**GNSO – ICANN Nairobi Meeting
GNSO Open Working session
WHOIS Update
06 March 2010 at 11:15 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing at the WHOIS Update held in Nairobi on Saturday 06 March at 11:15 Local time. 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.

(participants list at the end of the transcript)

Stéphane van Gelder: ...or to ask questions, use the Adobe Connect to raise your hand so we can see that, and then we can involve you in the conversation as best we can. Thanks very much.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, okay, that seems to have sorted itself out. Welcome everyone.

So, just to make sure everyone is aware of what's going on, my name is Stéphane van Gelder, I'm the Vice Chair of the GNSO Council, and I will be sitting in for Chuck and, well both Chuck and Olga, to be honest.

Chuck, the Chair of the Council, and Olga, the Vice Chair, nominated by the non-contracted parties house. Chuck is unable to make the trip, and Olga had a last minute personal matter to attend to, so she had - unfortunately, she had to cancel her trip as well.

So we will try and do our best to make sure these meetings go smoothly. And Chuck and many other councilors will be participating remotely, so I'm sure we'll try and get everyone as involved as we can.

Let's start straightaway with an update from Liz Gasster, on the WHOIS. Liz?

Liz Gasster: Thank you very much, Stéphane, and good day to everyone. Thank you for participating in this session. I'm going to be giving an update on the WHOIS studies that were requested by the GNSO Council.

There are two parts to my presentation. The first part is kind of a high level update on where we stand with all the studies. And then Part 2 is a deeper explanation of where we are with the WHOIS service requirement study, one particular study that we've been asked to examine.

I also want to mention that the Compliance Department of ICANN recently posted on February 15 a WHOIS Accuracy Study. There's a 60-day comment period on that study that closes on the 15th of April.

I'm mentioning it for two reasons. One, just to be able to clarify that that study is completely separate from these studies that are being requested by the GNSO Council. So that study is not a study that I'm going to discuss today.

But I think my second reason for mentioning it is that there could be information, I think, contained in that study that would be useful for those of you who are interested in WHOIS, to take a look at it and possibly comment on. So I wanted to just make that connection, if I could.

Okay, so I'm going to just briefly touch on what the goals of WHOIS studies are. As many of you know, policy related to WHOIS has been debated for many years. There are many competing interests with valid viewpoints that range from intellectual property concerns, concerns by cyber security professionals and law enforcement, concerns by individuals who are concerned about their privacy, and also privacy advocates who are concerned about privacy issues. Many registrars and other service providers are concerned about potential costs, and also intact to their business models.

So, although none of these previous discussions have led to significant policy changes in WHOIS, the GNSO Council hopes that study data emerging from

these studies would provide an objective factual basis for further policy making.

So the GNSO Council identified five WHOIS study areas to test hypotheses that reflect key policy concerns. Those are the five study areas I'm going to be giving an overview on today. And for the first three categories, the Council asked staff to determine cost and feasibility of conducting one or more of these. So they didn't actually ask us right now to conduct the studies, only to provide information about how feasible the studies would be and the cost of those studies.

So, if you have questions along the way I'm happy to answer them, but I need someone to help me, tell me when there are questions from people on the line instead of in the room. So are there any questions at this point? Great.

Marilyn Cade: My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm a member of the Business Constituency and the Chair of the first WHOIS task Force, many, many years ago.

I'm particularly pleased to see the work on defining the studies move forward, but I - and this question may actually be for the counselors that are in the room and for you, Liz. Realizing that the framework for the operational plan in the budget is published now, at what point is the identification of the funding for the studies far enough along that it can actually be reflected into the framework document?

Liz Gasster: That's the topic of my presentation, which I'll be covering throughout.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Liz Gasster: Okay, thanks. So I'm going to talk about the timing and also the timing of the budget. Okay? Anything else?

Stéphane van Gelder: Can I just make sure to ask everybody to really speak into the microphone, so that people participating remotely can hear us. And state - sorry, my name is Stéphane van Gelder, thank you Marika for reminding me of that. And please state your name so that everyone knows who's speaking.

Liz Gasster: Okay, so Liz Gasster again. I'm going to talk first about the WHOIS Misuse Studies. There were really two possible studies in this bucket of studies. Looking at assessing whether public WHOIS significantly increases harmful acts, and also to take a look at the impact of the anti-harvesting measures.

One of the proposed studies in this grouping would survey registrants, registrars, research and law enforcement organizations about (past acts) misuse that people think might have been tied to WHOIS. And another would measure a variety of acts aimed at measuring the extent to which published WHOIS versus unpublished WHOIS text addresses might result in misuse.

So we did use an RFP approach for this study in order to determine what the costs would be. Staff wasn't really in a position to be able to develop the costs ourselves, and we also wanted to take the opportunity to solicit from potential researchers what feasibility issues there might be.

So we received three responses to this study, and an analysis is underway. The analysis is actually very far along, and essentially I really missed the deadline for Nairobi by just a few days in order to produce the staff analysis of it. So it is going to be - the analysis is going to be released shortly. And you know, (what will it) be providing costs estimates for the study and also our assessment of feasibility and, you know, any issues that might need to be considered.

A question from Steve Del Bianco.

