

**ICANN**  
**Transcription ICANN Hyderabad**  
**GNSO Intellectual Property Constituency Open Meeting (Part 2)**  
**Monday, 07 November 2016 at 09:00 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: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the IPC Meeting Part 2 here at ICANN 57 in Hyderabad, India. I'm Greg Shatan, President of the IPC. And we will be having some guest speakers today, to edify and possibly even amuse us.

A few quick reminders, if you speak to say your name before you speak and do it every time you speak. If you want to have a question read aloud from the chat, but question before and after it, like you're doing HTML. Comment, do the same. Those will be read out loud. Everything else will be just left for the chat. We do have remote participation as well, so I will look for that. And if - I doing encourage you to login to the Adobe Connect room, remembering that this is - the Adobe Connect room for Room 6, not an IPC Adobe room.

So we will now begin with our agenda which begins with, welcome, roll call and introductions. And while I think many of us know each other, we may as well do a quick round of introductions. Greg Shatan, President of IPC. Partner with McCarter & English in New York.

Steve Metalitz: Steve Metalitz, Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp in Washington DC representing the Coalition for Online Accountability and currently, but not for long, Vice President of the IPC.

(Jana Call): Good morning. (Jana Call) from the Kenya Corporate Board.

Dan O'Neill: Good morning. Dan O'Neill with WBC Global contracting with ICANN for the development of a pilot project that we will present later today.

Angie Graves: Angie Graves. Angie Graves here at the behest of WBC Global. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Angie is the pilot project we'll be unveiling later today.

Aleksander Ichokjaev: Aleksander Ichokjaev partner at (Poposky) Law Office, Macedonia. Good morning, everyone.

Patrick Charnley: Hi. Patrick Charnley, IFPI, IPC member.

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

(Deepak Parmad): Hi. (Deepak Parmad), IP attorney, India.

Griffin Barnett: Griffin Barnett, Mayer Brown in DC. IPC member.

Brian Scarpelli: Brian Scarpelli with ACT, the App Association, IPC member.

Damon Ashcraft: Damon Ashcraft, and I'm with Snell & Wilmer in Phoenix, Arizona. And I am also the IPC Nominating Committee delegate.

Lori Schulman: Lori Schulman, International Trademark Association. And I'm Treasurer of the IPC for now and the next two years. Next two years?

((Crosstalk))

Alex Deacon: Sign her up. Hi, my name is Alex Deacon with the Motion Picture Association of America.

Vicky Scheckler: Vicky Scheckler with RIA.

Hector Manoff: Hector Manoff from Argentina, (unintelligible) IP firm.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. If anybody from the audience wants to come up and sit at the empty seats at the table they can use the mics and introduce themselves or if they prefer to view us from afar that's fine as well. Just like to note the difference style among two of our officers; Lori Schulman has already announced her reelection bid for next year which is the earliest in IPC history that anyone has ever announced their reelection bid before they even take the office for the year that they already won.

Vicky Scheckler, on the other hand, our incoming Vice President, did not identify herself as such, which might have something to do with the dinner we went to that went on until something like 1:00 in the morning and then apparently the taxi got a flat tire on the way back but we weren't in that taxi so we got home fine. So those who were in that taxi, my condolences. We had quite a nice drive in our posh SUV, taking the private toll roads that the regular taxis won't take because they're too expensive. So anyway welcome this morning.

The first part of our agenda is a continuation of topics from Part 1 of the meeting. For better or worse we don't have a lot of issues that are left over from Part 1, but we do have a couple. In particular, as you may remove her from our discussion of the motions in front of the GNSO, there is the discussion of the GNSO - new GNSO powers drafting team, motion and amendment, that is still a moving target, and there will be discussion on the IPC list to determine what we need, what we want, what we'd like to get.

Heather Forrest has asked that we make our thoughts, wishes, dreams known on the list so that she can work that into, if at all possible, what's being worked out for today's public Council meeting. So please do that as well.

Just a quick reminder of the schedule for the rest of the day, after this and debris coffee break at 11 o'clock, there's the ever popular GNSO review of all rights mechanisms in all gTLDs working group, and that is a public face to face meeting, not an update, which will be taking place in this room directly after the coffee break from 11:00 to 12:15. Also in this room, so you never have to leave this room, is the GNSO Council public meeting, 1:45 to 3:00, a break for coffee, I believe, if you're lucky, and then GNSO Council meeting Part 2 and then the GNSO wrap-up meeting.

At the end of the day you have a choice between the Internet Governance public session or the INTA reception. And if you're in this room you're invited to the INTA reception, which is from 6:00 to 8:00 pm at the (Avassa) Hotel rooftop. Lori.

Lori Schulman: Yes, thank you for plugging that. We planned the party before the ICANN schedule was finalized even though we tried hard not to overlap. But I want to say if we get enough people there, if you're interested in the high interest topic we will extend it an hour so to avoid the conflict.

Greg Shatan: So you may be able to go to both the Internet Governance public session and to the INTA event. But...

Lori Schulman: Come to the event.

Greg Shatan: Yes, of course. But also if you think you're going to try to do both. You can look for her, she's in the make ICANN great again hat. Just in case you can't read it, that's not a make America great again hat. I'm not taking sides, but just wanted to point out what the hat actually says.

So I'd like to see if anybody would like to raise any issues or re-raise any issues that we had from yesterday's meeting? Steve Metalitz.

Steve Metalitz: I don't know whether it would go here or somewhere else on the agenda, but it might be worth just talking for a minute or two about the session that we had with the Board yesterday. So is this an appropriate time to do that or would you rather do that under AOB?

Greg Shatan: I think we can do that now since we're ahead of schedule.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. The point I wanted to raise is that we asked the Board, among other things, we referred to our bylaws and charter that said that one of our missions is to give the Board advice on the intellectual property issues that we have some expertise on, I'm paraphrasing. And we asked the Board, do you feel like you're getting that or how do you get your advice now?

The upshot – it was slightly meandering conversation but the upshot of it was that we were invited to provide advice on issues within our expertise and we were told that it would be treated just like advice coming from a formal advisory committee like the SSAC. Now I'm not sure I totally believe that, but that was the invitation that was tendered to us.

And I think that gives us an interesting opportunity if we can identify issues that are appropriate for this and where we can have a unified position. It's not an advocacy point so much as a, you know, here's the state of the law. And particularly on some of the international issues and, you know, country names and geographic names and so forth where we think we might have a legal insight to contribute. We've got to now – we've been invited to use this channel to go directly to the Board and provide our views.

