

ICANN Transcription
Webinar on New gTLD Auction Proceeds Discussion Paper
Wednesday, 07 October 2015 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Webinar on New gTLD Auction Proceeds Discussion Paper call on the Wednesday, 07 October 2015 at 13:00 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-auction-proceeds-07oct15-en.mp3>

On page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct>

Marika Konings: Wonderful, thank you. We're just going to wait for one or two minutes to allow others to join the call before we get started.

It's three minutes past the top of the hour so I think we probably should get started, since we may have some more people joining us.

So good morning, good evening, good afternoon everyone. Thank you for joining the webinar on the new gTLD auction proceeds. Just a couple of housekeeping items before we get started. Please remember to mute your lines when you're not speaking. If you have any questions or comments, you'll have an opportunity to ask those at the end of the webinar, but in the meantime, please feel free to post any comment or questions you may have in the chat room and I'm sure people will do their best to answer them.

And so my name is Marika Konings. I'm Senior Policy Director and team leader for the GNSO. I'm quite happy to welcome you all here. I'll briefly take

you through the agenda before handing it over to Jonathan and Steve to start up the presentation.

So we start off with a welcome and introduction by Jonathan Robinson, who's the chair of the GNSO, followed by opening remarks from Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN board. We then briefly take you through a recap of some of the Buenos Aires takeaways and overview of discussions that were held on this topic there, and then we provide an overview of the discussion paper and highlight what input we're specifically looking for, followed by questions and comments, as well as expected next steps in this process.

So without further ado, I'll hand it over to Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Marika. And hello, everyone. Welcome to the webinar on behalf of myself and Steve, your co-hosts today, as well as Marika, who's done a significant part of the work in preparing the discussion paper.

I think it's probably important to set the expectations on the purpose of the webinar. Really the opportunity here is to make sure that we introduce properly the discussion paper to ensure that any content provided in the discussion paper is clear. And this is part of a broader effort to ensure that we encourage as wide as possible participation in this process.

It's clear that this is as substantial amount of money that's build up and there is significant broad interest in the - how this money is dealt with. And so it's important that the participation is wide and inclusive.

In addition, it's an objective of the webinar is really a step I guess in a continued progress with - in dealing with this topic but at a measured pace, measured pace for a couple of reasons really. One, because it simply makes sense to do so and do things carefully and properly, given the level of interest and the potential to effect - to use the funds to good effect. But also it's quite

evident that there is significant other current work or, indeed, cross-community work, which it necessarily must be.

So for all of those reasons, it makes sense to have the webinar, keep some momentum going, but not proceed with any undue haste. So we'll welcome any questions or points on the discussion paper to clarify it to make any points you'd like to make.

But bear in mind that this webinar is not the public comment per se. In other words, feel free to raise any clarifying questions and indeed any points of substance, but don't presume that those points of substance will be recorded other than as the proceedings of this webinar. And if you do have a point to make in the public comment, please do that through the public comment forum.

So I think that's all I'd like to say at the outset. It's an opportunity for us, both Steve and myself, to introduce the topic. I will come back after Steve and say a couple more - a few more points about how we got to where we are before handing over to Marika to walk you through the discussion paper and the issues arising.

So I think that's it for me - from me for the moment. Let me hand over to Steve and let him take you through the next couple of slides.

Steve Crocker: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And thank you, Marika, as well. As Jonathan had said, the purpose of this webinar is to provide information. It is not the primary avenue for making decisions or for accumulating comments, but we'll be here for basically as long as you all would like to answer your questions and to be helpful.

As I think many of you are aware, the auction process that is part of the gTLD program is deliberately designed to be the auction - the resolution process of last resort when there has been contention for strings. We have not tried to

maximize the amount of money that we're taking in. We have not tried to be in the middle of the process. But nonetheless, we have provided this auction process as a way of resolving contention when all of the means have failed for the parties to do it privately.

