ICANN
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad
GNSO Intellectual Property Constituency Open Meeting (Part 1)
Sunday, 06 November 2016 at 15:15 IST
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Greg Shatan: Hello and welcome to the Intellectual Property Constituency Open meeting here at ICANN 57 or I should this is Part 1 of our open meeting. Part 2 will be at 9:00 am tomorrow in Hall 6, which is the GNSO room. But today we're here. So what I'd like to do, is go around the room and quickly have everybody introduce themselves.

So I'm Greg Shatan, President of the Intellectual Property Constituency and in private practice at McCarter & English in New York.

Hector Manoff: My name is Hector Manoff. I am from Argentina, (unintelligible) member of the IPC for a long time.

(Michael):   (Michael) (unintelligible) Consulting out of Japan, although I don't look like it. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Steve Metalitz with Mitchell Silberberg and Knupp in Washington DC. And for the next couple of weeks anyway, Vice President of the IPC.

(Alexander Richicar): (Alexander Richicar) from (unintelligible) Macedonia private practicing, (Popsky) law office, member of IPC since last year.

Brian Scarpelli: Brian Scarpelli of ACT, the App Association and IPC member.

Damon Ashcraft: Damon Ashcraft with Snell & Wilmer in Phoenix. I've been a member of the IPC for about two years. And I am currently your NomComm rep.

Michael Adams: Michael Adams, Mayer Brown, IPC member for I guess we're saying years, five years, six years.

Griffin Barnett: Griffin Barnett from Mayer Brown as well.

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt, Mayer Brown.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady, GNSO Council for the IPC. I joined the IPC after I exited the ark with Noah and my other brothers.

Leon Sanchez: Leon Sanchez, member of the IPC and of the ALAC.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) Fellowship Program. (Unintelligible) Administer of Justice.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi, Kiran Malancharuvil, Policy Counselor and Mark Monitor out of San Francisco and IPC Participation and Policy Coordinator and incoming IPC Secretary.

Heather Forrest: Hi, there. Heather Forrest. I'm an academic currently at the University of Tasmania. And I am our – one of our councilors on the GNSO Council along with Paul McGrady. And I currently serve as Vice Chair of the Council for the Non-Contracted Parties House.

Dana Brown: Hi. Dana Brown Northcott. Director of IP for Amazon.com. Member of IPC.

(Jana Coll):   (Jana Coll), an IP lawyer in Kenya. I work for the Kenya corporate office in Kenya.

Man: Hi, this is (unintelligible). I'm Indian IP lawyer and special in cyber law and also arbiter for domain name dispute.

Colin O'Brien: Hello. Colin O'Brien. Partridge Partners, Chicago Illinois.

Alex Deacon: Hi. I'm Alex Deacon with the Motion Picture Association of America.

(Ty Griffin):   Hi, I'm (Ty Griffin), World Intellectual Property Organization.

Mary Wong: Mary Wong, ICANN staff, supporting the GNSO and therefore the IPC.

Woman: Hi, I'm (unintelligible) with (NIXI). I'm a policy analyst.

(Ishan):   Hi, I'm (Ishan), I'm a policy analyst with (NIXI).

(John Still):   (John Still) from Nashville, Tennessee. An applicant for dotMusic (unintelligible).

Patrick Charnley: Patrick Charnley, International Federation of the Phonographic Industry. IPC member.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'll take it around the other end.

(Mathieu Well): (Mathieu Well), I'm from SafeBrands, a French corporate registrar. I'm in charge of our legal department.

Tom Barrett: Tom Barrett from enCirca, registrar.

Man: (Unintelligible), also registrar.

(John Rodriguez): Hi, I'm (John Rodriguez) from USPTO.

Tom Brackey: Hi, Tom Brackey from Freund & Brackey in Los Angeles. I'm an IP lawyer by day and a registry operator the rest of the time.

Vicky Scheckler: Hi, I'm Vicky Scheckler. I'm with the Recording Industry and I'm your incoming Vice President.

(Savri DeSouza): Hi. I'm (Savri DeSouza) and the Secretary General with the Indian music industry representing about 70% of the Indian music market.

(Andres):   Hi, I'm (Andres) for (Thompson) (unintelligible) digital brand protection.

(William):   Hi, I'm (William). I'm a (unintelligible) India.

Mitch Stoltz: Hi. Mitch Stoltz from the Electronic Frontier Foundation in San Francisco. I am an intellectual property and free expression lawyer.

Angie Graves: Angie Graves, Web Group Incorporated, Atlanta Georgia, policy consultant.

Chris LaHatte: Chris LaHatte, I used to have another job, but now I'm practicing as a lawyer and a mediator.

Joe Catapano: Joe Catapano. I'm ICANN staff, I'm the Regional Manager for the North America Region. I work on Chris Mondini's team.

(Gorik More):   Hi. I'm (Gorik More) from the International Trademark Association (unintelligible), thanks.

Bartlett Morgan: Hi, I'm Bartlett Morgan. I'm a Fellow. I'm also a commercial lawyer operating out of Barbados in the Caribbean.

Man: Hi, I'm (unintelligible). I work for Deloitte (unintelligible) and Trademark Clearinghouse.

(Vicky Fullens): Hi. (Vicky Fullens) from Deloitte. And I manage the operations of the Trademark Clearinghouse.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: Susan and Nick, would you like to introduce yourselves to each other? No, to…

Susan Payne: Hi, I'm Susan Payne from Valideus based in London, IPC member. You know that.

Nick Wood: And I'm Nick Wood from Com Laude in London, I also represent (marks).

Greg Shatan: Thank you. I think that takes care of everyone but the later arrivers but we should move on the agenda. Thank you, especially want to thank our guests for coming to the IPC meeting and seeing what we do when we're left to our own devices. And want to welcome, you know, Chris LaHatte. And all I can think is the cat named LaHatte came back. So let us move on to announcement of new officers.

As Steve alluded to, and as you've heard, we've had our elections of the new officers take their seats on December 1 so we're still in the turnover period. So Steve Metalitz, after years of service on the IPC leadership, will be stepping down as Vice President. Vicky Scheckler from the RIAA is coming in as President. I thank you for reelecting me as President. Lori Schulman will

be continuing as Treasurer. Lori is still making her way here and that means you're the treasurer for now, okay?

Then we have Fabricio Vayra as our outgoing Secretary and thanks to Fabricio for his service. And our incoming Secretary is Kiran Malancharuvil. And I finally learned how to pronounce the fourth syllable of her name, which is good. And the – as she is moving up she – the Participation Coordinator job will be coming open and we will soon be announcing, you know, process for filling her shoes. And thank you for, you know, being in that participation position as well.