So we – I just wanted to flag that. It wasn't exactly what I was expecting to come out of that discussion but it might provide an opportunity that, you

know, again another channel that we should think about using when it's appropriate. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Steve, for bringing that up. I think that is a very good point to keep – to not let slip out of our frontal conscience because – this is Greg Shatan again for the record. And I think that was – of all the possible outcomes, I thought it was one of the more positive and ones. It's a challenge because if we want to legitimately and credibly be seen as an advice-giving organization, we would have to be objective and avoid advocacy for anything other than the rule of law. Since, as lawyers know, you can spin everything 15 ways if you want to.

They gave some other technical advice, which I thought was good. Number of our reports, like SSAC does, make them look different than any IPC public comment or other deliverable so that they're clearly seen as an advice, as a piece of advice and get treated as such. But I think this is actually quite an interesting way to satisfy the prong of our charter that sometimes doesn't really get a lot of attention. But given that we are chartered as such, it's really, you know, an excellent opportunity especially as we find ourselves sometimes dealing with concept of rule of law versus what I want even though it has no basis in law.

So being in favor of the way the laws actually work is a good thing but not a foregone conclusion around here. Any other points? Colin O'Brien.

Colin O'Brien: Hi, Colin O'Brien for the record. I was actually a little concerned by that statement because I feel that it's almost like the – the IPC is going around from the bottom up multi-stakeholder model to give advice directly to the Board. And I feel that that could create some political issues going forward. It just – it seems like there are a lot of multi-stakeholders, a lot of different ideas. And if all the sudden we're going directly towards the Board with advice, I think there can be some issues with that.

Greg Shatan: Steve and then Lori.

Steve Metalitz: Steve Metalitz. Yes, I agree. The question is who are the issues for? The Board has invited us to do this. So – well check the transcript. I think that's the case. So I don't see why it would be a problem for us. Would some people who don't like what we have to say criticize the Board for asking us to submit our views? Probably so. But I think that's inevitable.

Greg Shatan: Lori.

Lori Schulman: Hi. I want to follow up by saying I recognize that there are definitely sensitivities around that. But I also feel that we're really the only constituency that is in the place to do that. And the Board does need the advice as well as the GAC. I feel like both the GAC and the Board have a tendency to make decisions based not in law, certainly not in trademark law, maybe in talking about, you know, where good advice should come from.

Yes, we're advocating a position, but we also have a substantive knowledge that no other constituency has. And so I think it is fair to put us in that role and certainly put that in a role with the disclaimer that when we need to advocate for us positions, we're going to advocate for our positions. But when you ask us for advice, we'll give you pros and cons and the advice.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Lori. Greg Shatan again. I think – and we don't even need to be asked to give advice, where our charter says we can give timely and expert advice. And, Colin, I do acknowledge that. And that's why I think it's very important that we exercise this rarely, that we distinguish it fundamentally from our public comments in tone and in look and feel that these need to be more research and footnote-driven. Really needs – we need to be reflecting – if we're going to be giving expert advice, it needs to look like expert advice, not advocacy.

And we have to exercise it with great care because if we give advice and it looks like it's spun and it looks like it's advocacy that we've tried to cloak in a veneer of advice, our credibility will be shot and any future advice will be viewed exactly as you see it, as just a power play trying to take the slender reed of our advice-giving powers and turning it into some sort of, you know, advocacy sort of Trojan horse.

So we – when we do this we need to do it right and that means reflecting the state of the law even if we don't like exactly where the state of the law is ourselves. Because I think that if we get a reputation for giving objective state of the law advice that can be very helpful in the future because there's just a lot of noise around here.

And to some extent, and being a stakeholder who has tried to give objective and expert advice in working groups, I realize there can be – you can go only so far with that. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that ICANN spent several million dollars on outside legal counsel in CWG Stewardship and CCWG Accountability, aside from the fact that we needed governance experts, of which we have few if any, probably none, is that the – you can only go so far giving advice before people just say, hey, you're a stakeholder, you know, I don't know that you're telling me the truth.

So we need to give advice that even if someone who was expert but disagreed with all of our policy positions would say, yes, this is the law. That's the baseline. I'll tell you why I think we should ignore the law or deal with a different way. So I'd like to show – I'd almost like to show them to our most opposite numbers who have some degree of knowledge about this and if it passes their test then I think we're doing our job right. They may not admit it but then I'll just let their heads explode at the microphone.

Damon.



Daman Ashcraft: Greg, I just wanted to second what you said. I think what you said about giving advice, even if we don't necessarily agree with it from an advocacy standpoint is right on. And I would encourage you and others to repeat that as we go through and actually prepare written work product.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Damon. And I think we should prepare a sort of a – a statement about how we would go about doing this, you know, flesh out beyond what's in the bylaws that we have kind of a guideline for the future and we can capture these ideas as we go along.

So I'd like to see if we have Sandra Hoferichter in the audience? Sandra, come on up to the head of the table. We're playing the Price is Right. You're our first contestant. Sandra will be talking to us about the ICANN Academy Pilot Chairing Skills Program. And I've learned that Heather Forrest, Vice Chair of the GNSO and member of the IPC, is actually going to be a part of the faculty of the Chairing Skills Program so you know it's got to be good. Sandra.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you very much, Greg. And thank you to all of you for inviting me. Can we have that link I sent earlier this week up on the screen? And it would be a bit easier to explain.

Many of you – or some of you might be aware that the ICANN Academy is developing courses from the community for the community. One course has already taken place three times, which is the Leadership Program. And the next one will take place in Copenhagen, the three days before the ICANN meeting. This is a course especially designed for incoming and current ICANN leaders, so actually those who are active in the respective constituencies. And the call is – the call for participation is now open.

What you will have during this three days we will have some professional sharing skills and participation skills development. We will have in depth community discussion but I think the most valuable thing is that you get to

know the leaders from the other communities. And this is actually the part which was always for all participants and sort of an eye-opener, but I said, we did not really know how you function or how your group works and why you are doing the things the way you are doing it.

So this was really something which has the greatest value in this whole program. And what we also do we will have a joint cooking school where you can actually do something together, do something nicely. And if you click on that link, which is now at the moment in the Adobe Connect, you will get access to both of the programs.