And as a very important part of emphasizing that, this auction process is not a standard part of our budgeting or expenditure cycle. We've carefully segregated those funds, which are now accumulated to be slightly in excess of \$58 million and it may grow somewhat more, we don't know exactly how much but there's some more auctions that may happen.

We've segregated these funds and said that we will not use them for any of the regular expenses that ought to be part of our ongoing budget, and, thus, we will not fall into the trap, if you will, of becoming dependent upon these kind of funds.

So that opens the door to asking well if you're not going to do that with it, what are you going to do. And the answer is that we are now engaged -- and this webinar is part of the process -- now engaged in a broad consultation with the community to establish what the direction is going to be.

And as you will hear and as it's laid out in the discussion paper, we want to do this in an orderly and staged fashion. We want to focus first on broad principles and on what the process ought to be. I know that there's a big urge and a big tendency to put forth individual suggestions and use the money for this project or for that project. That's perfectly understandable but we are some distance away from making decisions about individual expenditures.

Another couple of concerns that we have is that we want whatever process we adopt to be relatively lean and lightweight. We do not want to be in the position of consuming a large fraction of these funds just in the process of figuring out what to do with them.

Another concern that we have is to make this a very clean and conflict-free process. In general, the people involved in making the decisions about what to do with the money should be separate from the people who are the beneficiaries of the funds. And this is an area that we take quite seriously within ICANN, and sometimes we find that people have different sensitivities about what is and what isn't a conflict of interest.

Our tendency at the board level is to be as clean and as formal about these things as we can but keeping in mind that all of us are working on behalf of the community.

I think that covers the primary messages that I'd like to convey. I want to express a great appreciation for Jonathan for all of the other people in the SOs and ACs that are - have participated so far and are eager to participate further. We want to be very supportive of that and at the same time we want to feel our way very gingerly through this process. This is frankly new territory for us. This has not been part of the strategic plan, it has not been part of the operating budget for sure, and we want to have this come out in as positive a way possible.

Fifty-eight million or so seems like a lot of money on the one hand, it's also a very small amount of money if you choose very large problems. There are sharp limits as to what can be accomplished with this much money. And most particularly, this is not to be viewed as a renewable resource. I've been in some discussions where there's been some concern about whether or not we could find a way to have a steady stream of these kinds of funds.

That's not currently in the - nothing's organized to make that possible. I can imagine that one could go down that path, but that's an entirely different discussion. And so part of the discussion about what to do with these funds is perhaps colored by whether or not to consume them sort of in one shot or whether to stretch them out or turn them into an endowment of some sort. All

of those kinds of questions remain open and not yet settled, and perfectly valid for discussion.

So with that, let me turn things back over to Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Steve. And the next slide, which we didn't move onto, but really essentially sums up some of those points you've made, which is the sort of commitments that ICANN made to date, which is to create a separate and distinct process to encourage as broad and as open possible participation in designing the process and next steps and to have a full and careful process for the decision making. And so that really seems to capture it pretty well from the point of view of ICANN.

I guess it's worth highlighting, and here we move onto recapping really what happened in Buenos Aires and probably taking a little step back prior to that. Because in the prior meeting in Singapore, there were GNSO discussions which more or less came to a head at that point in determining that there was sufficient interest within the GNSO to commence conversations, more formal conversations, on the topic of the new gTLD auction proceeds.

So the GNSO council then reached out to other supporting organizations and advisory committees to determine the level of interest in forming a cross-community working group on the topic. And based on that feedback, the council have decided to move ahead with the creation of a cross-community working group and to the natural first step would be to form a drafting time, which could then be considered by all SOs and ACs for participation.

In fact we went so far as to make a call for volunteers to join that drafting team, but then took a step back just prior to Buenos Aires and recognizing the extent of the community workload, as well as taking on board some of the initial feedback from Steve, yourself, and the ICANN board, and really thought that we would take the opportunity in Buenos Aires to hold off on bringing the drafting team together at that stage but really rather reach out

into the ICANN community at least and solicit initial feedback and input on that by informing the community about the history, take - and the current facts in relation to gTLD auction proceeds in both substance and style, and to also hear from others about how they have dealt with that in sort of parallel or related situations.

