Registration Abuse Policies Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 08 February 2010 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the   Registration Abuse Policies Working Group meeting on Monday 08 February 2010, at 15:00 UTC. 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 audio is also available at:**
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rap-20100208.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb

Present for the teleconference:
Greg Aaron - Registry stakeholder group - Working Group Chair
Michael Young - Registry stakeholder group
James Bladel - Godaddy Registrar stakeholder group
Berry Cobb – CBUC
Mike O'Connor – CBUC
Martin Sutton - CBUC
Rod Rasmussen – individual
Faisal Shah – MarkMonitor
Frederick Felman – MarkMonitor

ICANN Staff
Margie Milam
Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber-White

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is being recorded.

Greg Aaron: Thank you. This is Greg Aaron and this is the RAP Working Group Meeting
                    for February 8, 2010. And why don't we begin with the roll call, please?
                    Would you like to do the honors, Gisella?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call
                    we have Greg Aaron, Faisal Shah, Berry Cobb, James Bladel. From staff we
                    have Marika Konings and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. I hope I haven't left
                    anyone off. And I don't have apologies from anyone today. Over to you, Greg.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm on the phone, too.

Martin Sutton: Martin's just joined as well. Hi, everyone.

Gisella Gruber-White: Hello, Martin.

Greg Aaron: So we have Martin Sutton and Mikey O'Connor. I guess among our regulars we're just missing Rodenbaugh. Okay, we'll let's go ahead and get started. We'll zip through the agenda hopefully today. This will be our last meeting for a while, because we'll be delivering the paper this week.

So up on the screen, Marika has kindly collated the results of the final poll. So we'll walk through those today. Thank you for that Marika.

Marika Konings: No problem. You know that I sent out an updated version earlier this morning to everyone, that includes some additional results that came in late.

Greg Aaron: Okay. So let's see, which one should we go by then?

Marika Konings: The updated version is on the screen, and it probably makes more sense to use that one.

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right. And Fred Felman has joined us as well. Hi, Fred. Okay, so I think I've downloaded the correct version, and we had 13 people participate. And let's just go ahead and walk through.

The first question was the...

Michael Young: ...I joined. Michael Young.

Greg Aaron: Oh, hi, Mike. All right. Michael Young, there. All right, so our abuse definition had 12 agree. James generally agreed, but proposed a friendly amendment. Now do we have the text for that? Go ahead, James.

James Bladel: No, I didn't. Why don't you just - I don't want to be the odd kid out. So why don't you just go ahead and put me in with the rest. I think that we already resolved that we would, in the body of the report somewhere, describe what a material predicate is. So I didn't want to hold out on that one.

Greg Aaron: Yes, and I think that's now in the notes directly beneath the definition. We should see that in the latest draft, so I think that's taken care of.

James Bladel: Go ahead and move me with the herd then, please.

Gregg Aaron: Moo. All right, so this one goes down as unanimous consensus. Thank you, everyone. That's 13 and 0.

                 Cybersquatting is also 13 and 0, unanimous consensus. Thank you. That's easy. Then that's Recommendation 1, by the way. Now Cybersquatting Recommendation 2 is seven agreeing with View A, and six agreeing with View B, and no friendly amendments. So this one is almost tied. Marika, the working group guidelines don't give good specific guidance on what to do when there's something that splits so closely.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, that's correct and one option the group might want to consider is this is just initial report, is to put both views forward and specifically ask, though the public input process, to express views on A or B, or arguments why one should be considered over the other. And maybe this might be one we're going to be at the end of the day, following review and analysis of public comments, maybe the group can come closer to a consensus view, or one or the other that might be potentially followed.

Greg Aaron: Okay. So that would be suitable for this stage of the process, which is the initial report. What we'll do is - by the way, with each of these views, we'll list who voted for which. So in the report it will reflect seven and six. Does Marika's suggestion make sense to everyone? Any comments on that?

Martin Sutton: Martin here. I think that sounds good. I don't think we're going to shift it any differently from the split decision that we've got.

Greg Aaron: Okay, thank you. And Berry checks off as well. Seems to make sense. Mikey checks. All right, well let's go ahead with that then.

Front running is unanimous. Thank you. Gripe sites, deceptive and/or offensive, we have three votes for View A, eight for View B, and then two generally agreeing with View B but proposing friendly amendments. And those were from Mike Rodenbaugh and James.

Mike Rodenbaugh said caveat that new TLD policy implementation, such as URS may be applied to existing TLDs per previous recommendation, and thus address the concern about offensive domain names. James said View B could also include some language that additional mechanisms could themselves be abused to curtail freedom of speech. James, you want to comment on your note there?

James Bladel: Sure, Greg. This is James speaking, and, you know, I'm looking this over again. You know, during the discussion of this topic, I think that we had a pretty healthy discussion about gripe sites and, you know, those that are, you know, cybersquatting of a different flavor, and that they redirect to offensive or adult material using a brand name.

But other types, you know, such as, you know, brand name stocks and how we didn't want any sort of mechanism to deal with - that was meant to deal with the former to be used to suppress the latter. And I just - I can move to agree with Recommendation B if there's some mention of that in the body of the report, and that we've captured that element of our discussion.

Greg Aaron: Okay, well let's go to the text of the background section then. And the latest version of the paper was posted up by Marika. So it's at the top of the working group page.

James Bladel: Oh, it's very small.

Greg Aaron: Let's see -- I'm looking around Lines 630 to 650 approximately, James?

Marika Konings: James, this is Marika. You should be able to enlarge it from the top of the screen.

James Bladel: Yes, I'm doing that now. You said 630, Greg?

Greg Aaron: Yeah, somewhere around there.

James Bladel: One moment while I navigate.

Greg Aaron: In the text it does say we discussed practical business challenges, this is in - actually we have two sections in the background. We have one section which talks about gripes/complaint sites, and then we have a second section which talks about pornographic Web sites and registration of offensive strings. Because the two do have some distinctions.

James Bladel: Right.

Greg Aaron: We talked about some of the practical business challenges for blacklisting offensive strings. It talked about the differences between ccTLDs and gTLDs. We said gTLDs are global and it would be difficult to determine baselines and balances for issues involving free speech and morals.

                 Members commented that ICANN is not in a good position to enforce morals in relation to domain names -- that kind of thing. So free speech is mentioned

very, very briefly. Do you maybe think we need an additional piece of text there?

James Bladel: Possibly. I'll tell you what -- if we can table this for now and continue on with the agenda, I will take a look at this section under a microscope and see if there's anything I can recommend that I can post to the list.