And then the second program is especially designed for working group or community chairs. This is a program where chairs will have the opportunity to improve their chairing skills because chairing a meeting at ICANN can be challenging in sometimes. We will look at both chairing skills over telephone and chairing skills over face to face meetings. We will have again professional support from inside learning.

They will monitor, together with community facilitators, they will monitor and observe a chair while he or she is doing – chairing a session, giving feedback afterwards. And then on a second call or in a second meeting it will be possible to incorporate that feedback and see how it works.

This course will also start in December – December before Christmas we won't have much more than coordination calls so the actual work will start in January or February.

I would like to invite this community now to select people among yourself. Please select them beforehand because the academy working group is not going to do evaluation of participation, we want you to decide whom to send to this program. You will have one seat for the leadership program, which is taking place prior to Copenhagen. And please take note that this program does not include travel support but it includes of course the hotel, which will

be additional. So we can only invite people who are already on ICANN's travel list or who have other means of getting their travel funded.

And the chairing skills is also open now. If you go on both sides on the bottom of the page you will find the registration form there. But please make sure that you have made the assignment and the selection of the people you would like to send beforehand in your community. If we get multiple applications or multiple, let's call it, registration because it's not an application in that form, then we will come back to you as a community asking whom you would like to decide.

It makes sense that you might select a fallback option because it always happens that for some or the other reason people have to drop out on a very short notice and then it would be a pity not to – or to miss that place.

As you said already, Heather Forrest is heavily involved in the development of both courses. She will moderate a great portion of the face to face Copenhagen leadership program. And she will be also be involved in the development of this chairing skills, especially designed for chairs, which is a pilot. And as we did for the leadership program we have to learn from that one. So the first chairs who are going to take that one will be sort of the guinea pigs but we still hope there will be enough attention and enough interest on that one as well.

I'm open for questions.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. First question, what will be happening during the time before the meeting? As you say, it starts in December and then kind of rolls up.

Sandra Hoferichter: It's Sandra speaking. Good question. The chairing skills program starts in December, the leadership program is just a one-day meeting. So it could be possible that one person is taking the whole course, for instance, doing the

chairing skills beforehand, which will take place over the time January, February, a bit of March, and can continue afterwards. And then we have of course the opportunity to give personal feedback during the Copenhagen meeting.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Sandra. Any other questions for Sandra from the floor? Anything even if you don't know that you have a question maybe you want to ask a question somebody else might want to hear the answer to. I will note in terms of travel support that IPC does do some travel funding for the ICANN meetings, as many of you know.

And that, you know, clearly if you want to attend the leadership session that, and you're generally an active participate in IPC, which given that you're taking a leadership session I would assume you would be, that, you know, travel support to get to Copenhagen for that would almost certainly be available if you aren't already an ICANN-funded traveler or the like. So I would not – that should not be a bar to participation no matter what you – what your circumstances might be in terms of getting funded.

So I think we'll be able to bridge that gap for any of our participants who would like to participate. So I'll just further say that I think that this is a really excellent idea, so many of us who sit here and chair learn by the seat of our pants. We learn by doing and watching and by either explicit or implicit mentoring and speaking of which, putting my glasses back on to make sure I'm not mis-seeing things.

I joined ICANN – IPC in 2007 by joining a working group chaired by Chuck Gomes. And in terms of learning how to chair something by watching someone chair that was about as good a chairing institute as one could hope for. But it's still not a recognized legal – or recognized institution. I think and having something institutionalize this knowledge would be really helpful because it is not as easy as it looks. Sometimes it doesn't even look easy. And I think it's important to try to develop skills and especially because we

need to keep moving people up into leadership positions and chairing positions.

I'll acknowledge Michael Fleming whose probably still asleep after our late return from dinner, Michael, a relatively new member of IPC, stepped up to chair one of the work tracks in I think it's the RPM group or maybe it's subsequent rounds. But any case, you know, it takes guts to do that after you haven't been around too long. You should have more than guts, you should have some actual knowledge. Michael is going a great job but can imagine that, you know, all of us would like a little bit more support so I'll encourage to do this.

And recognize, as we've learned with leadership program, the first time around you're a guinea pig, you're in a beta situation. So on the one hand it may not be everything you expect; on the other hand you'll have a chance to make it more of what you would have expected. So want to thank ICANN for doing this and thank Sandra for spearheading another educational aspect of ICANN Academy, which is I think, you know, very helpful.

Any other questions? With that I'll thank Sandra and allow her not to cough at everybody from the front table but to do it in relatively anonymity of the audience. And thank you, Sandra.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you very much.

Greg Shatan: Next up on our agenda, as was mentioned, we have Dan O'Neill and Angie Graves. You can come up front so everyone can see you or you can do it from there if you prefer. By creating a choice I'm taking away all of my choices about what you do. Thank you.

Go ahead, Dan. Thank you.

Dan O'Neill: Greg, I'd like to thank you and I'd like to thank the IPC for the opportunity to present this morning on a pilot program which we have been developing – I have been asked to develop with the policy development staff of ICANN over the last year.

And it is – we'll go through the long title one time. It is the Document Development and Drafting Pilot Program. This is a program that really is a response to a request from stakeholder communities for assistance with drafting in response to ICANN opportunities, basically PCPs. A number of the stakeholder communities had expressed an interest in engaging to a larger extent in a number of the PCP opportunities or PDP opportunities that were available online but found that they just did not have the resources, the bandwidth to engage at the level that they would want.

So over the last year we have worked with ICANN staff to put together a pilot program. And I am thrilled that the IPC is one of the communities that has stepped forward to directly work with us in the implementation of this. On the one side of the track there are five communities that we are working with directly. There is the IPC, the BC, the ISPCP, the Registries and the Registrars.

And the way that the program is designed is for these communities what we have done is we have selected an individual research writer to assist each one of those communities on a one to one basis. So we've got five different research writers; one for each of those communities. And it's really to focus on assisting, in this case the IPC, in its ability to research, develop, draft, edit and submit into the ICANN drafting process.

It is really trying to broaden that bandwidth so that you can engage at a higher level. And I'm very honored to have Angie Graves here with me who the IPC has selected as their particular research writer to assist in this pilot program. So Angie has already been engaged with Greg and others so we've

already started this process. But I'd like to introduce Angie for just a minute, and then we can discuss the program a little bit.