And so that really led us into a couple of sessions in Buenos Aires, and I think we can talk to those in the next slide. We really ran two key sessions. One was a high interest session on the Monday in which - at which point a variety of community participants from across the board presented a broad range of views and thoughts and ideas about more or less everything to do with the auction proceeds. To be fair, there were ideas about process, there were ideas about mechanics, there were ideas about usage of the funds, and so on.

And that was followed later in the week on the Wednesday of the Buenos Aires meeting with a workshop session, which specifically laid out the facts in full detail both in terms of how the proceeds were generated, what the current states of those are. And just to highlight (unintelligible), it's worth noting that -- and we can actually put this in the chat -- there is a link, there is a website which really provides a schedule of the extent of the proceeds.

But in many ways, the - although it's necessary to know the background and extents of the proceeds, certainly the focus of the workshop was in hearing from others. And we took three case studies, in that case from SID in the Netherlands, the Nominote Trust in the U.K., and CRA in Canada, all of whom through their domain name related country registry work have generated funds, not quite in the same way as the auction funds, but nevertheless funds superfluous to regular normal operations, and have had to deal with those in some way.

And they took us through. And I'd encourage anyone who's interested in this topic to go and dig into those presentations and those different approaches,

because there were both similarities and subtle differences, and some real words of wisdom about the experience of dealing with, albeit a normal local Internet community, but the nevertheless, a multi-stakeholder community and in dealing with the preparation and management of different funds.

So that was a very, very useful session and took up some additional important data into the whole - content into the whole discussion. And having been through those two sessions, it became clear that the following really was in place.

On the next slide we - it was clear that there was significant interest from various quarters in the topic. But many had already gone so far as to think, and had quite strong views, about where the funds - where and how the funds could or should be distributed. But there was also a recognition that this had to be dealt with in a systematic way.

And before talking about where the funds go or how they go, that there was some key principles and a framework that needed to be developed first. So it's - and it was therefore suggested or proposed that in order to focus in on point three, the principles and process and the framework, in order to manage these, the ultimate disposition of the funds, a good first step would be to produce a discussion paper summarizing where we are to date and generating ongoing feedback and discussion primarily into those principles and processes and the framework.

And so that really took us to where we are today with the production of the discussion paper and its subsequent presentation for public comment, where you find yourself now with us in this webinar.

So let me hand over to Marika from ICANN staff, who had led the staff effort to write up a discussion paper, and Marika can take you through that, the key points in there. And hopefully that creates a very sound foundation then for the ICANN and broader community to provide their input into the next steps.

Over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Jonathan. I think many of things I'm going to be talking about have already been said but I think it's probably good to repeat those again. As I've already noted, the discussion paper really is a continuation from the discussions that were held in Buenos Aires, and even those that preceded those discussions, even though there were - maybe no formal discussions but the topic has of course come up in various fora and meetings.

The objective is to, you know, bring all the information around this topic together in one paper and allow for the community and as well, especially those that may not have been able to participate in the session that happened in Buenos Aires, to provide their input on some of the issues that are flagged and raised in the paper, and as well as come forward with ideas or suggestions on how to handle some of the questions that are being raised.

And the structure is quite straightforward. I won't dwell too much on the background and community and board discussions, because I think has already been covered quite well, both by Steve and Jonathan.

But really the focus point, and that is also the focus point of the public comment forum, is some of the issues that we've tried to tease out and raise which we believe need to be addressed in the next steps of the process. And as I said, some of those have already been flagged as well in some of the points that have been made. And of course the paper also talks about, you know, what are the expected next steps.

So instead I would like to focus here on what are some of the questions or issues that we have been brought forward. And I just want to emphasize as well this is not to be - intended to be an exhaustive list. The objective is also to identify did we miss anything, is there anything that the community should be considering - we might try to get that line to muted.