Just to dispense with a little bit of IPC business, one thing that we will be commencing after this meeting is a bylaws review. We've lived under the current bylaws for quite a while. Our bylaws have -- we've departed in some cases from practice on those bylaws and we'd like to bring the bylaws up to our practice or where necessary perhaps go back to the bylaws if we've gotten a little too ad hoc. So we will be looking to members of our group to form a bylaws team.

The Business Constituency and the NCUC have just - are at the very end of their bylaws review process so I'm hoping we can learn from both of our fellow constituencies in that regard. And I'm truly hoping that a group that is so full of lawyers will have many, many volunteers for a bylaws review drafting team. But I would also encourage those who are not lawyers to join so that we don't all get full of ourselves and write some ridiculously legalistic bylaws. So that would be quite helpful.

In terms of other IPC business, we will actually be – we'll be talking tomorrow about outreach and engagement, but I do want to acknowledge our continuing increase in engagement with the fellowship program and thank (Alexander) for being here and providing that bridge. We have other fellowship alumni, Dusan Popovic and Charne Le Roux who can't be here but we hope that we can double and triple those numbers as we go along.

One of the thing that's most important for IPC is to expand our diversity in terms of regional diversity, gender diversity. And I think it is good that, you know, a lot of our recent growth has come from outside the North America, Western Europe area that we need to continue that. And one of the things that I can see is that grassroots outreach is particularly effective, human outreach. So as we get involved more any region having people on the ground working on regional outreach will be very important.

What I'd like to do next is to turn to Heather Forrest. There's Heather and Paul. Just for an update on Council matters. We have kind of already figured out, you know, our approach but just to the extent that it's always good for everyone in the room to hear what's going on Council just very briefly and especially if there's anything that's changed since we last talked that's kind of baked in us to serve up, it's always helpful as well. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Greg. Heather Forrest. Could you please, since we have five motions on the table, I put a link to the Council agenda in the Adobe chat. Could we possibly pull up those motions on the screen?

Greg Shatan: In real time.

Heather Forrest: Wicked. That's so cool. Excellent. Good stuff. So specifically we have two items on the consent agenda. I don't think you need to click through to them. You'll see them in 3.1 and 3.2. There you go. And if we're able to make them -- I don't think you need to click through, I think the text that is there is fine but if we can make that a little bit bigger just so people can see it, that'd be great if that's possible.

While we're working on that, because the two consent agenda ones aren't all that bad. Thank you. Aren't all that controversial. We have before us five motions, two on the consent agenda and three that will require the usual course of full discussion.

The two on the consent agenda, you see here in 3.1 and 3.2, adopting the GAC GNSO consultation group on the GAC early engagement in the GNSO policy development processes status, yes, final status report and recommendations. These were discussed at a fair amount of detail actually in the GNSO GAC meeting that took place yesterday.

They're on the consent agenda because there really isn't anything terribly controversial in them. I think we all wonder whether these will actually, let's say, help in practice what they will actually do once we implement them more fully. But there doesn't seem to be anything controversial in so far as the motion is concerned.

And then secondly approving the appointment of Carlos Raul Gutierrez to the role of GNSO liaison to the GAC, taking over that role from Mason Cole who was held for the first two years.

Paul, anything we need to say on the two consent agenda items? Consent agenda? No, okay. Any questions on the two consent agenda items? No, all right so then we will talk about the substance then some requiring more discussion than others and more updates.

Item Number 4 you'll see is the adoption of the consensus recommendations from the GNSO Bylaws Drafting Team. This is certainly the most contentious of all the items in front of us on tomorrow's agenda. And the source of the contention I think we're all aware of is the drafting team's report and leading to the subsequent minority report.

I suppose in terms of an update on this I think we will have more to say after tonight's informal Council session when we sit down with the other councilors and talk about this.

I'm not suggesting that we're going to fix the problem but I did have a discussion with James after the meeting that we had with the Non-Contracted Parties House as a whole this morning wherein I said, and I thought naively, but maybe not if it's being taken seriously, that's fantastic, that I think this is a pretty poor outcome in terms of the fact that this is our first engagement with, as the GNSO, as part of the empowered community and to have a significant proportion of the GNSO community so vehemently against this motion, which has to do with our future. It seems to me a pretty poor outcome.

The upside of that discussion was I guess a suggestion that perhaps the motion could be withdrawn and redrafted. Now I understand that that doesn't change the drafting team's report. But there are perhaps some strategic things that could be done in a redrafted motion. So that has an impact in terms of not only our vote on the motion but in terms of our vote on the amendment.

Enter the extent that the motion were to be withdrawn, which of course I can't guarantee, but I hope we will hear more from James on that in the informal Council session this evening, that would - let's say the withdrawal of the motion would of course remove the need for the amendment.

And then my proposal, and I opened this to the floor, and this has only just happened, this discussion with James, so I haven't had a chance to talk to Paul about it either, is that we could then have a small group to work on redrafting the motion.

Now mind you, the contracted parties and the NCSG are not going to stand for any sort of revisitation or reopening of the drafting team. But I do think that we can do something in the wording of this motion to perhaps articulate more clearly some of our concerns and capture them in a motion. Again I might be naïve in that camp but I think that's open for discussion tonight.

Paul, anything?

Paul McGrady: No, just without going into details in an open meeting, you said there are all of branches starting to be extended or people talking about trying to find a way forward. I thought or discussion this morning on this topic with the other folks, was wholly unproductive, but the hallways have proved - or are starting to prove somewhat productive, but that's ICANN.

Greg Shatan: As they say in the halls of justice, it just is in the halls so that seems to be happening here as well.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Greg. Heather Forrest. So as the motion currently stands, Paul and I understand our instructions to be to vote against the motion. Item Number 5 you'll see is next steps for the GNSO and the chartering organization for the CCWG on Internet Governance.

We had an interesting discussion with the ccNSO on this topic in our, what we used to call weekend session, which was I guess are working session of the GNSO. And it's – I'm sorry, it wasn't it was in the context of our meeting with the ccNSO Council.

And the ccNSO Council expressed reluctance about removing itself as a chartering organization. You will see I sent around some high-level notes this morning from that meeting. And I think the way the discussion is turning right now on this is potentially redrafting this motion as well, that we will talk about this again tonight in the informal Council session and perhaps redraft this motion to condition our continued support on a review of the charter of the CCWG IG, which seems to me to capture some of the concerns that we raised in the IPC meeting that we had earlier this week.

So if anyone is deeply morally opposed to a review and reconsideration of the charter, that's something that we can discuss further on the list.

Greg Shatan: Heather?