Angie Graves: Thank you, Dan. This is Angie Graves. And I'm very happy to be participating in this program and especially with the IPC. We have a few months and many hours to work together to help advance some of the IPC's needs with respect to responding to comments and developing and drafting documents. So I'm eager to get started, get heavily engaged. And thank you so much for selecting me for this program.

Greg Shatan: Angie, I want to thank you for being part of the program and for being there to be selected. Angie is known to many of us who – from her work in the BC, but, you know, she's taking a sabbatical from the BC while she's doing this job. But the fact that we can start with somebody who has, you know, a great baseline of knowledge about ICANN and really just needs to deal with the ins and outs of IPC peculiarities and (quiddities), that gives us a real leg up in this program so we need to figure out how to use her 100 hours well.

We've already got her started on her first project. Basically she has been familiarizing herself with the IPC's public comment history, which is available on our Website, but is only organized chronologically which is not particularly illuminating with regard to the substance of any of the content.

So trying to draw together our historical positions on particular issues so that we have, you know, an actual issue history and policy history, you know, organized in a way that when we do comment on policy, since, you know, so many issues in ICANN have reiterated themselves, you know, nearly since the beginning, if not before, we can turn back to them not in an ad hoc basis, you know, scooping out every time we do it, going back to the 12 Whois comments we've made over the years, we will have a reasoned repository that will actually help us, you know, build our policy positions from a real, you know, knowledge base rather than just a, you know, pile of PDFs, which is what we have.

And, you know, the pilot is what we make of it. There may be times when Angie is sitting in with a drafting team that is working on a public comment and helping either to research particular things, and bringing them back to the group, may help with developing a framework, may help with drafting, may help with editing, whatever it may be depends – this may, for those of you who have been reluctant to be a lead-drafter in a working team, drafting team, this may help you be that lead.

I'll tell you from the point of view of being a chair of this group that having Chantelle as a secretariat has made everybody in leadership have an easier job and we can, you know, be more at our higher and best use knowing that we have kind of backup making sure that things, you know, get done and put in the right place. And I think that Angie can do the same for our policy development and drafting.

Of course, the positions we develop are our own. We're not all of a sudden going to sound like Steve DelBianco. But, well thing is I already said, "uh" so I don't sound like Steve DelBianco. He makes very sure he either says words or is silent. And it's one of his most admirable characteristic along with never saying, "you know" and when I look at our transcripts I realize I say "you know" a lot. So, but enough about Steve.

I think that it's really great and let's all try to work – this is only a pilot program. We have 100 hours and it ends in January, end of January. So I think we'll be able to dispose of that pretty easily. Anybody who have billed hours for a living knows how quickly 100 hours can go by. Sometimes in a single week it appears. But I don't think we'll use Angie up in a week, but we do want to use everything we've got. Dan.

Dan O'Neill: Thanks, Greg. I would just like to pick up on two point that you had raised. First being the notion that, you know, this is support to the IPC. We are looking clearly to just enhance the work that you're doing but, you know, we



are not trying to slot in over the work that you're doing and claim these comments or engagement at all as our own. So we are really looking to support you in your efforts to develop exactly what the IPC wishes to be saying and doing on these fronts. So I think that was one.

Second is the design of the program, what we tried to do is really kind of focus on the drafting process. And those are really kind of the guardrails that we used. And within that we wanted to allow a great deal of flexibility for each one of the communities to utilize this resource in the way that best suits the way that they go about this process.

So again, I think the IPC is going to utilize Angie and her skills differently than the BC might utilize, you know, their research writer. But it's – it's really kind of to support your process where you wish to plug in this resource so that it can be most valuable to you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Dan. This is Greg Shatan again. Just to follow up on that and that fact as a pilot we ourselves should try to use Angie in a variety of different ways, see what might work out best. So anybody – as we do start comments we should basically ask for Angie. Maybe I'll have buttons made up that say, "Ask for Angie." And get her involved in your drafting team. And we should consciously try to use her in different ways and different drafting teams. We can get a sense of what might work best.

Using her the same way in six different comments won't be as illuminating in terms of this being a pilot as if we, you know, try different ways of having her participate in the drafting process for us. Any questions? Anybody currently involved in drafting a comment? Brian Scarpelli, you're involved in drafting all comments lately it seems. Do you have any thoughts on how Angie might help you?

- Brian Scarpelli: Well, we should – well I'll connect with you soon about that. But I'm sure that we can find some ways that it would be very helpful I think. Yes, I appreciate it.
- Greg Shatan: Absolutely. And, you know, sometimes when we have comments, especially when there isn't a deadline, it can be very difficult to get even off the ground so we can get help on that. I'm looking at Damon Ashcraft as I say that. Not because Damon couldn't get a project off the ground but because he and I had to try multiple modalities to get a project off the ground, which finally is off the ground. Alex Deacon.
- Alex Deacon: Hi. Thanks. Alex Deacon. So I'm just curious, has this program been – has it happened in other constituencies? Are we the first? Is there any past experience on doing this?
- Dan O'Neill: The pilot is just getting started kind of across these five communities that I had listed out so we've got the IPC, the ISPCP, the BC, Registries and Registrars are all kind of, you know, ramping up together here. So what we were going to do really again in the nature of the pilot is obviously trying to provide a valuable service for each one of those communities as we go through these 100 hours.
- But I think the second pillar of any pilot is, you know, really kind of understanding, you know, what has worked, what has not worked, you know, how might we redirect some of the work or shift some of that so that, you know, at the end of this we can work with the IPC to really understand, you know, were we on mark with the way that we did things? How might we want to shift things going forward to make this much more effective for you, you know, if and when we're able to continue the program.
- Greg Shatan: Thanks, Dan. And what is the methodology for capturing kind of lessons learned or postmortem, as this goes along?

Dan O'Neill: Well there's clearly going to be just kind of a matrix to understand kind of logging exactly the kind of work that Angie is undertaking kind of throughout for this 100 hours to understand what percentage of that is writing, what percentage is editing, what percentage is she involved in community calls, you know, internal ICANN research, outside research, so that we can really kind of document, you know, an understanding of where that's at.