Thank you very much. So as I said, this is not an exhaustive list of issues, it's just - it's intended to serve as a starting point for the conversations and input, and you're all encouraged as well to identify are there any issues that we overlooked and should be considered as well.

So basically this list is - raises a number of items that we believe the community should be considering as it focuses on the next steps, whether that's in the form of a cross-community working group or whether that's in the form of some kind of other mechanism that may be brought forward in response to the public comment forum.

So one question is how can we make sure that the focus is on framework development instead of focusing on what to spend the money on. That's also a point that Steve already emphasized as well. It's very important that a proper structure and process is in place to have that conversation instead only focusing on how are we going to spend - what are we going to spend the money on.

And the question is also what kind of information or outreach should be conducted upfront to ensure that there's a broad knowledge base and experts from other similar experiences in other sectors, and we already referenced some of the presentations that were received from ccTLDs that have been in similar situations.

You know, what kind of external expertise may be needed, (unintelligible) to think about some fiscal questions that may come up. And how can you ensure broad participation and involvement. How can we make sure that we reach beyond the typical participants within the ICANN community or the insiders to make sure that there's a broad conversation and outreach down to make sure people have the ability to provide their ideas and suggestions and participate actively in the process.

And there's a question of board involvement. What are the expected or desired involvement and the role of the board, both with regards to participating in the effort but also how is the board at the end of the day expected to consider the recommendations once they have been approved either through the CCWG or some kind of other mechanism.

The point of conflicts of interest that was already made. And I saw there was also a question in the chat about that. Again, that's one of the important questions that the community will need to deal with. How can you avoid conflicts of interest and, as well, what is the definition of those.

What are the linkages made with other efforts? There are maybe other efforts that may have an impact on the discussions here. And some of the things that we flagged in the papers for example is work ongoing in the cross-community working group on accountability, which may affect how the current scope or mission of ICANN is defined in the ICANN bylaws. And there's also work ongoing defining or framing the global public interest or what that means in an ICANN context. The outcome of those efforts may have an impact on this effort, so it's important to keep an eye on those or at least be aware that those are ongoing. And then there's also the question of implementation. What's the expected scope of - across community working group or other kind of mechanisms with regards with implementation once the framework has been agreed upon? How do those two link together?

I said these points are really intended to serve as a starting point for further conversation and input and as well as hop inside and to fire other points that may need to be considered.

So the public comment period is currently open and as noted comments can be submitted until the eighth of November. And particularly you're looking and that point has already been made before as well on these points. What needs to be done as next steps? What are some of the key questions that need to

be addressed? How can we work towards addressing this, all the issues that are missed for example on this slide?

I've noted that most of the input that's been received so far in response to the public common forum really focuses on what can we spend the money on. And of course we won't lose track of that as those of you that may have reviewed the paper will have seen there's an annex to the paper that provides a list of all the ideas and suggestions that have been gathered to date from the different conversations that have been held.

And of course we'll be adding any further idea to that what's the expectation that - conversation around here is specific. Proposals or ideas will come at a much later stage once community has agreed on what the cost and framework for those conversations should be.

I think I already basically covered this. So I said input on the issues frame (unintelligible). Are there any other approaches that should be considered? The assumption is at this stage and also based on feedback received (unintelligible) that there is broad support for our cross community working group to address these issues.

For those of you that may be less familiar with that concept of course community working group is a working group that's formed through a charter that's adopted by different chartering organizations, different supporting organizations and advisory committees within ICANN that basically outlines the scope and mode of operation for such a group.

The idea behind it is that a group comes up with recommendation which I then consider and hopefully adopt it by all the chartering organizations before these are then put forward to the ICANN board. The collection is maybe there's another mechanism that hasn't been brought forward yet. So if there are any ideas in that regard feel free as well to submit that as part of the public common forum.

I said anything that we may have missed in the paper, any other issues that need to be considered, that's really what we're focusing on and that's on what the money should be spent on because we expect that there will be many opportunities further in the process where those ideas and suggestions will be (unintelligible) and are considered.