And if I'm the only one out there, then, you know, we can go forward without it. Just wanted to make sure that - I thought that was a pretty lively discussion that we had. And I wanted to make sure we were capturing all the elements that were raised in that meeting.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Well adding text to the background is very easy. If you want to add something to the recommendation, View B, also let us know about that. So we have two ways we could approach it, and we could use one or both. So why don't you think about that, and we'll move on in the meantime.

The next is 18, which is the proposal for registries to consider developing an internal best practices to restrict registration of offensive strings. For that recommendation, there were four in favor. Eight voted for View B, which is ICANN's not a good forum to make the recommendations, et cetera.

And then there was one person who said generally agree with A, but propose a friendly amendment. That was Mike Rodenbaugh, and he said best practices are not enough, but they're better than nothing. And he said other recommendations for mandatory policy are likely better to address the concern of offensive strings. So he wanted - it looks like he wanted mandatory policy for offensive strings.

All right. So we have a majority definitely going with View B there. Any questions on that one? If not, we'll go onto fake renewal notices. Go ahead, James.

James Bladel: Yeah, I think this would be another one of those sections where we would submit both in the initial report and, you know, particularly call those out to the public comment. I'm wondering, however, since I'm not among that group, if the folks who agreed with View A, you know, if they wanted to take a look at Mike's language there and modify View A, and if they would still agree with it? Or if they would prefer to agree with it without Mike's language?

I think that's maybe - if we can collapse these into a binary, you know, a binary alternative as opposed to three options, I think that might be helpful -- at least uncomplicates this a little bit.

Greg Aaron: Well, I don't know. This is Greg. Because we had discussed should it be mandatory or not, and that was rejected during the course of the working group's discussions. I mean does anybody want to take it the other way? I see Mikey's hand raised first, and then Martin's.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. My interaction with the work space just went crazy, so I'd like to pass and let Martin go first, while I get my act together.

Martin Sutton: Okay, Martin here. And I think, James, that's a good point. But it's a shame Mike's not on the call, because I don't think he participated in some of the calls that we were discussing this. So I think what I'd prefer is perhaps if we could get Mike to make his choice, either - which I suspect should then just agree with View A, and make sure then it is a - how soon do we need to have these finished by, Greg? It sounds like today is...

Greg Aaron: Our goal was to do it by today, yes.

Martin Sutton: And so, I mean we can send him an email. We can...

Greg Aaron: Or this is the initial report. I mean all of this will go into the report. So it will say we had X votes for A, X votes for B, and then there was basically a third kind of concurring thought from one member, I guess.

Martin Sutton: My preference would be to try and get Mike into one of those, if we could force him. Bear in mind the conversations we had on the calls previously. And I'm not sure how we would do that.

Greg Aaron: Well, this is the initial report. It can be revisited in the next round if he wishes to do so.

Martin Sutton: Okay.

Greg Aaron: So, Mikey, did you want to add anything?

Mikey O'Connor: Not on that particular topic. I had another idea, but if we're done with the conversation with Martin, I can go ahead. But otherwise, not on that issue. Martin, do you feel like this is done for you?

Martin Sutton: Yeah, yes. I'm not sure what we can do otherwise without Mike on the call.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. My thought was that - and this is sort of the first one that I noticed it, that what we seem to have in these View A, View B, is View A is generally a recommendation of some sort. And View B is generally starting with a recommendation, but then has justification included. And that we might want to chop off the justification part, or move it back up into the body of the report.

I'm hearing a lot of noise. Is that me that's doing that? I'm going to mute and see. No, it's not me.

Greg Aaron: Oh, there it is again.

Mikey O'Connor: Somebody's got a lot of background noise going on. Oh, there. I think that's got it. Good deal. Thanks, whoever it was. I don't know what's going on.

Anyway, so my thought would be that we would stop the View B recommendation at the end of the first sentence, and move the potential harm is vague standard, recommendation is - you know, move all that stuff up into the body.

So that we're just showing the two recommendations. Because what we've got here is sort of a little bit of the argument going on in the recommendations, and I think that the arguments ought to move up into the body of the report.

Greg Aaron: On this one the recommendation would be to make no policy, or just no recommendation.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. And then I think the rationale for that - I think what we need to do is balance it. We either have to have the rationale for the first recommendation in this as well, or the rationale for the second one needs to come out. But to have part of it with a rationale and part of it without, strikes me as awkward.

Greg Aaron: Let's see.

James Bladel: Greg, this is James. I know Martin's in the queue, but I wanted to respond to Mikey.

Greg Aaron: Go ahead.

James Bladel: Yeah, I mean I think now that I read that with what Mikey's saying, it's very true that in often cases, one view is a recommendation and then the other view is, you know, essentially rejecting that recommendation and substantiating the reasoning behind that.

So maybe - my concern is that when we put this out to the public, to folks that haven't participated or had visibility in all of the transcripts and reports and deliberations and compromises and things like that, that they're going to say,

"Oh, I think they both sound reasonable." And they're going to support both A and both B, without recognizing that in some ways, they're binary problems. And that's not going to help us when we get to our final report.

So I'm wondering - and this is more work. And that's why I'm kind of shying away from it a little bit. But I'm wondering if we couldn't say, you know, recommendation is X, and then I support Recommendation X or I do not support Recommendation X for the following reasons.

I think when we put them up as Choices A and B, where B is really a rejection of Choice A, that that could be confusing to the folks who are reading the public report. And the temptation is there for comments to either select neither or select both. And I don't think that that's the kind of feedback we're looking for.

Greg Aaron: So you're saying there was a recommendation - the rough consensus was to make no recommendation. And what we could say is that was done for the following reasons. Then there was another group that said that there should be a recommendation to do the following.

I do think there would probably be, since this report's 100 pages, there will probably be an impetus for people just to skim the recommendation sections.

James Bladel: Right.

Greg Aaron: Also to just read the executive summary. And it would be a good idea to encapsulate somehow the main points behind each decision or view. Is that fair to say?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that's right. But then I think what we need to do is we need to have the major points in support of the recommendation added, so that we've got the whole argument there, rather than half the argument. Right now what we've got is half the argument. We've got a recommendation that's

usually pretty terse, because it's backed up by the background section. And then...

Greg Aaron: Right. What you would need then, Mikey, is you would need a line or so of the arguments for View A.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. And I think if we do the View A, View B thing, we'd need to do that for all of the View As, because in most cases, they don't have those summaries. They just have the recommendation. That's all. I think either way is fine, because I agree with you that I think a lot of people will probably just read the recommendations.

But that being the case, then I think we need the rationale for the recommendation with it, or not. I mean either way, I think, works. It might be easier to do the remove, because then all you're doing is deleting some stuff. And that would force people to go back up and read the...