But I think a real critical element is going to be towards the end of the program is that kind of exit interview process both with Angie and her experience and her engagement, the work that she's done and the way that she has been able to interact with the IPC. And then conversely working with you, Greg, and your colleagues to understand from your perspective exactly how that worked, what did work, what did not work, what should we be thinking about doing different. So we're going to try to use those two to kind of lay out exactly what has worked and where we might want to go going forward.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Dan. Steve Metalitz.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, thank you. I want to join everyone in welcoming Angie to our ranks, at least temporarily. And just to stress what Greg was mentioning as I think her lead-off project, which is organizing and keywording the resource we have, but that we can't utilize very effectively of the hundreds of public comments we filed over the years. So for example, I know one thing that – public comment period that's now open is the Phase 2 assessment of the Competitive Effects Associated with the new gTLD Program.

I'm not sure who is leading that team to work on that or whether it's somebody in this room. I'm not the person, but it just strikes me that, you know, this is a – we commented on several of the economic studies that ICANN commissioned leading up to the new gTLD rollout. And also associated with it, so for example, they also commissioned an economic

study on vertical integration that was very relevant to how that issue was handled in the new gTLD program.

So it – you know, once we – to make it easier to access what we've said in the past, and kind of our approaches to these questions back, you know, these studies were mostly maybe six, seven, eight years ago, to be able to access that quickly and feed that into this drafting process I think is going to be a big help. But it's not going to, you know, write the comment for us, but at least give us a sense of what we've said before on this topic. And if we're going to say something different we should at least know that or else we may want to continue along the same line.

So I just think that's a great example of how Angie's work could potentially really add value to what we're doing. And I'm sure there will be other such opportunities going forward.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Steve. Dan, excuse my naiveté, or poor information, retention skills. But when you refer to the matrix, is there an actual written matrix? And would we be filling that out or would Angie be filling that out?

Dan O'Neill: I will be working with Angie to fill out the actual matrix in terms of the work that she is doing. You absolutely will be engaged in that secondary process of the interview as to, you know, how the program was set up, how it worked well for you, how Angie was able to, you know, engage and interact in your process. But the matrix is something that I will be working on with Angie really to kind of formally track exactly the focus that she has.

But, you know, if you've got other input into, you know, how that matrix might be extended out and you're being able to add into that, would be happy to work with you on that as well.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Dan. I hope that this is as successful as the first matrix and not either of the sequels. So speaking of matrices. So and I think we'll also be

interested during the course of the process, will there be an opportunity for cross learning between the different parallel pilot programs?

Dan O'Neill: Oh you enter right into those – the sensitivity that we had in establishing the program and that is there was sensitivity first and foremost in that this is something that I am one step removed in that I am contracting with ICANN for this. But it ultimately has come from the ICANN Secretariat. And then what we wanted to do was make sure that, you know, each of the communities that – a critical element that we saw for the success of this is that trust relationship that is developed between the community and the research writer.

You know, there was some concern that, you know, if we had a single research writer servicing one or two – or two or three communities then you're getting into a situation where, you know, that level of confidence in terms of engaged in calls and so on could be compromised. So we did want to very clearly delineate that there's going to be one research writer for each community.

What we are planning to do is, you know, we certainly do not want to do anything that's going to undermine that trust relationship that the community can have, that this is an individual that is focused on strictly your work. But in terms of, you know, kind of on a generic basis, understanding what other communities might be doing in terms of utilizing that resource and so on, we are going to try to share that on a timely basis so that, you know, really what we'd like to do is get to a best practices kind of situation here.

But there is some sensitivity about, you know, kind of sharing and too much discussion across the communities while the pilot is ongoing.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Dan. That's helpful to know. So in the four stages of play we'll be engaged in parallel play, Stage 2, usually starts around Age 2 to 3. So at

least we move past solitary play. And I won't make any off color remarks about that and ultimately associative and cooperative play, as we figure out what we're all doing together. I think that is good, but – and I think it's important to try to capture the longitudinal and latitudinal data and obviously aggregated, anonymized and sanitized and obviously you don't want anybody to feel like there are spies and they're reporting back to the other constituencies about, you know, how they're doing things or, worse, what position they're taking. So I understand the sensitivities and even the sensitivities of working with ICANN at all that some people seem to have.

But, you know, looking at how we work with policy staff and work with Chantelle, and knowing Angie, that even if this program were a secret spy program, I think we'd at least be able to turn Angie and not make – and make sure she wasn't a double agent. We'd bring her over to our side, take her in from the cold.

So I want to thank you both for your presentation. Thank you, Angie, and you may now know exactly what you're getting yourself into but then again, none of us do but I know that you will do a great job. Thank you, both.

Next up on our agenda we have a – one of our favorite long-time guests, the Compliance Department with Allen Grogan and Maguy Serad. Please come on up to the table. There is a slide I believe, or maybe two. As promised to be no more than two, it's probably 10 now but, depending on more data is better. So would like to thank Maguy and Allen for coming to us. And note that Allen, is this your last ICANN meeting or do you have one more?

Allen Grogan: Last one as part of ICANN staff anyway.

Greg Shatan: That's true. ICANN – you try to get away and they keep you pulling back in so we may see Allen with a different...

Allen Grogan: Might be at the microphone at a public forum someday, you never know.

Greg Shatan: There you so. You could take Brad White's job, you've got the hair for it so...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: And good stuff under the hair as well. But in any case before I dig myself a deeper trench I will turn things over to Maguy and Allen.

Maguy Serad: Good morning, everyone. My name is Maguy Serad. I'm with Contractual Compliance. Thank you for inviting us to this forum. We appreciate the opportunity. We've provided additional slides and appendix, but I just think that one slide, if you don't mind, I'm not sure who's manning the – yes, one more. Whoa, that is small. No, go up. Okay. That's hard to read.

Okay, I should know what I've provided you with, right? So basically what I want to do is just spend about two minutes giving you a high level update where we are, what we're doing. We are actively preparing for the ICANN enterprise system solution.

You all have heard of the highlights project or the Salesforce project, this is a centralized system that's going to host – thank you – centralized system that's going to host or become a portal also for registrars and registries information and compliance will move into that.

Why is this relevant for this audience? We hear from this audience the opportunities for improved reporting, opportunities for improved resolution codes. So we are taking this opportunity to vet through a lot of the resolution codes. When I first came on board, coming from a system development background, it's best to have no less than 10-20 resolution codes because we try to translate them and make them global. And as we continue to grow and hear from the community more details, more details more details. We're now over 200 resolution codes.

In the meantime, to bridge the gap, what we're trying to do is where applicable provide more information as we are closing the reporter. And for you guys to also know, being almost similar scenarios from the registrars on some of the resolutions.