So I mentioned before the timeline and we probably should (unintelligible) on the eighth of September to allow people additional time and taking into account the ICANN meeting in Dublin is around the corner. The public common forum will run and stay open a couple weeks after that meeting so the eighth of November. Staff will then summarize that input and make updates the discussion paper as deemed appropriate and submit all that information to the different groups that have expressed an interest in this initiative so that the next steps can be initiated.

I'm putting here as well the notes to those documents which you can also find at the bottom of the chat. And with that I'll hand it back over to Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. So there's really some threads developing in the chat and that's good to see and we will record those and make a note of that in the records of the call. Obviously there's some threads on the conflict of interest issue, any other points? These should be very useful to get these made and is clear as possible effective of input into the public comment.

When the group does stop the committee (unintelligible) in whatever format they finally take so it get to start to do this work in earnest. There's - as broad as possible and effective feedback into the chartering or scoping of that work.

Would anyone like to make any comments? (Unintelligible) would you like to comment on the microphone and make any particular points? As we said the main purpose is to make sure you're well equipped to provide substantial comments into the public comment but if there are points you'd like to make

or clarifying questions you'd like to ask feel free to do so now. Nathalie confirms in the chat (unintelligible). I'm new to it so if you do wish to come in you can just raise your hand and I'll come to you in sequence.

That's a good point for example where there's a question (unintelligible) decide that all of the expenses of the process will come out of the turtle proceeds or has it not been decided yet. No. Technically it's not been decided and if you had a firm view on that again that's something to express.

If for example - Steve may already have a view on this. I'm sure others will as well but you may have a view that that should certainly be the case or you may have a view that it should certainly not be the case and if so providing that input and a ration for that within the group's work.

At this point it hasn't been that level of - to the best of my knowledge it hasn't been a month (unintelligible) or ICANN can correct me if I'm wrong. But I think the principle is there's a ring fence capital sum to the eventual cost of administering that. I don't think that's been specifically decided as to where that comes from.

One thought I have for you on this (unintelligible) is a little bit of adversity like our conversation about the - what we call this type of group, this concept of a cross community working group. Actually maybe some of you know, maybe not all of you do. The concept of a cross community working group is a relatively new concept and at least in the way it works at the moment there's some work ongoing at the moment ironically passing in the form of a cross community working group to define the rules and operating procedures for such groups.

It appears that more and more and one of the - there's a desire and a recognition of the need for working across the different communities rather than in separate individual sub-communities. So it makes - at least to many it seems quite a lot of sense to make sure we have a reasonable but open

framework for doing this kind of work and where there's broad interest from multiple SOs, ACs and in this case even potentially from outside of the core ICANN community and Marika highlights the community to develop the principles for cross community working groups.

All right. Well unless there are - I don't see either hands coming up now. I hope that's being informative. I'm not going to keep you on the webinar unnecessarily. The intention was to raise the profile of the paper, as we said make sure you're in a clear position to be able to provide the input. Steve is there anything having heard the webinar that you'd like to make as a closing remark before we wrap things up?

Steve Crocker: Thank you Jonathan. No I think we covered it, perhaps covered anything more than once. I see Bob (unintelligible) just asked what's the timeline for this process. We haven't set a specific timeline and in fact it's good that you asked that question because it touches on something else.

One of the debates that we had early on was whether to push this process forward or to hold it back in difference to the extraordinary workload that we're all experiencing during the transition process and related matters within ICANN. So I think it's a bit open as to how fast this process is going to proceed. Everybody is under such extreme pressure that there are very few cycles left.

It needs to go quickly enough so it doesn't just languish and it needs to go slowly enough so that we have time to consider and I don't have any way of putting specific dates around those. Happy to have whatever the pressures are from the community determine that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve. And I see we have a hand up now from (unintelligible) so please go ahead (Muhammad).

(Muhammad): Thank you Jonathan. You hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, we do hear you.

