

Jeff and I have had some pretty lively discussions about it the last couple of days and realized that we need to work with you folks to get to a solution around this. I just didn't think that it would happen at this meeting.

David Maher: Well, he picked a good time to disappear.

Male: Maybe that was no accident.

David Maher: Is there any other business?

Chuck Gomes: It would be nice, I think, for you and Jeff, if we could continue through those items on the Clearinghouse and the URS. If we can't go item by item, maybe we could at least have people kind of express their general position.

For example, are you generally – anybody – strongly opposed to either of those concepts, assuming the details are worked out appropriately? Some things like that, again, so that we get a broader sense of where our members are at on those two things.

And if Jeff gets back – and I see his PCs gone, so he may not be. I don't know. His mic's still on, but...

Female: I think he went to another...

Chuck Gomes: ...I think that's David's fault. Thanks David.

David Giza: Yes, thank you, Chuck. Well, I'll correct that error right now.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Male: I would add it does seem that Jeff is a necessary participant to go through that. But maybe while we have David here, before he leaves, that whole issue of registry continuity and selecting a backup provider, I think that that's still a work in progress. And I know that in a number of places in the Draft Registry Agreement, there are provisions for transition of registries upon termination, for whatever reason that ICANN has in its sole discretion the ability to choose a backup.

I think that there still remain a number of very significant questions as to how you select a backup provider, how you notify the existing registry if you're dinging them for lack of compliance. If you go through the notice and cure periods in order to do that. So it's very difficult to have even a straw man proposal. But we've got very specific language in the Draft Registry Agreement before we've even come to a conclusion on what that continuity program even looks like.

Patrick: So the continuity language, I don't think is all that new. And in fact, we've worked and spent quite a long time talking about it. I was under the impression that after the Paris meeting, ICANN and the Registry Constituency had come around to a general understanding of those terms, and that the terms that appear in the Applicant Guidebook haven't changed anything from what was in the gTLD Registry Continuity Plan from last year.

                So if there are things in it that look somewhat different, I really would be happy to talk to you about it. And there's opportunity to work through it and address those concerns.

Male: Yes, they are in there, because I'm looking at the redline from the last version to this one that cites to brand new things.

Patrick: Yes, so as there are new areas in this version of the Guidebook then definitely call attention to them, and we'll try to address those concerns.

Chuck Gomes: Now Patrick, should Steve do that to you directly? Is that the most efficient way?

Patrick: No. Actually, I think if it's something that's in the Guidebook now, the best way to do it is to put it into the comment forum, and I obviously will see it, and other staff that are responsible for the base agreement, so Dan Halloran will see it as well. So put it in that way, and call attention to it if you have questions, and we'll definitely do our best to try to clarify the areas of concern, because I don't think that it's really new concepts.

David Maher: I just recalled, Jeff said that he was leaving and will not return. And I think that it wouldn't really be all that useful to try to build consensus on these IRT issues without him present, because even though I'm an alternate, he is far more familiar with the deliberations that went on and the questions that are still there.

	The Joint Meeting is not for another 30 minutes. Actually, I can think of useful things that I have to do in the next 30 minutes. I think unless there's any other business before our group…
Male:	Are we comfortable with what conversation we're going to have with him? Are we staying by the agenda, which is just a couple points?
David Maher:	Well, the agenda is very simple. It was the election of the Vice Chair, and that's done. And the other is the question of the centralized zone file access, and that's an area where, apparently, the registrars don't have a firm position. So it'll be an opportunity for us to introduce our views and try to get them to understand the concerns we have.

If there's anything else that anyone wants to bring up at that Joint Meeting, we'll probably have time to do it. |
| Male: | Well, the only other thing I was thinking about is if we want to raise that very same point about the amendment issue that Peter Dengate-Thrush already felt pretty clear about to encourage the registrars to comment on that from a contract certainty standpoint. You or anybody else could sure do that. It's just a thought. |
| David Maher: | Okay, well, I'll call on you to bring it up. Not hearing any other business, so in that case, thank you very much. We got a lot done. |