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Greg Shatan: On that point, I would just like to mention, not with my IPC president hat on but as a member of the CCWG IG, that we had a meeting yesterday evening at which this was discussed at quite some length, and I would say was a very well attended meeting as well. And I think in terms of wake-up calls, the motion was what I'd like to call an existential kick in the pants. And I think that's good.

There was I think a real realization that while a lot of good stuff actually happens in the CCWG IG, nobody else knows about it. We're kind of the tree falling in the forest. And that's not good; there needs to be output and deliverables. And, you know, we'll figure out the issue of the end issue at some point. That will probably the hardest one because the current CWG model requires a beginning, middle and an end. But more importantly we need a productive middle and making the CWG IG more productive I think is a focus.

And I think the message was not only heard loud and clear by the co-chairs and the members, who realized they all need to step up, myself included. I have not been as informative to IPC about what's going on in CWG IG, but also ICANN staff and realizing that the group is under supported in terms of say secretariat or in terms of some -- a group that can really help us with output.

So I think what we will see is a more productive, more fruitful, more informative Internet governance working group especially with ICANN now unmoored from the IANA contract, we're in the ocean with the other Internet governance groups. And a group that deals with it is important. And I think that came out in the GNSO ccNSO Council joint meeting.

So I think finding a good way forward for the group in a way that you can find it to be helpful. So I think it's also helpful to come to me or to the councilors or the co-chairs of the CWG IG, currently Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, Rafik Dammak and Young Eum Lee, say, you know, if you have ideas about how the CWG IG can be more fruitful, you know, just say so. The idea is to make it work now that we've seen the abyss, I think hopefully we will be better off for it. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Greg. Heather Forrest. And if that's the case then perhaps our motion has achieved what it was set out to do before we even had to vote on it. Item 6, if we return to the Council agenda, is a motion to dealing with chartering of the new CCWG on New gTLD Auction Proceeds.

By way of update on this, I understand that we are one of the last SOs and ACs to vote on this, and everyone else have, it was just the schedule, and other SOs and ACs have supported. We even think that there might be enough already -- I'm not sure precisely how the votes work but I think they have enough votes for this thing, let's say there is an in principle approval of the charter. So we are just jumping on the bandwagon.

We haven't expressed any concerns about this within the IPC up to now. So I don't anticipate a huge amount of discussion will take place around this either.

With that, Greg, if you'll forgive me, I have to step out for 10 minutes for a discussion on the chairing skills program, which is a new pilot program to be offered in 2017.

Greg Shatan: And I should mention that we will be visited tomorrow morning from by (Sandra Hooferichter) from – who is helping the chairing skills program get off the ground. So what Heather learns today we will all learn tomorrow morning at around 9:30. Thank you, Heather. And thank you, Paul, for the report from Council.

Heather Forrest: Teaching.

Greg Shatan: Oh you're teaching oh of course, excuse me. I'll just be a student, learn from the master. Next is Steve Metalitz.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, just a point of order, I know this is difficult because we do have a lot of new members and potential members here, I think if people could explain acronyms that are being used in their interventions at least the first time that could be very helpful, because there was a very high acronym content in the last report. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Steve. If anybody has any questions, even a question about an acronym, you know, please just speak up whether you're a member or a guest or put it in the chat if you're in the Adobe room. And I would encourage more people to go into the Adobe room because we only have 13 people in the room and clearly we have many more people in the room.

So moving on now is reports from working groups and review teams. It's always good to hear what's going on in those groups. And I see Jeff Neuman sitting at the table so I'm going to pick on Jeff as a co-chair to give a report on what's happening in your working group.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. I just came here because I wanted to enjoy the free food.

Greg Shatan: There is no food.

Jeff Neuman: I noticed. Susan told me that. Sure so I'm one of the co-chairs for the policy development process, the PDP, working group on Subsequent Procedures for new gTLDs. That's a mouthful.

Essentially we are charged with -- are working group is charged with reviewing the 2012 round for introducing new gTLDs and then proposing any

revisions to policy and implementation for subsequent application windows. I won't call them "rounds" since that's one of the issues that's been discussed.

We have completed our first consultation, community consultation questionnaire, which the IPC responded to so thank you for your prompt response. You were one of the few groups to actually respond, along with the GAC, the Registry Stakeholder Group and the ccNSO and the SSAC so thank you for that.

We are – we have – we've been looking at a number of overarching issues including whether there should be new gTLDs, how those should be introduced, whether it should be first come first serve or indeed rounds. And we've broken into for work tracks. Work Track 1, which is one of the co-chairs is Karen Day, who you may know from the SAS.

That group is looking at overall process, applicant support. Looking at whether we should accredit or preapproved registry service providers or the backend service providers.

Work Track 2, which I see Michael Fleming over there. He's one of the co-chairs along with Phil Buckingham, is looking at the legal and regulatory and contractual requirements or obligations for new gTLDs. That includes looking at things like the base agreement. It's also looking at reserve names, looking at the vertical integration of registry, registrar separation, depending on which side of the coin you want to fall on.

In addition, we have Work Track 3, which is looking at objections and string contention and community priority evaluation. So that one is co-chaired by, you know, I think I said Karen was for Work Track 1, and I apologize, she's actually one of the co-chairs for Work Track 3. Work Track 1 the co-chairs are Christa Taylor and Sara Bockey from Go Daddy.

So Work Track 3 is co-chaired by Karen Day and now it's going to be Robin Gross is stepping into the other co-chair role. And Work Track 4 is looking at the technical issues so what are the criteria, the right criteria to evaluate, looking at the financial criteria, looking at IDN – sorry, international domain name issues, and universal acceptance.

Those are the four work tracks. We expect to have another community consultation, a questionnaire essentially, going out in January of 2017 so you will all be asked to provide input on a number of issues involved in those work tracks. There are certainly a number of issues that I'm sure you will want to weigh in, including or especially Work Track 2 where there are issues with the agreements with Specification 11, which goes to certain requirements for registries to monitor abuse etcetera. And that will come out in January.

And I'm here for any questions. Our ultimate timeline is to hopefully come out with a preliminary report towards the third quarter of next year, 2017, and wrapping up in early -- Spring 2018.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jeff. Anybody have questions for Jeff or about this workgroup in general? Thank you, Jeff, appreciate the report.

I should mention a couple of things about working groups in general, if you're interested in joining it's never too late, although if you join late you have to catch up on your own time and you can't reopen things that were fully decided just because you showed up. If you show up and you have, you know, some amazing secret knowledge that you want to share with the world and it changes everything, that's maybe a chance but otherwise, you know, don't look at the fact that these have started some months ago as a barrier to participating.

And of course if you are a member of those groups we need to camp out our participation and have the numbers but not always the amount of exercise of work in the working groups. Nick Wood.