(Muhammad): Hello? Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes (Muhammad). We hear you.

(Muhammad): Thank you very much. I just want to raise one point that this is relating more specific. I've gone through all the materials we got regarding the use of this fund but one question come back to my head is did we think about the item survival process, how this fund can help ICANN in a process where the fund we see more fund going down.

You see ICANN revenue dropping less interest in getting domain names because we didn't do much for the inquiries of the domain name registration worldwide if you look at the small number of 300 million domain names worldwide and I didn't see anything that can be tapped because many times it's a point regarding how we're going to help increase the domain name business worldwide.

I think that this question is relevant for ICANN because it means how we're going to deliver for ICANN sustain. And I didn't see anything related to that like - because many times when this point was raised we always object that the budget wasn't sufficient to do a lot about that.

So now that we have something that can help think out of the box, not thinking about the day to day operations or how many dollars we're going to have for ICANN for any new domain name registers. I think that it's time to think about how we can do in order to help to increase more domain name registration worldwide, where the potential is. And this isn't something that ties into any of this process.

We're more focused on operations doing stuff but I think that's reason to think about if all the users going to have less and less interest in registration of domain names, if people -- young people -- start thinking about only using their Facebook or only their Gmail and no new registration at all we all see that there's a high risk of not having that explosion of domain name or the increase continuing.

My question is can we have a target of just thinking about how we as an organization help increase the domain name registration (unintelligible). How we're going to do to educate more people to have more interest in our business because the more domain registers, the more business we're going to have and the more revenue ICANN's going to have in order to sustain and perform the mission point is working.

So it's not part of the commission of ICANN but we need it. It's time to start thinking out of the box and try to see if we can use something specific for this function fund to help ICANN in the long term getting more and more registration domain name, not only 300 million domain name worldwide where we have 7 billion people worldwide.

Federation is too small and I've never seen people asking themselves questions about what's going to happen if there's no new domain name registration. We see the trend in new gTLD. It's not much. We all know that the numbers aren't there and I think that's because we didn't think about how we're going to help educate more people to get interested in it, get more communities involved, getting interest in domain name before - find the interest outside where people are spending a lot of money and time educating them and helping them understand. I see billions of people getting their Facebook but not having their domain name. This a point.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much. That's a good point. It speaks to ultimately the disposition of the funds rather than the process but I think that's a good point to throw into the mix. I saw (Steve's) hand come up. Steve I don't know if

you'd like to respond immediately to that or should I defer to (Daniel) who's next in the queue. Your call Steve. Would you like to go next?

Steve Crocker: Yes thank you very much Jonathan. (Muhammad) thank you very much for that impassioned comment and I think that's very helpful because what you laid out is one particular broad direction that the funds might be applied to. And tied to what you're saying is a sense of direction about what's best for ICANN and what's best for the community.

I think that it'd be fairly easy to get quite a few people who would agree with you and I think it'd be equally fairly easy to find people who have alternative opinions. For example perhaps we'd have no trouble finding people who'd say we really need to apply those funds to improve the security and stability of the network or more particularly secure ability of the top level domain registries and registrars in one fashion or another.

Another would be to perhaps to apply some of that money to the non - open source software that we're all dependent upon and yet is arguably underfunded. And those are just two of what I suspect would be a somewhat interesting list of broad areas and that's without making specific decisions within each of those areas.

So I think this is where we're looking for vigorous and broad discussion and I'm hoping that insightful ideas come out of this rather than just sitting down in a room and saying well, this is where we're going to apply it or conversely opening the door for proposals from every single direction and then having no sense about what values to apply to all that. So I appreciate your contribution there and I think perhaps not what you intended exactly but I think it'll serve as a stimulant, as a provocative way of opening the discussion rather than setting - making a firm decision to go in that direction.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Steve. Let me just hand straight over to (Daniel) who's next in the queue. Daniel, go ahead. Daniel, no audio at the stage. All right I'm going

to take for the moment a written contribution from (Daniel) in chat which - it points out he had previously mentioned in another forum it's a real risk in his view on the demise of the DNS in favor a few platform demand such as Facebook and Twitter and that feels like a risk.