So we are vetting them. And, you know, hopefully we're going to get an end goal. But if you do have any questions, and I know when we close a ticket, we ask you not to respond because it will not go into a queue. You can always email us at [compliance@icann.org](mailto:compliance@icann.org) asking specific questions about a ticket, just include that ticket number in it and we'll be happy to accommodate.

We continue to have ongoing audit activities for registrars and registries. Interesting received a question say, if you continue at this pace when will you be done with audits? Try to start to do the math. This industry, you know, with our audience, registrars and registries, who are our auditees, continues to evolve and change. So I don't think this – there will be an end date to audits.

Plus, audits are ongoing activities to help us be more proactive. So what we do we target our audit samples to address some of the high topics – hot topics, whether things we see through the media or some of the criteria that we all, if you've attended the program update you've heard me speak about. It could be contract parties who have high volume of issues. It could be a lack of collaboration. It could be we have received sources or information or there are some concerns about certain contracted parties. We roll them into an audit.

We target to complete two audits by area. Currently we are in the process of auditing registrars. And we closed a registry audit about a month ago. We target two audits, one for – two for registrars and two for registries in a calendar year.



We have, and we continue to improve on our dashboard reporting, a lot of interest in Whois inaccuracy breakdown. We've provided additional breakdown if you look at our monthly report. As you know, ICANN is involved in multiple activities, not only receipt of individual who has an accuracy complaint but we also receive – we have the ability to receive bulk submissions.

And we also launched into what we call quality reviews and then ICANN as an organization has launched the accuracy reporting system which is one of the Affirmation of Commitments Whois Review Team recommendations. So we're providing data on that.

In addition, we have improved a little bit the definition in the dashboard definitions, and also at the bottom of the dashboard, we realized we also provide a lot of data to different review teams like the CCT Review Team, the RPM Review Team. So we provided a link to those sites because we don't have this data specifically on our page.

Last but not least, we continue to actively engage with contracted party. Why is this of importance to this audience? We are trying to do proactive approach to address what we call low-hanging fruit. So in addition to the onsite visits that the team has conducted, spent few days in China, a couple of days in Korea working with targeted audiences on what we see as opportunities.

If you've gotten to know me for the past five and a half years, I don't speak of issues; I speak of opportunities. We also try to conduct internal projects where we – when we conduct audits and we publish an audit report for each audit we conduct, you hear us speak of remediation. We wanted to test the remediation. You know, when a remediation is concluded, we come back and test it. But not just one time, we launch another test to see are they sustaining that remediation? Is it just a one-time thing?

I would – I'm happy to report from the sample size we conducted on that audit remediation, they all passed the test. So remediations that were applied a year or two ago are still in effect.

Another one we're conducting and focusing a lot on is Whois verification and validation. And it's more of a target project. We're targeting on certain areas where we have a high volume. And hopefully through those targeted outreaches, we want to measure if there is a correlation between outreach and reduction or even higher rate of compliance in those areas.

With this I leave the deck in your hands. We've provided data and open it for questions.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Maguy. Questions? Alex, is that an old hand?

Alex Deacon: Yes, but I'm formulating a question at the moment.

Greg Shatan: Okay, we can go to Steve Metalitz...

((Crosstalk))

Alex Deacon: Go to Steve and then I'll...

Greg Shatan: While Alex is...

Alex Deacon: ...put one together.

Greg Shatan: ...cogitating.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Steve Metalitz. First I just want to thank Maguy and Allen once again for coming to meet with us. This is a pretty standard feature of our IPC meetings and has been for many years, and we always appreciate the

information you bring and your willingness to respond to questions, sometimes rather barbed questions, other times less so.

But as, I guess maybe as in my role in this being my last meeting as an IPC officer, I just wanted to thank you for all that you've done over the years. I did have two points. First, just one of your – it's gone now but one of your bullet points was about contributing to working groups and – excuse me, implementation review teams and so forth. And I just wanted to say I think that's a very – potentially very valuable and it has been important input in some of the groups that I've been involved in anyway.

So sometimes in the past we didn't have that much – get that a much input or communication from Compliance and especially in terms of implementation the – having the perspective of how Compliance would enforce it is very valuable. So I want to thank you for that.

The other point that I wanted to raise has to do with transparency in the compliance function which you'll not be surprised to hear is a big concern for us. And rather than – we've had a lot of dialogue about it and, frankly, I don't think it's been very productive; it's been kind of repetitive. One thing that we are trying to do in a couple of different ways is get a little more concrete about what kind of things we want to see and that we feel we should be able to see in order to better understand how Compliance approaches its job and also better understand how we and our clients, as complainants, can be more effective.

So I don't have anything to bring forward on that right now but just to say that we are trying to come up with something that's more concrete and specific and hopefully when we do that we'll be able to progress with you and get more transparency into the system which we think is a really serious need. Thank you.

Allen Grogan: Yes, we did hear from contracted parties yesterday or the day before, I don't know, they all run together, that they had some discussions with the IPC about potentially doing some joint proposal or suggestion on how we might be more transparent. So we look forward to hearing from you.

Greg Shatan: Allen, I mean, rather Alex, has the cogitation completed?

Alex Deacon: Yes, it's – well it's not well formed but let me take a shot at it. So this is Alex Deacon. So I think what Steve said is kind of part of what I wanted to say. And maybe if it would be helpful I'll just give you kind of an example of why I think more transparency is needed. And I think in our limited experiences with filing complaints with the Compliance Department is that we didn't get an opportunity to learn from the process. So let me explain at a high level.

So for example, let's say we file a complaint that says we believe there's a compliance issue, X, with some scenario. And we file a complaint with details of our understanding and why we're filing the complaint, what we did previously, etcetera.

And then the complaint, I assume, it's a black box. You send this – let's say it's a registry issue. You send it to the registry. The registry then perhaps reaches out to the registrar, maybe the registrant, I don't know, probably the registrar. And let's say the response from the registry is well, you know, whoever filed this complaint doesn't understand what X is about and they're wrong about X and here's the following reasons why they are wrong and so you should, you know, the complaint should be closed.

And so all that happens and I'm sure there's emails that go back and forth and then from our end we get a response that says, the case has been closed. We have found no incidence of compliance breach. And we haven't learned as to why, right? We haven't learned from our mistake perhaps.