Nick Wood: Yes, Jeff, could I just ask about your - about the group's strategy to the concept of if it ain't broken don't fix it?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, Nick. That's a great point. I was actually just thinking about that mentioning that as well. So it's important to note that the way the group is operating is that in 2007, 2008, there were policies that were passed by the GNSO by consensus that went up to the Board that were approved. Those policies are still in place including policies of there will be additional new gTLDs.

                  To the extent we cannot reach any consensus on either revising those policies or revising how they were implemented in the Guidebook, the default position is that what exists will continue. So I think it's very important to the extent that we all believe that there should be changes, we should work hard with other groups, other stakeholder groups and constituencies, to try to find some workable solution. Otherwise if we are at odds, you know, the issue is going to be resolved in favor of the default, what is already in place.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Jeff. And thanks, Nick, for bringing that up. I think that's an important concept especially, you know, looking for some predictability of not totally reinventing of wheels all the time. We're not as fortunate to be graced with chairs in our group for all of the other working groups. Do we have Jonathan Zuck in the room? He is absorbed in the CCT Review? Absorbed in the CCT Review.

                  So I'm wondering perhaps, Steve, I can tackle you to talk about the Next Gen RDS group?

Steve Metalitz: Sure. This is Steve Metalitz. I am participating in this group and it's to – it stands for the Next Generation Registration Data Service, sometimes referred to as the what comes after Whois. And however there are other

people in this room who've also been active and perhaps more active than me so they should feel free to chime in.

This group has now been underway for six or eight months. It is making very slow going. It's a very complex task because it builds on several prior reports, notably a very detailed report from an expert working group on Whois. And it's looking at a wide range of issues about how our existing system ought to be either reformed or perhaps jettisoned in favor of a new system.

We developed a matrix of possible requirements for a new next generation registration data service. That is about 1000 items and is gleaned from the expert working group report in about 30 or 40, maybe 60 other documents that were reviewed by the working group members.

A methodology has been developed for starting to debate or discuss those possible requirements and deciding which ones really should be requirements and which ones should be tossed aside or modified. And just to give you an indication of where we stand on that, we began deliberations for the first time on actual possible requirements when the group met here in Hyderabad on Thursday. And I think we covered two of them out of the 600 or 700 in the first tranche, so we're at Number 3 I guess now.

So it's definitely not too late to join. There definitely is a learning curve for getting caught up. But I think it is also possible, you know, you can focus on one or two areas and get mostly engaged on those.

And in terms of - I've not actually seen a, I don't remember what the official timetable is for this, but it's going to be a very lengthy process. So that's what I would - how I would summarize it. I don't know if Alex or Vicky or others who've been active on this want to add anything.

Alex Deacon: Hi, it's Alex Deacon. No, I agree, I think that's a good summary. It's going to take some time and effort. From my point of view the key is focusing on the

important things and less so on things that aren't, that's more of an art than a science. But I think in any case it will be a lot of work and it will take quite a while. I haven't seen a timeline but it's on the order of years for sure.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. And I'd like to mention for this working group that we are trying to coordinate among the IPC members were on the working group. That may sound completely obvious that we should always do that and we should have always been doing that forever but it's not always the case that working group members from the same constituency try to maintain contact with each other and have any sort of more formal organization.

So we at least try to make sure that we have a least one person showing up at every working group meeting and try to help those who do show up, at least one person will kind of provide a little report back. That might be a little bit more useful than what you just get in that wiki afterwards. So it's something that we really need to try to do for all working groups going forward because otherwise we just tend to kind of burn a lot of energy without necessarily, you know, working in a concerted fashion.

Anybody else from that working group would like to comment? Seeing none, we have the…

Nick Wood: Greg, can I just ask a…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Please, Nick.

Nick Wood: I read something before this meeting, and I think it was in the rather good GNSO briefing for this meeting about the work before the GNSO. And I think it said about this group that some people were questioning the need for accuracy. Was I dreaming that or is that a real - is that a real point?

Steve Metalitz: You were not dreaming. I don't remember exactly what was said in that briefing. But the question has come up as to whether accuracy is a requirement that we should be seeking to include. And then a subset of that is, if it one of the fundamental questions that we need to address or is it something that could be dealt with later?

My sense is that one way to approach is to say all the requirements, all the things that this service is supposed to do will require accuracy to do them right. So it's kind of hard to separate that out. So I'm – I don't think that accuracy is going to be thrown off the bus. But when we actually get to questions of accuracy is another matter.

Greg Shatan: And if I could just add? I think first, there are concerns about accuracy meaning perfect, and some things – sometimes you can have a field that is inaccurate but that is not fatal in terms of contactabiliy or the like and that people – some people might be concerned that there might be some scoring against them for not having say, you know, full nine-digit zip codes or the like.

And then I would say also that it should come as no surprise that there are people in there with strongly held views and positions and that sometimes these manifest themselves in ways that aren't immediately understandable. You have to kind of figure out why they're saying what they're saying because on the surface it's not sensible. But that's just the way of things.

So I have Vicky and then Susan.

Steve Metalitz: Just as a note, Mary just put in the chat the link to the work plan for that group, which I think have whatever passes for a timeline at its current stage, so just as a point of information.

Vicky Scheckler: I was just going to say that the rhetoric within the group sometimes makes it sound like they don't think accuracy is necessary. I don't think that's quite

what is meant; I think it's a fight over what level of accuracy is appropriate in this context.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Thank you, Susan. Any other questions on the RDS working group? If not we will move onto the next of what I call the big three working groups, the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs. This is also a long, one that's going to go on for a while. There are three chairs, J. Scott Evans, Phil Corwin and Kathy Kleiman.

I'm a member of that working group. I don't know if there's any other member of the working group would like to speak to what we are doing in that group? If not I will just say briefly that we are working our way through -- in two phases – Phase 2 being the UDRP, which is domain arbitration system that most of us have come to know, if you have come to love over the last 17 years.

But first we are going through all of the other rights protection mechanisms. We started with the PDDRP which is that post-delegation dispute resolution procedure for dealing with complaints about registries that may be essentially, you know, operating infringement machines.

And it's never been used. There are some who question why it's never been used. And one of the other questions is to what extent are there registry practices that could give rise to a PDDRP but they're just not being brought out there. So I think for our community we should, and I will make the footnote that the vast majority of registries run, you know, good solid businesses and are, you know, not problematic in the least.

But for those that may fit into the other category we should think about whether a PDDRP is something that could be brought or if it's something that couldn't but should, why the PDDRP isn't useful for it, because it is a trademark PDDRP we're talking about. So this is a group that, you know,

should think about whether there are issues that could arise because, you know, right now the PDDRP is sitting there waiting to be used.