Greg Aaron: Yeah, because in a lot of cases, View A came first and then View B came second, in reaction to View A. So that's how we got there. Okay, what we could do then is - I mean it'll help to see this on paper. But what we could do is we will first list the predominant view. And in most cases it's going to be really easy, because a lot of these we had unanimous views.

But in the ones where we had splits, we'll say the predominant view was such and such, and then a line or two maybe of rationale, and who voted which way. The alternate view is such and such, with a line or two of rationale.

Now I think like with View A in this case, we probably got a line or two of rationales that we can pluck out of the background section.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. I think that's right.

Greg Aaron: There must be the argument. It's in there already. We need to maybe supplement that. What we're going to have to do today is, Marika and I are going to have to put this stuff into the document. I propose where we need rationales, we'll bring it up out of the background text. We'll reproduce it, and then you will see it laid out.

Now what this requires - we could probably do that today, post it up, and then it would require that everybody just take a look at it. See if we missed anything that really needs to be there. But I think that would cover it. It would also allow any new reader who is completely fresh to this material to understand what the major arguments were and why people were going one way or the other. I think that's an important goal to meet. Does that sound okay?

Mikey O'Connor: That sounds terrific.

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right.

Faisal Shah: Greg? This is Faisal.

Greg Aaron: I see Faisal's hand? Yeah, go ahead.

Faisal Shah: Just on the - I agree with everything that's been said. I guess I just want to make sure that we, you know, don't bias the recommendations the way that gets people to kind of vote in a certain direction. I don't think we're going to do that. I like the fact that we're putting some of the support behind new recommendations.

But I'm saying here's where most people are going, and here's another alternative view, or whatever. I just want to make sure it's fairly objective so that people can actually read them both, and then say, look, I either like this one or the other.

Greg Aaron: Hopefully that is what we're going to accomplish.

Faisal Shah: Yes.

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right. So anyway, on Number 18, we worked through that and we decided we would list Mike's vote as a - I guess a concurrence, but he was kind of interested in mandatory policy.

We then move onto fake renewal notices. And there were 12 votes to agree, and James disagreed with an alternate view. James, would you like to read your alternate view?

James Bladel: Yes, Greg. This is James speaking, and I think that my alternate view really was just a sequencing recommendation that we - if you look down at Recommendation 2, I was in favor of that recommendation as a predecessor for Recommendation 1. That's what I was trying to get across in Recommendation 1, is that I felt that Recommendation 2 should precede that.

Greg Aaron: Okay, so you think the first step would be to recommend possible enforcement action to the compliance department.

James Bladel: Correct.

Greg Aaron: Okay, so let's look at Recommendation 2. The recommendation is that the GNSO refer the issue to the ICANN Contractual Compliance Department for possible enforcement. There were 11 votes to agree. Let's see -- one disagree, and no vote from Faisal. Okay, Faisal, are you abstaining from this?

Faisal Shah: Actually I'm not really sure why it says no on there, but I would agree with it.

Greg Aaron: Okay, so you do agree. Okay, so that goes to 12 agrees. And then Mike Rodenbaugh said he disagrees. He says there does not seem to be any policy that Compliance could enforce. Okay, so James, do you have, in the -

well let me ask you this question, James. Would anybody mind if we put Recommendation 2 first?

Mikey O'Connor: No, I think that's the right thing to do. This is Mikey. The other thing I was going to suggest on Recommendation 2 is we might want to expand it to say something like "refers this issue to ICANN's Contractual Compliance Department for possible WHOIS data misuse," or whatever the right phrase is. So we'd actually name the policy that we're thinking about in the recommendation. I think that would probably erase Rodenbaugh's objection.

Greg Aaron: Okay, so Mikey, we need to come up with some language. Would it be "for possible enforcement action comma including..."

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sure that the phrase is in the body. I don't have it in front of me, but there's policy on misuse of WHOIS data, and...

Greg Aaron: It could say "for possible enforcement action comma including investigation of misuse of WHOIS data."

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that'd work fine.

Greg Aaron: Let me type that into the box. Okay, I put it into the chat box there. I'd like to take a straw poll about adding that little bit on as per Mikey's recommendation to specifically call out the possible compliance hook. So if you like adding that on, can you indicate with a check?

Okay, and while we're doing that, Martin has raised his hand. Why don't you go ahead, Martin?

Martin Sutton: Sorry, I'm on mute. I hit the wrong button. That's a tick.

Greg Aaron: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I like James' friendly amendment that's in the chat box.

Greg Aaron: Oh, okay. James says "by registrars or third parties."

James Bladel: Yeah, I just thought clarifying that by tacking that on the end might help. I'm fine with it either way, Greg. I was just trying to be helpful.

Greg Aaron: Do you feel strongly about it? Or in the background section do you feel that it makes it clear who is probably sending these notices?

James Bladel: Well I think we discussed that, right? We were discussing whether it was resellers of accredited registrars, whether it was registrars, or whether it was just, you know, unrelated third parties that were attempting to get forms of authorization for other purposes like hijacking. So, you know, I think when we direct Compliance to do something versus a policy, we have to be mindful of, you know, who they can enforce it against.

So and I think that the policy, of course, through the RAA about registrars, and then of course I think there's some things in there about bulk WHOIS as well. So I was just trying to be specific about who the potential abusers could be. But I don't feel that strongly about it.

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right. So anyway, shall we go with the version I typed into the box? If James doesn't feel strongly, it looked like we had all votes for. I didn't see any opinions against.

James Bladel: I think we should go with that.

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right. So in this section what we'll do is, the recommendation about a contractual compliance, we'll actually put that one first. It will become Recommendation 1. And then we'll also add that phrase, "including investigation of misuse of WHOIS data." Then would come the Recommendation 2, the old Recommendation 1.

Now, James, we have to figure out if we want to alter anything to bring you into complete full consensus or not. Can you explain your view again? Do you really feel the recommendation for compliance should happen before a PDP? Is that your view?

James Bladel: Yeah, Greg, and I was thinking that perhaps I can offer some friendly modification to - and maybe it's not friendly. Maybe it's more of a material change. I'll let the group decide.

But maybe the language in Recommendation 2, the old Recommendation 1, can be modified to address both my concern and the concern of Mr. Rodenbaugh, which would be something to the effect of, you know, if Compliance does not feel that there's sufficient policy for them to enforce in this area, then the RAP/WG recommends the initiation of a policy development process by requesting an issued report to investigate safe notices.