Steve Crocker: If I might while we're waiting for (Daniel) or somebody else, the idea that there may be a long term threat to the domain name system in terms of revenue to ICANN is a very sensible question and it's one that at the board level of ICANN comes up should I imagine.

It's not a imminent threat. We're not going to see the 200+ million registrations that currently exist fall off dramatically and the revenue that we get is pretty much tied to the number of registrations. Of course we get - primarily get our money from the gTLD registration, not from the ccTLD registration. So take that number in half if you want a rough number.

I think it's fair to say that the rate of increase of registrations is dropped off. I don't know that the actual number of registrations has declined at all and I think it'd be quite some time before the number of registrations itself start to decline to the point where it becomes worrisome.

So I think that at worst we're facing at least in the foreseeable future a leveling off rather than a sharp decline. That doesn't mean it's not worth looking at over the long term. Even as there's the rise of other kinds of identifiers and other settings that are outside of the ICANN (ambit) I'm not convinced that there's a depression level change in the ICANN revenues.

Certainly that's open for discussion and definitely something to think about but I think the near term prospects is more of a leveling off instead of a sharp decline. That may feel like a depression (unintelligible) use of living in ever increasing times but it isn't exactly.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Stephen). I think we've got to be careful we don't get drawn too far down this particular path here because clearly the market will be what the market is and we may or may not be able to imprint that market. But really the more - it seems to me that that's the high level point here, is to discuss whether or not anything like that would be in scope or out of scope as far as these funds are concerned.

So it's about trying to get this group, the deals with it to work at a level of principle and you're handing the checkpoints out are we supposed to ensure the proper operation of the net, not maximize the number of domain names. Really that's the discussion that'd be very useful to have in feeding into the public comment and setting out the potential scopes so when this group is born to do the work it can form a very well informed charter and tightly and effectively scope the work.

(Daniel) are you able to come in on audio yet or shall I - (Muhammad) if you could make a brief comment then and it feels to me like we can probably wrap this up. So come back in for a second time and then we'll probably wrap it up and if there's any new contributions.

(Muhammad): Okay thank you very much. I think that what I just want to add here is the goal of my suggestion wasn't necessarily to come down on is this client relevant or not. Basically we're handling or is that a bind between ICANN number of registration and holding that.

The question is what we'd like to do is how we can get a better use of a plan that's going to be here in order to come into the scope of ICANN. The scope of ICANN is digital (unintelligible) also. It's obviously going to have community to get involved. So what I'm trying to see is based on how we're organized between SO - the GSNO and others, the ccNSO. We try to answer the question from our perspective because when we talk about Internet many (unintelligible).

We're just trying to talk about the DNS (unintelligible) in itself might be gTLD or ccTLD. This is some perspective that I'm asking myself the question how ICANN as an organization can strengthen this organization to the different SO and get a partner or somebody that's on a day to day interaction. That's why I (unintelligible) of Facebook penetration in developing countries compared to how numbers of registration we have to the ccTLD or the GNSO.

So my question is I think that's part of our mandate to think about how we (unintelligible) being more and more strong and better filled community for which they have been built set up. That's really the point.

Jonathan Robinson: Got it, thanks (Muhammad). That's useful. Again I'd strongly encourage you to get that - to articulate that and get that into the public comment so it effectively helps set the scope of the work that follows and clearly that's not only you but others as well but that's clear. Thank you.

All right. Well I think it remains to just thank everyone for those - for listening, for hearing us out on the discussion paper and for making those contributions and observations both in the chat and on audio and to yet again encourage you to put any comments or thoughts you have on the future direction on this work on the public comment so that we can pull that together and drive this forward at the better pace we hope to in the month ahead.

Thanks everyone. We'll see you or many of you at least in Dublin and enjoy working with you online before and after. Thanks.

Steve Crocker: Thank you everybody.

END