And I would say we've adopted the Neuman philosophy in that group as well, you know, if it ain't broke don't fix it. And since it's never been used we don't really know if anything is broken. So trying to rebuild it or change some of the fundamental parts of it without understanding that they might need to be changed would be foolish, and so we have real work to move onto.

And moving on now we're into the Trademark Clearinghouse and discussing various issues about that. I will mention on our agenda, I thought we were going to have -- be able to have a visit from Greg Rafert from the Analysis Group, which performed the Trademark Clearinghouse review. But unfortunately he's had to change his travel plans I believe, and that puts him out of reach for this meeting. So I'm sure that we will find another way perhaps on a call to have a Greg Rafert from Analysis Group talk about that.

So this is another large group. We have all sorts of folks represented. I know we've got a member of the group here as a guest. And it's a, it's a lot to explore and there is a lot to unpack. And again a lot of positions. And in the end, you know, while there is a lot of positional speech, in the end I think we will get to where we need to get to as a community since almost always we do manage to succeed in these working groups. There have however, been a few fallen soldiers over the years.

Anything from any other member of the RPM working groups? Thanks.

CCT Review, as you know there's been a lot going on about that. Jonathan Zuck isn't here. David Taylor is also a member of that group from our group, and unfortunately David is not here either. So we will hear more about that. That certainly, you know, suggests that you go to some sessions or go talk to Jonathan to learn more about that.

One of the things that is important for CCT review is to - for us to try to produce more information. This is - things are not as data rich as one might hope. And any data that we can provide from our community would be very helpful. Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you. Steve Metalitz. Just to unpack this a little bit, again for some who may not be as familiar with it. This is the review on competition and consumer choice and trust. And that doesn't tell you what it's about either. This is really the retrospective review of the launch of the new gTLDs over the past five years or so.

All the other things that we've been talking about like the Subsequent Procedures in particular is talking about the next, you know, the future rounds or future release of new gTLDs. This is trying to look back at what has already been done.

And unlike some of these working groups that we've talked about that have extremely long timelines, this review team has a rather compressed timeline and they're going to issue at least their preliminary report by the end of this year. And we can go into the reasons why they have a more compressed timeline, but the fact is it's going to be moving somewhat faster than the others.

But I think as Greg may have already mentioned, you know, any information, data, anecdotes we can provide to them about the experience under various aspects of the new gTLD launch would be very timely now. I mean, it's almost – it's getting the near the end of the time that we can submit those. So it's too bad Jonathan isn't here, but I know he'd be very eager to talk to anybody that wants to know what kind of information they're looking for and it's easy to submit that. So I would just encourage people to follow up on it. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Steve. Next like to move onto the Cross Community Working Group on Country and Territory Names as TLDs. And Heather Forrest, who is

not busy enough as Vice Chair of the GNSO, also co-chairs that group with the same aplomb. And I will turn the mic over to Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Greg. Heather Forrest. So I'm going to drop in preliminary report, I'm just going to drop into the chat there some of the - a link to the document that I'm about to mention.

So interestingly enough, this group met in this room yesterday I think, and came to a pretty - what looks to be a pretty significant decision which was an agreement to terminate the group's work.

And the basis for that decision is essentially that the group has a concern that there are too many let say multiple overlapping parallel, slightly different but the same efforts in relation to geographic names very broadly defined within the ICANN community, including this cross community working group, including the GAC working group, including the work that's being undertaken by staff on two letter codes, including work happening outside of ICANN in which various ICANN constituencies and involved folks are participating.

So the group said that, you know, ultimately, as I said in the New gTLD Program Reviews yesterday, we want to be part of the solution rather than part of the problem. And this group was specifically chartered to establish whether or not it was possible to develop a uniform framework on the use of country and territory names as TLDs.

And we said in light of all of these multiple overlapping activities there's no way that it's possible to develop a uniform framework. And so the group is in the process of reaching agreement on the articulation of the recommendations that will sit in the initial report. You have a link to where you can find the initial report there in the chat.

So there are obvious overlaps with intellectual property interests when we start talking about country and territory names and geographic names more

generally. I encourage anyone who is interested in the issue, and I very much thank a number of you in the room for being in the meeting yesterday and lending your input to the discussions that we had.

I understand that ccNSO, despite the fact that we really had what looked like a very solid seeming agreement yesterday, the ccNSO maybe have cast that in a slightly different light in its meeting today, which comes as a surprise to me because we all left the meeting very very happy. But nevertheless, I remain confident having lived with this issue since 2011 that we can see this through to its end, that we are doing it for all the right reasons.

I will say this because I hope this is the last face to face meeting at which I present to the IPC as a co-chair of this cross community working group, much as I love it, that it's been a great pleasure to represent the IPC and indeed the GNSO in these efforts. And I've done the very best I can. And I hope that in whatever next incarnation this group had, and I hope we as an IPC can support that next incarnation, having at least some relevance to subsequent procedures, given that geographic names and reserved names are part of subsequent procedures charter, that we will continue as a community to support that effort.

Thanks, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Heather. Anybody have any questions for Heather? I would just like to say briefly that I came in and visited that group. It's a group that I have followed radically but nonetheless decided to speak up during the meeting, because I do.

And one of the things that I - one of my big takeaways from that meeting is that the ccNSO, or I would say certain elements among the country oriented types, might like to see the ccNSO become the geographic names supporting organization. Of course there's already a GNSO. And of course - and it seems that while I haven't gone back and looked, there some people who

believe the definition of a country code TLD may not be as narrow as one might think and might in fact bring in the names of bridges and other things.

So and maybe I'm exaggerating slightly for effect. But I think it underscores what I see as a more fundamental issue about jurisdiction and who does what to whom and what's a gTLD as opposed to just kind of concerns about relative claims that one might have to a string, that in terms of ICANN, you know, existential question about how policy gets done.

I will say that I interjected more than once that these all seem like gTLDs to me and that they should be dealt with in the GNSO and that we have a group where the next round is being dealt with the subsequent procedures and that all of these should be dealt with there.

There were certain people who disagreed with me apparently. But nonetheless I was able to give voice to those concerns. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Greg. Heather Forrest. I would just like to say very quickly in substance, there is a preliminary conclusion in that preliminary report. You will see it in Section 4.3, I believe, whereby the group has reached let's say an agreement on the idea of reserving two letter codes for CCs.

Now I want to say, as a member of the IPC, and of course I co-chair that group so I was not really at liberty to give my personal view on things, but I will say that I know that there were many in the GNSO community that, if you like, agreed to that recommendation with a very clear rationale that have nothing to do with any sort of substantive legal rights in two letter codes, because of course these don't exist from a legal perspective.