So, you know, just really put a qualifier of a few words ahead of that recommendation that, you know, failing the compliance route then we need new policy, and we need to kick off the development process. But I leave that to the group of whether that's a tweak or if that's a wholesale, you know, restructuring of that recommendation.

But I think that that would kind of wrap the arms around both what I'm trying to get at with my alternative view, and I think it also addresses what Mikey - I'm sorry, Mikey - Mike Rodenbaugh is saying as well.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Mikey, did you want to say something?

Mikey O'Connor: I just wanted - this is Mikey. I just wanted to chime in in support of what James is saying. And since I was pretty involved in the drafting of this, I don't think that's a major change, and in fact makes a lot of sense to me, too. I'm

loathe to start off more PDPs if in fact the tools already exist to solve the problem. So I like the re-sequencing, and I like his addition of that clause to the second, the now-second recommendation.

Greg Aaron: Hey, James, this is Greg. Would you type in your proposed modification into the chat box?

James Bladel: I will. Give me a couple of minutes here and I will work on that.

Greg Aaron: Okay. One of the challenges we should talk about is whether or not this is a material change. Because basically what we would do is - it's adding a conditional statement.

James Bladel: Right.

Greg Aaron: And we do have a few members who aren't on the call. So my dilemma is can we make this modification and put their names on it, if they haven't chimed in on it? And it's kind of sticky situation, I think. I think we're missing at least five of the people who voted.

Now one thing we could do is, this is the initial report. And when we go to the final report, we can certainly re-poll some of these issues, especially - and we're going to have to do that in some cases, because we'll get some public feedback. One of the solutions we could go with is we can add a line in the recommendation summary for this point. And we could say the group will consider in its final report whether to make Recommendation 2 conditional, basically.

So we could just say we're still talking about this. We didn't, you know, basically the situation is we didn't measure that issue in an official fashion, but we could say, you know, that's going to have some ongoing discussion looking towards the final report. Does that make sense?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. That works for me.

Rod Rasmussen: Greg, this is Rod. I would say one of the other things here is that we would be able to ask the Compliance Department whether they have sufficient policies or sufficient guidelines in place to be able to do enforcement as part of their process from going from initial to final.

Greg Aaron: Okay, that makes a lot of sense. By the way, let the record reflect that Rod Rasmussen is on the call. Okay, what Marika and I can do today then is we'll draft a sentence about, you know, we're considering the conditional statement, and we will investigate that with the Compliance Department looking towards our final report. Does that sound okay to everyone? Let me put it this way. Any objections to that? Okay, we're hearing none. We'll go ahead and take care of that today.

Okay, so I think we are through fake renewal notices. Any other comments on fake renewal notices before we move on? Okay. Hearing none, we're on to domain kiting. And the recommendation was no policy development at this time. There were 12 in agreement. Faisal proposed a friendly amendment saying this should track the same recommendations in the front running. I'm sorry. James, you've raised your hand?

James Bladel: Yes, just wanted to chime in and support Faisal's friendly amendment. I think if we can be consistent with those two, I think that's helpful.

Greg Aaron: Okay, so Faisal, what would you suggest it read?

Faisal Shah: I guess maybe I was being somewhat pedantic, but it was more to the idea that it was more like it's unique to front running. It's unclear to what extent front running happens. I wanted to include that. And the (RPW) does not recommend policy development at this time, and then if you look at front running, it says that the (RPG) suggests that the Council monitor the issue

and consider next step if conditions warrant. Somewhat - I mean I wanted to just track it in the same way.

Greg Aaron: Okay, so yeah. So we would add the bit from front running which says it's unclear to what extent it happens. And then it would say the RAP does not recommend policy development at this time. The RAP/WG suggests that the Council monitor the issue in conjunction with ongoing reviews of domain tasting, and consider next steps if conditions warrant. So would that do it for you?

So we add the unclear to the extent, and then the recommendation does say we recommend that the Council monitor the issue. Okay, so I just wanted - you cut out a little bit there, Faisal. So does that work for you?

Faisal Shah: That's what I was looking for.

Greg Aaron: Okay, let's do a quick straw poll. If you agree with that change, please add a check mark next to your name. If you don't, use the X. And we have check marks from Greg, Fred, James, Martin, Mikey, I'm assuming Faisal. Berry, you have any - Berry and Michael haven't noted anything. Rod, how do you feel?

Rod Rasmussen: I'm sorry, I needed - checkmark please.

Greg Aaron: Checkmark? Okay. So that's seven checkmarks, eight checkmarks. None disagree.

Man: Could you add a checkmark for me as well? Sorry, I don't seem to be able to put one in.

Greg Aaron: Okay, no problem. Okay, so that looks like it's unanimous then. Okay, so we'll make that recommendation. So Faisal, you would go from generally agreeing

to agreeing, and that would make this one unanimous. Okay, excellent, excellent. Complete consensus on that one. Thank you. Thank you, Faisal.

Okay, next one is malicious use of domain names -- 11 agreeing, two generally agreeing but proposing friendly amendments. And those were Mike Rodenbaugh and James. Mike says the effort should also consider mandatory minimum practices applicable to contracting party in addition to best practices. And James says ICANN's role should be extremely limited in this area, and only serve to facilitate the discussion amongst affected parties.

I'm not sure what to do with Mike's, because he missed a lot of the discussion, and we say why - we have some notes in the paper about why we don't think mandatory practices may be possible in this area. James, would you like to speak about your friendly amendment?

James Bladel: Yeah, Greg. Sorry, I was a little slow on the mute button. This is James speaking, and I'm just trying to stand back and take in all of our discussions on this area. And I think it's, you know, I can't shake this idea that once we get into the use of names, credentials, credit card security, you know, account security at registrars.

And, you know, all of these things start to step outside of, you know, what ICANN's, you know, core mission is. I think it can help. I think we have all the players that can make an impact in these areas.

And I think ICANN can be an excellent venue to bring all of those folks together and get those conversations started. But I think that their role, ICANN's role as an organization, needs to be very limited here. It just needs to be more of a facilitator of the discussion.

And I think I said it either in this recommendation or in something similar, that there are peer groups out there as well -- APWG and RASG and other groups -- that are more directed at the sharing and dissemination of best practices.

And I think ICANN should be considered a peer organization to those groups rather than just adding this to its mission.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Let's talk about how we might be able to address your comments. I think one of the reasons why we recommended non-binding best practices is because there were doubts about the appropriateness or the ability of ICANN policymaking to make binding policy in these areas.

So one question I have is, is that covered sufficiently in the background section of the text? Or do we need to add something? And if we did, would that address your concerns?

James Bladel: Okay, this is James speaking again. And I'm not sure it's a question of adding. I think it's a question of with this particular recommendation, there might be some takeaways. You know, I see references to supporting by ICANN resources and forming advisory groups.