And I think just getting back some information about, you know, why it was determined it wasn't a compliance issue would be helpful because it basically allows us to stop wasting our time and wasting your time and wasting time of whoever we're complaining about if in fact we are wrong.

So currently because of the nature of the information not, you know, all that information not getting back to us, perhaps summarized, perhaps redacted, I don't know, we don't get a chance to learn and improve moving forward. So that's kind of a little bit of the issues that I've seen now with the process. And if we were able to find a way to convey that information to allow us to learn about what's going on, I think that would be very helpful.

And I think so we will be putting more details together as Steve mentioned, but I wanted to give you some insight into my thinking at least about, you know, how we could improve things.

Maguy Serad: This is Maguy for the record. Thank you, Alex, for the input. It is not a black box. So, there are people behind, there are people within it. We vet the current reports that are shared with us. And in the absence sometimes of some evidence we send an inquiry to the contracted party to review it. And if we have enough evidence we send a notice and we, you know, it is an alleged noncompliance or is it truly a compliance issue?

But the feedback is well taken. As Allen said earlier, we welcome the input. In the meantime, I'm not just sitting and waiting. I've asked the team to – here's the challenge I'm faced with. We are – we have a global team. I've shared that with you on many occasions. It's not excuses, those of you who know me, I do not make excuses. I'm all about efficiency and effectiveness. And sometimes it's like causes some opportunities for us to address.

So being a global team, we try to standardize our communication globally. So when you are filing a report, and we are such a diverse team, everything from audit risk and audit background to, legal background, to technology

background, we try to standardize our communications in template format for that one reason.

Another reason is we are in the process of also translating. So everything happens in English but we also try to also append it in a different language. So if everybody is going to creative and responding it causes us a challenge. I don't have translators sitting in all the time, even though our team can manage up to eight languages, but we're not hired to be translators. So we try to do things proactively and efficiently to build in the system.

But I have heard you loud and clear. I've asked the team to kind of be more in tune with it, let's try to provide some level of closure that brings a learning experience.

Which cue specifically, if you can give me some ideas I can kind of hone in on it and see if we can work to be more in tune of what is it we're looking at and how we can address.

Alex Deacon: Yes, I think it's been about 18 months since we filed the complaint and as I mentioned, you know, we – the data set is limited so there's clearly more to learn. But I'll dig some up and if I could send you some specifics I'll do that. But it sounds like Vicky has kind of...

Greg Shatan: Vicky Scheckler.

Vicky Scheckler: I had a question for you in terms of filing complaints, let's say, against a registry, is it better for you to send them individually one at a time if it's domain – sub domain by sub domain by sub domain? Or is it better to show you a pattern and practice of problems that might be accumulated over, say six months or a year or something like that. What is easier for you guys to deal with?

Maguy Serad: Thank you, Vicky, for the question. This is Maguy. We can address both. Here's what I mean by that. If there's a systemic issue, now to go in the complaint form, we don't have the flexibility to enter multiple TLDs or enough details. You might want to send an email to [compliance@icann.org](mailto:compliance@icann.org). Share with us what our – what is the systemic issue that's being observed and for which TLDs. And we're happy to take a look at it.

So but if there's a specific TLD and a specific issue then you can file it specifically in that form. It's interesting you bring that topic up because we had similar requests in the past from ALAC where if they see a systemic issue the form limits that. This is today the opportunity for us to – [compliance@icann.org](mailto:compliance@icann.org) email and provide information if it's more systemic and multiple, or if it's specific it's in the form itself.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Maguy. And thank you, Vicky, for the question and Alex as well. Patrick.

Patrick Charnley: Thanks, Greg. I just wanted to go back to your question, Maguy, to Alex about examples. I think in South America one of – I'm from – Patrick Charnley from ISPI. We're the overarching body for the record industry. In South America one of our local representatives attended the meeting and raised the issue that was discussed just over there with the Board. And was asked for examples which were subsequently provided, haven't been provided previously.

So I just wanted to be clear that we have given examples of where the record industry, at least, has filed complaints which have been very, very detailed about the scale of infringement. They've then been escalated to ICANN. And then the response has come back that it's been investigated and no action. So I just wanted to be clear that those examples have been provided. That was it. Thank you.

Maguy Serad: Thank you, Patrick. Following up myself on Alex's point, I think it's very important to try to get a feedback loop that's really helpful. So iterative learning for the complainers, so to speak, or complainants, maybe that's a little bit better sounding. Because I think sometimes it can feel like we're playing the mystical swami-Oracle-fortune-teller machine in an old time arcade where all you get are kind of yes or no answers and you have to keep trying to ask questions until you get an answer that's meaningful.

But of course, you know, the fact that, you know, we can also engage in dialogue beyond the codes and the like is also important because as we'd like to get our batting average up and the only way you can do that is you get feedback against live pitching, not to extend a baseball metaphor especially since the season is over, go Cubs. And I'm from New York though but I'll cheer for the Cubs.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Yes, well, look, they took 108 years to do this so it's almost – and then they inspired the Irish rugby team, which after 111 year draught be the New Zealand All Blacks for the, you know, first time in anybody's living memory. I think they did find 108-year old woman in Chicago who was around for the first one. I don't know if they found a 111-year old Irishman to remember the last time that Ireland won the test.

But anyway, do we have any more questions for Allen and Maguy? Seeing none, I want to thank Maguy and Allen for coming to meet with us. And to thank Allen for coming, well, both Allen and Maguy have come over and over again but thank Allen for all of this time working in Compliance and Contracts and all of the other areas where he's served ICANN and the community.

As Allen indicates, we may see him in another guise but recognizing he deserves the recognition. As much as we sometimes, has been said, asked barbed questions, you know, we appreciate having intelligent, thoughtful,



skilled, senior staff on the other side. So we will – we know that Compliance is and will continue to be in good hands, but want to thank Allen for all the time.

Allen Grogan: Thank you. Appreciate that. I've worked closely with a number of people in this room over the last three or four years and have really appreciated the interaction and the opportunity to work with you so thank you.

Maguy Serad: Alex, Patrick, Metalitz. Metalitz holds a special place in my heart. Sorry, favoritism I know. I hear you. I have an appreciation for the learning and the additional transparency. I look forward to your input. In the meantime I'm not sitting idle. We care. You see in the audience I have Owen and Jennifer and Jennifer is leading our team in addition to all her responsibilities, into that transition to Salesforce. So we are in the process of trying to see how we can accommodate that.