But we agreed to this reservation of two letter codes knowing that discussions on three letter codes and names would come and that there would be compromised in the community. And that there would be an understanding of the application of the same rationale that we used in relation to two letter

codes, which was there is a clear established policy set out in RFC 1591 that the ISO 3166-1 list is a standard that's maintained outside of ICANN; it can use outside of ICANN. And it has a function that ICANN has adopted for a particular technical reason in RFC 1591.

Now that justification of course doesn't carry over to three letter codes or names. It's very carefully articulated in that report. But I for one feel disappointed that we haven't had a chance really -- we have discussed three letter codes and simply not been able to come to an agreement. I feel that that will be reopened in light of the fact that let's say there hasn't been any real demonstration on the part of the CC community to compromise. So I just echo your comments, Greg, and I won't say anymore here. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Heather. One last thing to mention kind of maybe just not related but I think it is related is that we also need to deal with in the community and the issue of CCs that are really Gs by which I mean for instance, and not to pick on anyone, dotCo which is nominally - it's technically owned by or for the country of Colombia but it is operated as a - an alternative to dotCom or dotCorp or dotLLC as a company oriented domain.

And of course there are some that have been around for years, dotTM has been marketed to the trademark community even though it's really for Turkmenistan. And (Tuvoluse.tv) has been marketed to the TV industry as well and yet those all fit under the ccNSO with their rules, or lack of rules, compared to, you know, dealing with gTLD consensus policy that doesn't reach them.

So if the lines get fuzzy all of a sudden, you know, there are various different lines that could get redrawn. So maybe I'm just making trouble up here at the top so don't listen to me. But that's a comment there.

To keep up I do have a couple more on here on the list. The IGO INGOs Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group co-chaired by Phil Corwin and our own Petter Rindforth, we don't have Petter.

And the interesting thing happening there is really happening more in terms of questions of what's going on between different groups in ICANN, and that's way beyond the amount of time we have to cover here. But there certainly are issues to be discussed. And we will revisit those in future.

Last, just the accountability group. And I'm going to go to the end of the table and disturb Leon Sanchez to tell us a little bit about - to give a little overview of what's going on in Work Stream 2 and thank Leon for his, you know, continued operation as a co-chair of one of the most momentous working groups in the history of momentous working groups.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Greg. Well in Work Stream 2 we've divided the work in different groups of course. And I think that one of the most heated discussions is taking place in the jurisdiction working group and in the human rights working group as well. And I think the IPC is very well represented of course in both working groups.

And so far there hasn't been much advance in the results in each of the working groups. We have produced some draft reports by some of the working groups which are not even – have not even been approved by the plenary CCWG but we're in the process of course of ironing each of the reports.

And the aim for Work Stream 2 to come to an end is at the middle of the next year, let's say June 2017. This might be a little bit of wishful thinking for us. It's at least the aim of the co-chairs to have this working groups finished by, as I said, next year – mid next year.

So I think that the input of the IPC – and participation of the IPC is very, very important at least in the human rights and the jurisdiction working groups. We've seen the battle on human rights for quite a long time within ICANN and how it could affect the interests of intellectual property rights holders. So I do encourage you to actually step in and feed the discussion because I think it's a very important stage now for us to actually defend intellectual property rights within this working group.

So I'm open for questions and this of course a bird's eye view of where we are at and well Work Stream 2 will continue to carry out its work in the different working groups, as I said. Thanks, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Leon. Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady. So just some color commentary on Work Stream 2. In the jurisdiction working group, Greg is co-chair, co-rapporteur, whatever they're called this week. And is doing a great job keeping it on the rails. Mole that that got whacked, Number 1, I think it's sufficiently whacked – it was the issue of should ICANN flee California jurisdiction. There are still some hanging onto that hope but I think for the most part that's been tempered with some reality.

Bad idea Number 2 that popped up after the first mole got hit, is the anti-accountability idea of should we make ICANN immune from access to the – any courts anywhere so that it could do whatever it wants and not be accountable. I'm not really sure how that fits into Work Stream 2 on accountability. I could see it fitting into Work Stream 2 on unaccountabilty but nobody chartered one of those.

And so that's a really horrible idea and people who are for it are calling it a nuanced and difficult topic. And I am calling it the most straightforward nonsense topic that I've heard.

But it goes back to the point, we've got to be vigilant because at the end of the day whoever is on the call wins. And so we all have to be on the call so that the whackadoodles don't win.

Secondly, on the human rights subgroup, I would just like to pass along my frustration and maybe somebody else could join me in being frustrated. This group is steadfastly refusing to look at the human rights obligations that it already has under California law.

The part of the bylaws that talks about developing the framework of interpretation on human rights clearly says, in accordance with applicable law. So one would think that you would start with applicable law. Well this group just as refusing to do that and are going out, they want to bring in professors who wrote nice papers of nice things people should do. But they are refusing to engage with applicable law.

And as a result, they are going around essentially cherry picking things that they would like to see and trying to plug it into something that they've not developed a basic understanding of how California affects this.

And so again, that's not something where we're gaining any ground. That seems to be, the human rights one seems to be substantially off the rails in my opinion. And so again we need more participation with people who are committed to that project actually turning out a work product that's related in some way at least to what was envisioned.

Now others may be more optimistic about where that was going, but I think right now we're bogged down in a lot of nonsense. And the end result of that one is not going to be great. So that when especially anybody who is interested in a really fun group, that needs to get guided back onto the rails, that's a good one to join. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Paul. Excellent color commentary. Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, just a question for Paul. I'm on that group too and I told Paul to let me know when to weigh in because I obviously have a lot of other things going on, like many of you. So I will definitely support you on that.

But how can an organization just declare itself immune anyway? I mean, like why doesn't this – Greg – why don't we shut down this conversation? Because I don't think that's something an organization could do.

Greg Shatan: I'm letting this conversation run a bit because basically we kind of closed the documents we are drafting on so that they could remain stable during Hyderabad. And there are certain people that want to talk about it. My plan is to refocus us after Hyderabad. We have a work plan which is to deal with issues. And we have an open issue to look for issues or gaps and try to then see if we need to remediate them in some fashion.

Immunity, if it is anything at all, you know, is a remedy do something, but we have to see what problem it remedies other than the problem of accountability, as Paul pointed out. So essentially there has to be a balance between allowing a certain level of discussion so that people feel like they haven't been kind of shut down prematurely, between - and back and going off the rails, so kind of taking advantage of a bit of the timing to let this come out.