And I just, you know, I feel like that's just making me a bit uncomfortable about, you know, that's a little more than a toe in the water for ICANN. That's them wading into this issue in a big way, and I just - I think that perhaps this recommendation could maybe be slimmed down, and some of this stuff moved into the background. And then I would be a lot more comfortable with it.

And of course I think Mike's objection is going in a different direction, so I don't know if that makes his objection stronger or if that also addresses his concerns. But I can't speak for what he was addressing.

Greg Aaron: Yeah, Mike's recommendation, I think, is not compatible. I think his amendment is not compatible with this recommendation, frankly. It may have to be listed separately -- not as a friendly amendment. It's going in a very different direction. Now what, if you wanted to slim this down, what would you suggest to us?

James Bladel: Honestly, I would start with the first sentence and leave that in. And then possibly, you know, possibly even move all of the rest of that to background. That's just, you know, that's just shooting from the hip here. So...

Greg Aaron: Okay. Mikey, would you like to go ahead?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Greg. This is Mikey. I'll try and stay on James' track here. The reason I raised my hand is because there's the High-Security TLD advisory group that's been formed, that I think is picking up a fair number of these kinds of topics in its deliberations. So I was going to suggest a link between this recommendation and the work of that group.

                  I'm okay with James' notion of pulling a fair amount of this stuff back up into the background, and letting the Council sort of decide how to proceed. I think this is again one of those ones where rationale and background started to creep into the recommendation. And, you know, we might want to thin that down just a bit. But we may also want to link it to the HSTLD.

                  Rod, you're on HSTLD. Think that's right? Or am I...

Rod Rasmussen: No, I'm not, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, you're not?

Rod Rasmussen: No.

Greg Aaron: Mikey, this is Greg. I'm tracking that one. I'm not on it, but I'm tracking it, and it's actually much different than what we're talking about here.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

Greg Aaron: And not addressing actually most of the issues of how to deal with these
                 things. It's a very specific plan, and there are a lot of different issues involved.
                 I actually wouldn't link them. I think they're different beasts entirely.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I don't feel real strongly about it. It's just sort of a heads-up that there is
                 something going on over there.

Greg Aaron: Okay, let me see if I can approach it this way. This is Greg. I think there is a
                 lot of support for the recommendation to do best practices, because we have
                 some issues where, you know, we have use issues and we have some scope
                 issues. But a lot of people liked the idea of doing best practices, because it
                 brings people together. It gets them into conversation, and gives people
                 some really practical ideas that they can maybe use in their own work.

                 And there is also the concept that this is a worthwhile thing to happen in the
                 ICANN context, because all the parties are there, for example. And that's why
                 we wanted some sort of support from ICANN. And that's why we put ICANN
                 resources into the recommendation.

                 Now, I mean I also see James' point personally, which is there are other
                 bodies out there who also do best practices. And they absolutely should
                 continue to do that, and they should continue to, you know, there should be
                 cross-fertilization and so forth, you know, APWG does best practices,
                 (MAUG) does it, et cetera. I don't think our recommendation precludes any of
                 that.

                 James, if we use the first sentence and then include "it should be supported
                 by ICANN resources," and then added the rest of it into the background
                 section, would that work for you? And what we are saying is these are non-
                 binding best practices. That is pretty clear, I think.

James Bladel: Yeah, Greg. This is James speaking. Let me ring in on that a little bit while,
                 let Faisal raise his hand. Just let him go ahead.

Faisal Shah: Yeah, I was just going to say that I absolutely agree with having the - I would like to see all these, you know, what's already in here, remain here. Only because I think it gives, you know, ICANN a guideline as to what we're thinking as a group, in terms of what we'd like to see happen. I'd like to see that in the recommendation and not necessarily be pulled out.

I guess my other concern is that I'm tending to agree also with Mike Rodenbaugh that maybe there should be some minimum mandatory practices that we should include as well. So, like I say, I guess we're starting to split a little bit on this particular recommendation.

Greg Aaron: Okay, so you're in favor of keeping the material in the recommendation, in the recommendation.

Faisal Shah: Yeah.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: Greg, this is Rod. I would like to agree with that position as well. I do not want to water this down any more. Thanks.

Greg Aaron: Okay. So James, where does that leave you?

James Bladel: That probably moves me into disagree, then. So...

Greg Aaron: Okay, and you would disagree - you wouldn't recommend best practices at all?

James Bladel: No, no, no, no, no. I recommend best practices. I do. It's the remainder of the commitment of resources and forming of advisory committees, and then the identification of things like stolen credentials, and when it talks about, for example, I think our - or maybe it's a different one where it mentions

something about credit card security as well. Is that in this one or is that further down?

Greg Aaron: This is the only one that touches on that.

James Bladel: Okay. Yeah, I guess that puts me out on an island. Sorry, Greg.

Greg Aaron: Okay, so you would - you're basically at a concurring opinion, which is you like the idea of best practices, but - how should we phrase it?

James Bladel: Okay, I like the idea of the best practices for to address, to help registries and registrars address the illicit use of domain names. Once we, you know, beyond that sentence, that's when I start to get concerned about just scope creep on the part of ICANN.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Okay, I guess what we'll need from you is, can you craft a sentence or two that we can put into basically explain your concurring vote?

James Bladel: Yeah. Yeah, I'll put something together.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

James Bladel: I'll have the list by noon Central.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Okay, all right. So that would give us - James is going to provide a separate concurrent - basically a concurring opinion. But otherwise it looks like everything else would remain the same. Is that correct? Any other...

Man: Well, Greg, I think we need to - do we need to reach out to Mike? Or...

Greg Aaron: Well, what he suggested seems incompatible with the recommendation and all of the discussion that's led up to it. That's what's a little difficult to reconcile. I mean our background section says there are significant scope

issues, and I think Mike may be disagreeing with that, but I'm not sure. I think we're going to have to list him separately.

I mean we're still at 11 in favor of the recommendation, so it's a strong consensus at this point. And I think we're going to have to list Mike separately. And I'll just quote what he said.

Okay, if no other notes there, then that brings us on to WHOIS access. And Recommendation 1 has 12 in agreement, and a friendly amendment from James. But James, I don't have the text of your friendly amendment. Can you tell us more?

James Bladel: Let's just go ahead and move me into agreement on that one if you would, please.

Greg Aaron: Okay, thank you. All right, so that one's unanimous. The second is unanimous as well. That's the recommendation that the GNSO request the Compliance Department publish more data. So that's unanimous as well. Thank you, everyone.