I'm not going to make you wait until then. I will look at it and see where do we have the opportunities to make immediate changes to accommodate the responses and the closure. And in the absence of that, please send an email. You all know – you know how I spell my name, Maguy, right, or send it to [compliance@icann.org](mailto:compliance@icann.org) and we're happy to address it. Have a great rest of the meeting.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Thank you, both. So we have about seven minutes left, which pretty much brings us I think to AOB.

Steve Metalitz: We have outreach and engagement.

Greg Shatan: We have outreach and engagement; of course, how silly of me to forget that of all things. An update on outreach and engagement which is, you know, very important to us. We've completed an outreach and engagement strategic plan for ICANN fiscal year 2017, which we're well into. I want to thank all of the members of the outreach and engagement taskforce for their

contribution to the plan and to outreach and engagement planning so far. But a plan is only as good as its execution. So we'll need help from all members to execute.

Some specific items to consider are, first, trying to do more regional outreach; second is our slow but steady improvement in our engagement with the Fellowship Program. And I see Aleksander Ichokjaev over there. I'm sure I mangled the name slightly but thank (Alexander) who is, you know, both a Fellow and now a mentor in the Fellow Program, for doing that. And acknowledge Dusan Popovic and Charne Le Roux, our other Fellowship alums.

And want to thank Steve Metalitz who had made the Fellowship Program his special brief over the last couple years, if not longer. And, you know, helped, you know, position us iteratively until we are now bearing the fruits of a real engagement with the Fellowship Program.

It's important for us to look for Fellows. Fellows don't – we are lucky enough to have a couple of Fellows in the program who didn't come through any sort of IPC mechanism who are interested in intellectual property and in joining our community. And we've met some of them and I encourage (Alexander) to try and introduce them to as many of us as possible and to, if you are introduced to take a sincere interest, take a business card and try to bring them into our group. It's important to get both fresh blood and more diversity. And the Fellowship Program allows for both of those things.

Also on the CROP program, we are engaged – this is a program that's for regional outreach. And we've elected this year to have one regional outreach event and two trips where one of our members travels within their region typically, to an event and provide some additional profile. So if there's – for IPC. So if there's an event where you want to go and speak or go and have say an event on the side or the like, and go and fly the IPC flag, it's not a junket of course, but you can apply to do one of those outreach trips.

And then we'll be planning some form of an engagement party, that doesn't sound quite right, but we'll be handling, you know, some sort of an engagement event as well, you know, using the CROP funding as well. So there are a number of things we're going to try to do and to bring our plan to action.

We want to dig down into the ICANN Next Gen program and into bringing in more potentially student members and the like so that we can kind of capture, you know, folks in law schools, business schools, public policy, foreign affairs schools, who maybe, you know, looking at intellectual property issues and make sure they're not turned to that part of the intellectual property community which does not believe in IP rights on the Internet. Be nice to keep them on the light side rather than the dark side of that particular issue. As much as I respect everyone across the spectrum of course, we are here to protect IP rights.

So there's no reason to go into in depth, but please do watch this space and think about ways to engage and to bring people in. We'll also be looking for more opportunities for people to Sherpa and mentor new folk, and we'll try to have more of a program for that. Because retention is a very important part of engagement and so is learning and trying to break into the ICANN universe inscrutable acronyms and long-standing issues can be very difficult so more help. There is various kinds of ICANN 101 sorts of things that are available. But live contact is always the best.

Anybody have any questions or thoughts, observations on outreach and engagement? Seeing none, I will remind you of an outreach and engagement opportunity today, thanks to INTA, at the (Avassa) rooftop, 6:00 to 8:00. If the party is hardy 6:00 to 9:00. If the party is really hardy 6:00 to 9:00. So after that, you know, buy a round for your friends, they'll buy a round for you. But INTA won't.

So make sure to get there early and drink. No, sorry, and engage. And do go there and look for people because this is not an IPC event. It's an INTA event but it's an INTA outreach event. There will be local members of the intellectual property community, there will be members of the broader IP-oriented community that are within the ICANN 57 who will be there. And this is an opportunity to engage in a very conducive setting. And I want to thank, again, INTA and Lori Schulman, for this opportunity. And also the INTA folks on the ground. And the – what is it – which firm is helping underwrite this? Might as well give them their plug.

Lori Schulman: (Singh), (Singh), (Laul) and (Sethy) are our local sponsor. And they've really done a nice job of helping us organize. The rooftop of this hotel is supposed to be one of the nicer reception venues and we've got eight different Indian dishes being served and an open bar so it should be pretty good.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. And I think that does not bring us to really the top of the hour or the top of the half hour, depending upon what clock you're looking at. But before we break, any final questions or, folks, the floor is yours. Lori again.

Lori Schulman: This isn't a question, it's a comment. I'm speaking in my personal capacity, but, congratulate you for becoming president for one more year and to say thank you from the community so I guess I will take a little bit of a community voice here to say it's been noticed that you've really been trying to bring together different constituencies to speak, that you've really worked hard at staying up to date on some very complex issues and chairing. And so just I think your thankless job deserves a thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, everybody. I view myself as a servant leader and it's a pleasure to be your servant and to also help lead us as we go through and it is nice to be thanked for a thankless job every once in a while and very much appreciated. And by the way, Macallan 18-year old is a wonderful scotch. I do want to – thank you, thank you all.

Speaking of thanks, it shouldn't go unnoticed even if it's already been noticed, as this is Steve Metalitz's last meeting in at least his current run of IPC leadership. And I was with a note of trepidation, amid noting he didn't say it's the last one this time, you know, maybe Steve is going into more of an eminence grise mode, I don't know or just sick and tired of, you know, wearing the mantle and burdens of explicit leadership and will be in thought leadership. But I want to thank Steve for his years of service to the Intellectual Property Constituency.

And, you know, really was, you know, here through the gestational phases if not before and taking us through numerous bumpy times and various different leadership roles and various different leadership configuration. But Steve's wise and steady hand and his excellent leadership and his help, you know, with leadership as I acknowledged yesterday, you know, really deserves a great thank you from our community as well to thank you, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you very much, Greg. And thanks all. I know I am leaving the leadership in very good hands here, great slate that we have that will be carrying on. I was an eminence grise years ago and now it's gone to eminence blanche but we'll see what's the next incarnation. But you'll be seeing the eminence around from time to time. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Very good. Well thank you all and this meeting is now adjourned.

END