And I think there's been some very good discussion on both sides. Paul McGrady and Paul Rosenzweig have both come in, you know, pointing out some of the issues with the arguments brought forth by those who would support the idea of immunity. But to answer your question directly, the first question you asked, if they can't. You cannot -- an organization cannot unilaterally call themselves immune. You know, maybe if you're running a pirate radio station beyond international waters, but even that didn't really work I think.

There is a methodology perhaps but it's clearly – even, you know, entertaining spending any time on discussing it I'd rather discuss, you know, when the Indians are going to win a World Series. Paul.

Paul McGrady: So to go back to that, while some of this may be wacky, these people are dumb, okay? There's a plan. And I think the plan is to get some sort of affirmation that this is something that ICANN should be seeking and then go find a government to do it, right?

So that is - that's why it needs to be tamped down. That's why I don't think it needs to be entertained even for one more second. This would be like having a working group on reforming our meeting structure and topic number one is let's have no more meetings, right? I mean, this is the anti-thing of what we're trying to accomplish in this working group.

And so, you know, I've been around ICANN-land long enough to know that the longer a bad idea is allowed to exist in the ecosystem, the more it gains strength. And so I'm glad to hear that we are going to refocus and try to bump it off and send it the way of the dodo. But again, you know, somebody is – they're not just suggesting this for giggles. I think that there is an endgame and I think that we should be very careful that we don't allow it to gain traction because it essentially, like changing the jurisdiction outside of California, would undo Work Stream 1. This would undo 20 years' worth of work.

Greg Shatan: Leon Sanchez.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks, Greg. Leon Sanchez. And this is where your voice is important. This is why I really encourage you and urge you to come to the calls, as Paul said. I mean, we can't have Greg just to shut down these discussions. He's not able to do that because as a co-rapporteur he must remain neutral in a way and actually facilitate the discussion within the working group. So in this way we need to outnumber the other team and that is why I'm trying to pull out as many IPC members into the discussion as possible.

Greg Shatan: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Just on that, I mean, I don't necessarily agree that a rapporteur needs to let any discussion go on. This is the jurisdiction group. Its not be the immunity group or the liability group. So I think Greg, I mean, I understand why you haven't, but I think you could actually shut it down. I mean, otherwise any topic related or not that's brought up could be discussed. You know, I could put on the list that I want to be 6 feet tall and be in a Broadway musical, it's not going to happen. I'll leave it to you as to which one is going to happen.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Jeff. Again, I think both you and Leon have good points. And of course the issue is how to manage a discussion in a way that is neutral and productive and yet brings out from the – in a bottom-up fashion whether there is support or not for any type of continued discussion and the like.

Paul McGrady: In Greg's defense, you know, what we're talking about are the dancing bears charging the audience while in Ring Number 5 the clowns have caught, you know, the trapeze artist on fire by accident, right? And so, you know, I think he's – Greg's doing a good job. But we're all encouraged to hear the maybe that idea is the next one on the chopping block. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Paul. And also as somebody who never metaphor he didn't like, I have to congratulate you on that extended metaphor. Thank you. So I think that takes us through Accountability Work Stream 2. If anybody has any questions about that, these or any others, now is the time.

I would just double down on Leon's remarks regarding participation in those groups. I think almost uniformly that feeling is that while there are a lot of names there is a necessarily a lot of breadth of contribution. I would be surprised to find that we had more than 10 people on the jurisdiction group who have actively contributed, and yet we have at least - we have close to 60

people signed up who are nominally supposed to be part of these groups, which were supposed to be worked on.

The idea was if you signed up you should be expecting to do about five hours of work a week. I'd say some people would, you know, going till Armageddon and not do five hours of work on that group. Yes, Becky.

Becky Burr: I will admit that I'm a dilettante and did not put in my five hours. But Leon and Paul, I stand ready, willing and able. Just let me when you need me to weigh in.

Greg Shatan: And just to go briefly back onto the human rights, I'm active there. I'm almost as active as I am in the jurisdiction group but there I can, you know, speak my mind. And I think that there are those -they're a kind of two major positional issues there from our point of view.

One is that people would like to turn this into a system where ICANN would be fully compliant with the UN guiding principles on business enterprises and human rights, the Ruggie Principles. And a long story short, ICANN being what it is, not really a business enterprise, I think that's a really poor fit. And while there may be some things to learn from the Ruggie Principles, there are a lot of ways in which they should be used only as reference material and not as sort of a scorecard by which we succeed when we meet all of the Ruggie Principles, some of which go way beyond interpretation.

And if the group is only charged with providing a framework of interpretation so that the human rights bylaw is dealt with consistently in the future. And the other concern is that there are people there who are not concerned about the full panoply of human rights but really only want to look at, maybe this is overly churlish, using human rights as a means of diminishing and denigrating intellectual property rights. And ignore the fact that there are two of the universal declaration of human rights really feed into protection of intellectual property rights.

But they would rather concentrate on those that stand in opposition. And it's a real tug-of-war in the group, so definitely more help in the group always appreciated.

Let's just move on in terms of IPC policy positions and public comments. Thankfully we're not completely drowning in public comments but I will turn to Kiran.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Great, thanks. So unfortunately I have a hard stop at 4:40, so I'm going to breeze really quickly through this. And if people have some questions about public comments they can email us or bring it up in the next session.

So we going through the public comments list, we have not yet put a call out for the Middle East and adjoining countries strategy, if anyone is interested in that please ping the list. On the proposed amendments to dotXXX Registry Agreement, we have two volunteers as far, Brian Scarpelli and Claudio DiGangi.

On the Phase 2 assessment of the competitive effects associated with the new gTLD program, we also have Brian Scarpelli and Claudio DiGangi. Brian Scarpelli and Claudio DiGangi are getting my volunteer awards. The award is a deeper knowledge of ICANN policy, so congratulations.

So we do not have any volunteers for proposal of Lao script root zone label generation rules. Maybe for obvious reasons. So we will just get past that.

The draft PTI fiscal year '18 operating plan and budget, we will discuss with our treasurer, who is currently in route to India, Lori Schulman. And if we decide that there are IPC implications then we will put a call out to the list.

On the - there are two comments on GNSO thick Whois, one consensus policy requiring consistent labeling and display RDDS output for all gTLDs.

And one proposed implementation of GNSO thick RDDS Whois transition policy for Com, Net and Jobs.

I – sorry, when it comes to the list, I don't see whose working on this. I'm going to take a wild guess and say that Steve Metalitz is entrusted in (unintelligible) with thick Whois and if you have not thought about being interested in that well too bad, you will be.

So and then we have continuous data driven analysis of root server system stability draft report. No surprise that the IPC has no volunteers for that as well.