Uniformity of contracts -- we've got eight agreeing with View A, which is for the creation of an issues report to evaluate whether the minimum baseline registration abuse provision should be created for all in-scope agreements. And then we have five for View B. So, any comment? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Greg. This is Mikey. I think that the only thing I suggest on this one is the same that we've been doing on some of the others, which would be to write a little bit of the rationale for View A and include it in this recommendation -- just so that people sort of see both sides of the argument.

Greg Aaron: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: And, you know, treat it the same way we've done those other ones.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Sort of lean this towards Berry to do that, but I don't want to volunteer him. Berry, would you like to do that?

Berry Cobb: Sure, yeah. I can do that.

Greg Aaron: Okay. So Berry, if you can, for instance, look through the background section, pluck out a couple of sentences or so that maybe crystallize the main points behind View A, can you get those up to the list?

Berry Cobb: Yeah, I'll send that out here in a little bit.

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right. So this is eight to five. Now in our guidelines for the working group operations, a rough consensus is a position where a small minority disagrees, but most agree. The next level is strong support, but significant opposition. So we've basically got a, I don't know, close to 60/40 on this one. I think it's a little more than a small minority.

I would - again, these guidelines are pretty mushy, but I think this one might be labeled as strong support, but significant opposition. Does that sound accurate?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I agree those are pretty mushy definitions. And with that said, you know, it's close enough.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Any other - of course we'll list the numbers and so forth anyway. All right.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As suggested before, you might want to opt as well of not putting any labels on there yet, and just presenting indeed the numbers. And, you know, leave the actual labels for the final report. That might be a way to

work around it instead of pre-judging what people might support -- minority or majority view. I don't know.

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right. Well what we'll do is we'll follow the same approach where we put - I mean I think we are supposed to put labels on them. But this is one that I'm sure we'll receive further comment between now and - through the public comment period.

So we can also do the same thing as we agreed to before, which is further comment to come. And we can always re-measure this one after the public comment is in. We'll see what people say. How about that? Okay, any disagreement? Okay, all right. Well, let's do that, then.

Meta issues -- Recommendation 1, uniformity of reporting. That is unanimous. Thank you. And Recommendation 2, collection, dissemination of best practices -- we have 11 agreeing and two friendly amendments. The first one is from Fred. He said especially with respect to security best practices. The second one was from James. Let's see - Fred's not on the call today, is he?

Man: I think actually Fred took off or removed his friendly amendment, and went the agree. I believe I saw that in the chat box somewhere.

Marika Konings: Yeah, that's correct. This is Marika. He posted on Question 45, I withdraw my friendly amendment. It has no place in the document.

Greg Aaron: Oh, okay. All right. So we move that to at least 12. And then James, would you like to talk about your friendly recommendation? James, if you're there, you're on mute.

Marika Konings: According to meeting view, James disconnected.

Greg Aaron: Yeah, he said in the chat box, sorry I dropped trying to unmute. So I guess
                     he's not back in. We'll give him a minute. While we're waiting for James, let
                     me read his - hello? Let me read James' amendment while he rejoins. It said
                     generally agree, but ICANN must be seen as a cooperative, peer
                     organization with other groups such as APWG and RASG. ICANN has no
                     remit in this area, but can serve to facilitate the dialogue. James, are you
                     there yet?

Gisella Gruber-White: He's not on yet.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Well in the meantime, what would you like to talk about?

Faisal Shah: Hey, Greg, I just want to bring one thing up, and I guess I'm just trying to
                     figure out how to reconcile this in my head. But on Number 30 when we
                     talked about Mike Rodenbaugh wanting to recommend a minimum
                     mandatory minimum practice, I can't agree with that, but I mean I'm in favor
                     of the best practices mandatory minimum practice. I'd like to see that as well.
                     I mean how do I show that in the document?

Greg Aaron: Okay, so you are in favor of considering mandatory minimum practices?

Faisal Shah: Yeah, I would be in favor to the extent we can, and I'd like to see some
                     mandatory minimum practices. Now obviously it may be outside scope and
                     whatnot, and that's something I'd let the - so consider, but I would like to see
                     something to that effect. So I'm not sure how to reflect that.

Greg Aaron: I'm not sure either, because I guess that is the question. What is - if it's
                     mandatory, it's got to be in scope.

Faisal Shah: Right, right.

Greg Aaron: So, has anybody identified those areas where minimum practices would be in
                     scope?

Faisal Shah: I think it's probably something, I don't know, maybe to some extent maybe Martin could even address this better. But maybe it's even something that I'd like to hear - I mean I know we don't have him here, but something from Mike Rodenbaugh as to what he's thinking.

Because maybe after getting some more feedback from him, it may not be applicable then. But it doesn't necessarily - it's not necessarily, you know, something that I think I would dismiss out of hand. So maybe to some extent we should be getting some feedback from him.

Greg Aaron: I think that's the question then. If you guys are interested in mandatory minimum practices, I mean what - do you have a fundamental area that is in scope? We did identify...

Gisella Gruber-White: James is back on.

Greg Aaron: James, are you there?

James Bladel: Yeah, I'm back. Okay, while you were off we went back to - we were talking about Number 30. And we'll go back to your other question in a minute. Faisal had brought up in Number 30, well maybe there were mandatory minimum practices that he would be interested in supporting. And my question is, well what is in scope? The WHOIS issue, for example, the WHOIS accessibility was something that we identified as being in scope. And so we made a recommendation on it.

Faisal Shah: Right.

Greg Aaron: So my question is, to you and I think to Mike, and I'm happy to post this up to the list, is well if you want mandatory minimum practices, what are we actually talking about? What is the area that might be in scope?

Faisal Shah: Okay.

Greg Aaron: Because I think we've arrived at the recommendation for best practices because most of these malicious use issues are specifically out-of-scope. That's the discussion we've been having for the last nine months.

Faisal Shah: Hey, is Martin - Martin, are you on the line? I'm just kind of curious to hear what you think of it.

Martin Sutton: Right. Fussing with mute there as well, but I popped her okay. I'm still struggling in terms of specifics on this one, mainly because of the long debates that we've had about what's in scope and what's not. So I support the (unintelligible) here. We could have a go at trying to draw out some specifics, but there's nothing that I would throw out there at this stage.

Greg Aaron: Okay, well I'll tell you what. I'm going to - I'll send a note up to the list, to Mike Rodenbaugh, and then everybody feel free to chime in. But my question is going to be well, if you're supporting mandatory minimum practices, is that incompatible with the recommendation? And if you're supporting mandatory minimum practices, then let's - we need to hear what's in scope. It seems to be a scope question to me. I'll post that up.

                  Okay, so let's go back to the last recommendation, Number 45. James, we are at 12 in agreement, and then you've suggested a friendly amendment. So can you talk about your friendly amendment?

James Bladel: Yeah, well in regard to Number 45, I think I, in the chat box there, withdrew that concern. I think it's addressed elsewhere. So similar to Frederick, I think I'm moving into the agreement column.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

James Bladel: I did have a question regarding Number 30, however. Whenever we say best practices and then we say minimum mandatory best practices, does that not start to overlap with the question on UOC?

Greg Aaron: Well in our paper we said very specifically that we think that best practices means, by definition, a non-binding thing. So if people are talking about a binding thing, then we need to get our language and definitions straight about what that means. I mean a binding best practice is an oxymoron, according to our current definitions.

James Bladel: Right, right. And doesn't it, I mean, doesn't it start to collide with the idea of a minimum baseline registration abuse provision in the registration agreements that, you know, that we've called out? And I just, I see what Mike is saying as possibly overlapping with Question 39.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think the difference here is that of course on this one, on 30, we're talking about use abuse as opposed to registration abuse.

James Bladel: Ah, okay.

Mikey O'Connor: You know the scope issue's a bit different there.

Greg Aaron: That's true. Okay, so on the last one, James, are you okay going to agreeing? And do you think any additional background material is needed?

James Bladel: Yes, and I'll check.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

James Bladel: Yeah, yeah. I'm okay going with agreeing, and, you know, I'll check on the background on that section, Number 45, to see if there's any additional background, but...

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right. All right, so that makes 45 unanimous. Thank you to Fred and James. And James has an action item on that one for this morning.

Well that brings us through then. What we have to then do is finish up our executive summary, and Marika's been working on it. And Marika, would you like to take the floor and talk about what you've been working on?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So I posted earlier today a first draft of the executive summary, in which I've attempted to highlight the key sections of the report, (unintelligible) first in the background, what (unintelligible) foreseen going into the abuse definition and registration practice use with caution. And then I need to cover some of the registration abuses explored, and then moving into the recommendations.

On of the questions there is that, for example, Chapter 5, many of the information there on the different abuse types is already kind of a summary of the discussions we had. And bringing that information into the executive summary - I don't know how much we can summarize some of those parts.

So the question is, is it sufficient to point people in that direction and just focus on the recommendation for each abuse type? Or do we need to provide more information on each of the abuses we identified, which, you know, might be providing the same kind of information that we're already providing in Chapter 5. Because for example, the definition and issue, everything's very easy to summarize that type of thing.

And the same applies then to Chapter 6, 7, 8 and 9. And for now, just reference those chapters and, you know, the focus would then be in the executive summary on the actual recommendation. Or do people feel that more information should be provided here, and not just by reference.

Greg Aaron: Does anyone have their hands raised? I think we may have some old ones on there.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I've got mine up.

Greg Aaron: Okay, go ahead, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, I think the kind of key editorial notion is to presume that a lot of people will only read the executive summary. And that we ought to give them whatever they need, so that having only read the executive summary they've got enough of a flavor of where we've gotten to -- not to sort of take us back nine months.

I think that's part of the difficulty we had with these recommendations, is that a person like Rodenbaugh, who hasn't been on the calls very much, when he just read the recommendation, didn't have the context. And so I think we need enough in the executive summary so that a person reading it will have sufficient context to be able to understand the recommendations. I know that doesn't give you a specific answer, but...

Marika Konings: Yeah, it doesn't work because that's a bit of a challenge for us, especially if you look at Chapter 5 where some of the sections are very short. (Unintelligible) we're not actually providing any recommendations. And also like, you know, I also find it very difficult because in some we have very different views. I definitely - I'm willing to, you know, make an attempt and try to find more information in there.

But, you know, some of those you might want to argue as well, for multiple people to understand it, they really need the full context. And it's maybe, you know, to summarize it, it might not do justice to one point of view over another. But as I said, I'm happy to, you know, give it another go and make another draft, so people have the chance to look at that and provide comments on it.

Mikey O'Connor: My immediate reaction to the first question you asked at the top of this was at least acknowledging the abuse types is useful for the executive summary. And in the cases where the information in the chapter is very short, so you're essentially replicating the whole chapter, I think that's less of a problem. If it gives people good context and it's pretty short, then having it in the executive summary in complete duplicate is okay.

I know how challenging it is to write executive summaries, where you're trying to summarize a long and very carefully argued section. You might just highlight it and say you really, really need to go read the details to understand this.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. I have my hand raised, and I was going to kind of make that same - we know that people are going to read the executive summary, but I don't want to completely let them off the hook by - because there is a lot of background and important nuance in some cases.

So what I would propose is we do include very brief highlights for each abuse, for example, to provide some context, which sets up why maybe some of the recommendations came out the way they did. But I also think it's important to refer people to the main sections, maybe even by line or page number, to not completely give them the impression that this is all they need to know. We do want them to get into the material.

I will say in most sections we did do a pretty good job, I think, of summarizing the issue at the beginning of the section, and summarizing why it's important to what the main issues are. We might be able to clip some of that information and copy it into the executive summary.

For example, I'm looking at WHOIS access and one or two sentences actually might summarize it, which is that, you know, we found the basic accessibility of WHOIS has a relationship to registration abuses. And it appears that it's not always accessible on a guaranteed or enforceable basis.

That is helpful. It gives some context, and helps explain the recommendation, for example. So, do you think that approach would work?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm happy then to - so I'm going to give you, okay, so what I already did is indeed list the different abuses that are being addressed in Chapter 5. And then for the other chapters, for 6, 7, 8 and 9, there maybe then add a little bit more substance to it. Would that be a workable approach?

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. I think so. And in some cases, the mentions might be quite brief. Because some of the abuses we said actually they're not abuses, or they're out of scope and we dispensed with them.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, this is Mikey. Just I'm looking at Line 100, or 101. One suggestion might be to just call that list of abuses out in bullets, rather than in the paragraph, just to highlight them in the text a little bit. I think things like that would probably help, so that people have little lists to look at rather than in the paragraphs. That might make it clearer.

Greg Aaron: Okay. How's that sound? Okay, all right. Well let's take a shot at that. We need to beef up the executive summary a little bit, it sounds like. We're going to attempt to do that within the next 24 hours, and have a new draft out.

So the next draft will contain the consensus levels and so forth that we discussed today. We'll beef up that executive summary, and this will allow everybody to see it for a couple of days before it gets transmitted to the Council on Friday. So...

Marika Konings: I'm back again, too. Sorry about that.