To go over some of the non-public comments, things that the IPC is working on, on October 18 we put out a call for volunteers on the economic study on new gTLD programs competitive effects. This went directly to the IPC kitchen cabinet team, which is a nickname that we've given to the group within the IPC that is consulting with the members – our members of the CCT team. And we'll follow up on that. We also put out a request to the IPC kitchen cabinet on input to the CCT Review Team and that's I think underway.

We recently closed a comment on Latin America, not like in general but okay so the Latin America and Caribbean DNS marketplace study, I want to thank Hector Manoff and surprise, Brian Scarpelli, for helping with those comments. So thank you very much. And those are in.

We also have an ongoing issue regarding the dotBible registry. That is being run by Damon Ashcraft. And I want to thank Sarah Deutsche for completing a draft on that comment. We will have a communication going out to the IPC list from the small group on Monday so please watch for input on that.

As I said, we have an IPC kitchen cabinet team which is inputting into the CCT so if you're interested in that work, please consider joining that.

And then we have the big three PDPs, the RPMs, the RDS and new gTLD Subsequent Procedures. We do have calls for volunteers out for a small group within the IPC to address covering calls and covering issues for those three PDPs. The only one that has actually formed and is active is the RDS group under the guidance of Steve Metalitz. Thanks, Steve. And we do not have – we have not been successful yet in finding somebody to lead and organize a small IPC group for RPM or new gTLD PDPs. So I think that we will be renewing a more robust call to action.

I will not that we have a lot of members that have taken leadership and active participation roles in those PDPs, but we don't have anybody within the IPC yet to coordinate IPC positions and coverage. And I think that's important in making sure that the IPC has their voice in those sort of big PDPs. I think it might also be interesting to talk with IPC leadership about something similar for Work Stream 2 so we can coordinate the volunteer efforts and share the burden on what sounds like very much needed input from the IPC on some of those issues.

So please watch for that. I'm super excited to not be doing the participation and policy coordinator work. It's a lot by myself. I will say thank you to Chantelle who I also, surprise, did not prepare properly for this meeting and she saved me on Skype about an hour ago, so thank you, Chantelle. And then I guess we'll talk about it tomorrow.

But we have a research assistant joining us as part of an ICANN document production pilot program organized by Dan O'Neil and that is Angie Graves who a lot of us know from her participation in the BC. So she's going to be joining us as our research assistant, and she will be assisting the participation and policy coordinator and Chantelle in preparing our public comments and helping us understand IPC historical policy positions.

So sweet, that's it for me. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Heather. I mean, thank you, Kiran. Oh…

Kiran Malancharuvil: Major upgrade. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Well it's a compliment to both of you. In any case and I want to echo the thanks to Chantelle for supporting us in all of these IPC and CSG meeting. You may not know that Chantelle is supporting us from California where it is currently about 3:07 am, and yet she is here with us, which is amazing. And I also want to thank for this particular meeting Colin O'Brien for being our remote participation coordinator and Adobe Connect person.

I see hand from Jeff and a hand from Heather with some AOB as we're moving…

Kiran Malancharuvil: Real quick before I leave, if you haven't signed in please do so. I'm just going to put the sign in list as I leave five minutes early here, with Greg. Cool?

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Jeff and then Heather.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, this is Jeff Neuman. I was just going to suggest that why doesn't the IPC kitchen cabinet that's helping on the CCT review team just help also with the Subsequent Procedures and the RPM? I think it's kind of a good -- it's a similar group of people, right?

Greg Shatan: Not necessarily. I mean, we do have an actively identified group of people who have signed up for each of the working groups and we have email lists for them, what we basically need is a person to be - was a member of the working group to be a captain to organize the other IPC members of the working group to do that and just make sure that, you know, we kind of don't lose our momentum in our ability to work.

I saw hand from Steve, and I have Heather. Okay, so Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Greg. Heather Forrest. We're not normally in the practice of making motions in the IPC, like many of you may not even realize this that the support we are receiving from Chantelle Doerksen is in fact even remote support. She has seamlessly providing us with an insane level of service. And I think that we as a constituency should communicate back some very strong message of praise to her boss, Rob Hogarth. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: I think we all second that. I would also say that in future the importance of the secretariat being what it is, and understand that maybe ICANN does need to leave some people to keep the lights on but it would be great to recognize the importance by having her on the ground. And I expect that she will be on the ground in Copenhagen, our next meeting.

So we've drawn close to closing time here. And just want to see if there is any other business. Colin O'Brien.

Colin O'Brien: Hi, Colin O'Brien. Just a real quick thing, I know INTA is having a reception tomorrow night around – from 6:00 to 8:00, there is invitations here. Especially the people who have just joined in the room and have heard alphabets soup of acronyms, it would be an opportunity for you to meet members of the IPC in a more relaxed setting and kind of if you had the questions that you were afraid to ask in front of everybody else you can ask one-on-one, while somebody is having a beer. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Colin. And I will point out the reception is not limited to IPC members. If you're in this room it means you're interested in intellectual property perhaps and it means you can have the reception, 6:00 to 8:00 at the (Avassa) rooftop.

Any other business? Vicky Scheckler.

Vicky Scheckler: Since I'm not sure how many of us are going to make it to the second IPC open meeting I like to take this time now to say thank you to Steve Metalitz, for his years of service on leadership. Thank you so much.

Greg Shatan: I have to – I have it – I have to second what Vicky said and to say particularly stepping into the job of president, having not been in leadership is an – is a difficult task and without the firm but very – it's hard to say – you know, Steve's guidance without kind of taking over was very important. Very quiet guidance and I never felt like a decision was taken out of my hands or that I was in any way, you know, being guided, but yet the kind of – the wisdom and experience and, you know, occasionally catching me when I was about to go over a ledge was extremely important.

And, you know, there are better ways to get into being a president of something than coming in cold, but there's no better vice president that you'd want in that position than Steve Metalitz. So I think that I wish now in retrospect that we'd gotten some big engraved Lucite thing, but unfortunately I was going to form a committee for that but Steve forgot to remind me to do so, so I did not…

Steve Metalitz: Last time I left office they got me a nice bottle of whiskey but we can take that later.

Greg Shatan: Thank you for the hint. So any other business? I think that now that we've thanked both our remote support and our long-time leadership, currently outgoing vice president, Steve, are good thing to end on. I'd just last say that we do have a Part 2 to this meeting, since normally we meet for quite a bit longer than this. It's at 9:00 am tomorrow. It's in Hall 6, the GNSO room.

We will be visited by Compliance there and we always have questions for Compliance. Also by the chairing skills coordinator, (Sandra Hooferichter), and also by Dan O'Neil and Angie Graves to talk about the document pilot program as well. So I do encourage you to come to that meeting and we'll

also pick up on any other loose items that we may have. And I will now call this meeting adjourned and thank you all.

END