Greg Aaron: Yeah, so Marika, you and I might trade some material today. We've got a couple of other bits and pieces coming in from folks like James and Berry. And I think our goal is to produce something later today, maybe for posting first thing tomorrow. And we'll be done, hopefully.

Mikey O'Connor: Marika, did you - this is Mikey. Did you hear my little thought about bulletizing Line 100? Or were you off at that point?

Marika Konings: No, no. I got disconnected there.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay. My little idea, and it might be one that would solve some of the other issues, is on Line 101 there's a sentence that contains, as you said, the list of abuses. And my thought was that one way to make it stand out a bit is to just turn them into bullets instead of a list in the paragraph.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: You might find other opportunities to turn things into bullets. A lot of people, at least people like me, tend to read these things and look for those little lists. And I think that that would help -- kind of highlight those things a bit.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Greg Aarons: Okay, let's try that. Okay, just another couple of quick items. After Nairobi, this goes into public comment. And we had previously discussed how the standard public comment period is 20 days long. But we thought that might be a little too short.

Again, our goal is to get public comments in, discuss them, and produce the final report 21 days before Brussels, which is in mid- to late June, I think.

So we have to decide basically how long we want this public comment period to be open for -- 20 days being too short. Would 30 days, a month, be better? Any thoughts?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that's a good idea.

Greg Aaron: Okay, that gives us basically somewhere late March through late April for
                  public comments; gives us the second half of April and May to digest those
                  comments and prepare the final report. And then we'd have to publish the
                  final report around June 3. So that would seem to work, just logistically. So
                  unless any objections, shall we ask for 30 days? Okay, I'm not hearing any
                  objections.

                  Okay, so Marika, you and Glen and I can talk about the logistics of that
                  offline, and I guess we have to figure out when that public comment period
                  would start after Nairobi. We'll figure that out and get the news out to
                  everyone.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Greg Aaron: Okay, and if that's figured out, then the only other thing is Nairobi. We're
                  waiting for some potential meeting dates and times from Glen, because
                  they're putting the GNSO schedule together still. So we don't have a date yet
                  to give the Council a slide presentation. James and Mikey are going to be in
                  Nairobi, and they've volunteered to help with that. So guys, we'd love your
                  help with that. We just don't know if we've got a date and a time yet.

Marika Konings: Greg, this is Marika. I think the update to the GNSO Council is foreseen for
                  Saturday afternoon.

Greg Aaron: Saturday pm?

Marika Konings: I think so. I don't have it at hand, but I think that's when the GNSO is
                  scheduled for now. But it says some things are still moving, but that's the
                  latest I've seen.

Greg Aaron: Okay. James and Mikey, are you around on Saturday afternoon?

James Bladel: Yeah, I get in Friday night.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, me too. I'll be in Thursday afternoon actually.

Greg Aaron: Okay, all right. Sounds like no problem then.

James Bladel: Mikey, maybe you and I can plan to touch base, you know, Saturday morning someplace.

Greg Aaron: Okay, and after we get the paper, and then we're going to work on that slide presentation. Marika is going to help us with that because she'll have a template and so forth. So we'll work on that in the two weeks before Nairobi.

The only other logistical thing is our next teleconference date. Now that we're basically done, we don't need any more teleconferences until after the public comment period. So we'll figure out the dates for the closing of that, and then we'll get a summary of those public comments.

Staff usually creates a summary, and then we'll set up a meeting on maybe a Monday at the same, usual time. But that might be a month and a half or so from now. So we'll check the logistics and I'll send a note out to everybody when we have an idea for our next conference call.

But that takes us otherwise to the end of the agenda, and we're right on time actually. So we have a few bits of clean-up, but we're basically done with our initial report at this point. Look for the next draft up to the list within the day, or 24 hours at least. Please do take a look at it. Barring any unforeseen issues, Marika will take the final draft, except the changes, and then she'll transmit it to the Council on Friday as planned.

This is a major achievement, everybody. This is a long report, but it's a long report because we were asked to do a lot. And I think very admirably we've come up with some very focused recommendations, a lot of really nuanced, really, I think, well reasoned and very civil discussion over the months.

I'm very, very pleased to have been working with you on this. I think it's turned out really nicely, and it's something I hope everyone is very proud of. You did a great service here. So I just want to thank you for all your hard work, and kudos, kudos to everybody.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. So is it true that there's a confetti and balloon drop going on simultaneously in 10 or 12 locations around the globe at this very moment?

James Bladel: It's still too early to drink here, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, dang. Well I think - I just wanted to say to you, Greg, that I thought you did an absolutely fabulous job chairing us through this.

Greg Aaron: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: And, you know, so thanks for all that, too.

Greg Aaron: That means a great deal to me, Mikey. Thank you. And rest assured there will be happy hour in Brussels.

Mikey O'Connor: Hurray! Hurray!

Greg Aaron: Yay! So any final thoughts before we adjourn the call?

James Bladel: Yeah, as long as we're thanking folks, I just wanted to extend that to Marika, Margie and Gisella and staff as well.

Greg Aaron: Yeah, as always.

James Bladel: You know, Marika never sleeps.

Man: I don't think she's human. I think she's a machine. I'm starting to suspect that. Just some of the things...

Marika Konings: I don't know if I should take that as a compliment. It sounded like that, but...

Man: Or maybe she's triplets, and then she does the...

Man: Identical triple twins.

Man: Identical triplets, and we never know which one we're dealing with, and that way she's a 24-hour employee for ICANN. It's amazing.

Man: In constant touch through ESP. Very handy.

Man: Seriously, Marika, you're running about four of these, aren't you? Four different groups or so?

Marika Konings: I think it's even a bit more than that.

Man: I think it's six at the minimum.

Man: Well, well done. We really do appreciate the staff's assistance with this. You help keep us on course and organized, and we appreciate all the background information you bring to the meetings and so forth, so big thanks to you all.

Marika Konings: And thank you all, too, for your cooperation.

Greg Aaron: All right, well thanks again, and keep tabs on the list for further developments. And we'll absolutely get together it sounds like in maybe around six weeks. For those of you who are going to Nairobi, have a good time, a safe time. And maybe some of us will be able to log in and participate remotely. And we'll definitely re-convene and catch up with each other in several weeks. So thank you, everyone.

Marika Konings: Thank you, everyone.

Man: Thanks, Greg.

Man: Thanks, Greg.

Man: Thanks, Greg.

Greg Aaron: Have a great one. Bye-bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Bye-bye. Thank you, (Tim).

Coordinator: Thank you. I'm just going to disconnect the recording now. One second, please.

Gisella Gruber-White: Lovely.

END