Steve Del Bianco: Thanks Liz. Of the three responses, were any of them willing to do a survey for this? Or were they taking the analysis, Method 2?

Liz Gasster: All three were willing to do both.

Steve Del Bianco: Second question. And this might actually be something you can handle at the end, but the high likelihood that our draft applicant guidebook, (once) approved will require a thick WHOIS for new gTLD registry operators. You don't want to miss the chance to learn from our study vendors.

Any implications for thick versus thin WHOIS in the world going ahead? Because as you know, when we designed all these (RFPs) to study parameters, we didn't at the time know that we would likely have a thick (world).

Liz Gasster: Thank you. We do talk a little bit about that in the second part of the presentation.

Okay, I'm going to go onto the WHOIS Registrant Identification Study. This study would look at how registrants identify themselves in WHOIS, and the extent to which domains owned by businesses or being used for commercial purpose are not clearly identified as such in WHOIS.

Perhaps, for example, the actual domain user's identity is obscured by a privacy service or suggests that the registrant is a non-business entity or is acting without a commercial purpose. And then tie that to the use of privacy and proxy services in terms of correlating for those domains, whether they're using privacy and proxy services.

So we also used an RFP approach here to determine the cost and feasibility, in this case we received five responses. And again, our analysis is going to be forthcoming very shortly, just couldn't quite get it done for this meeting.

I will say that each of these studies, roughly the estimates for these studies, and again, you'll get more detailed information, are between $150-170,000 each.

The third area is to take a look at proxy and privacy services really from two distinct perspectives. These will probably end up actually being two separate RFPs. We have not developed RFPs yet on these two study areas, they are complicated. And we focused on the first two areas first.

The first of these two privacy and proxy areas is the privacy and proxy abuse study. This would look at the relationship between domains associated with illegal or harmful Internet acts and privacy and proxy service abuse. Essentially, looking at the extent to which domain names used to conduct illegal or harmful Internet activities are registered via proxy and privacy services.

We think this seems technically doable, but it could be challenging because of the need for assistance from many input sources, and would likely need extensive community participation. So, that's why we've delayed a bit the RFP on this, although I think we'll be releasing this RFP by the end of March or maybe early April.

And then the second proxy and privacy services study that the GNSO requested was really to look at what we're calling the Reveal Study. It would measure the responses of proxy and privacy services to request to reveal information about the registrant or licensee of the service.

This study is logistically difficult because it seems to require that there be actual victims of actionable harm to originate the reveal request accompanied by evidence of harm. So we're continuing to assess how we might approach an RFP for this study area. And that particular study, I think, is going to take longer to release the RFP. I would say maybe by the end of April or so, but I'll have a more clear update within the next few weeks on that study.

The fourth area of study asks us to look at the readability of non-ASCII WHOIS. The study with -

Stéphane van Gelder: Sorry to interrupt you. People are wanting to ask questions. Can I ask that we ask questions at the end? Just hold off until Liz finishes her presentations and then we'll take a list. Thank you very much.

Liz Gasster: Thanks, Stéphane. Liz again. So we're talking here about the fourth area of study, the readability of non-ASCII WHOIS. This study would involve a technical analysis of how various client side software would display (on non-ASCII) registration information.

We've held up on this study because there is (FS) GNSO working group on internationalized registration data that was recently convened following the Seoul meeting. This group is in the early stages of considering questions like, you know, what should we require from internationalized registration data?

This group will also address technical questions regarding how data elements might be extensible to accommodate users who would benefit from registration information displaying in familiar characters from local languages and scripts.

There actually is an update on this, I think, being given by - in the SSACs. Unfortunately I just don't have the date and time available right now, but I can get it to people who are interested. I just want to make a point of saying I think there is presentation on how that group's progress is coming along shortly.

And then the last area that the GNSO Council asked staff to look at was actually not so much a study, but a compilation of WHOIS service requirements based on both the current requirements of WHOIS and

previous policy discussion. And in this case we did not go the RFP route. We decided to conduct the study ourselves.

One of the policy staff, Steve Sheng, has actually done the work developing this compilation. And I'm going to be, in the second presentation that I'm about to give, just highlighting some of his findings so far. We again think that study will be complete in the late March timeframe, at least the first draft of it, and we'll be sharing it with the Council and the community as well as well as other (SOs) and (ACs) for their input.

So, I wanted to just briefly touch on the timeline and next steps for these first three study areas, and also kind of answer Marilyn's question at the same time, which is our first step is to finalize a report to the GNSO Council on the first two study areas. We're also going to be finalizing the draft to a service requirements report, as I say. And then also developing and finalizing RFPs on the proxy and privacy services studies.

We'll be providing to the Council details on the first two study areas fairly shortly. And as I say, you know, each of these studies is going to cost somewhere in the - the estimate is somewhere in the $150,000-170,000 range, each. I'll provide more detail on this in the analysis.

But it is important to - because these studies are costly, it will be important for the Council to raise this issue in the budget process, and request funding for those studies, and also to consider the prioritization of studies recognizing that we'll have proxy and privacy services studies that we'll be providing costs on later, which perhaps might get carried over to the next fiscal year.

That's just a suggestion, but it's something that I think the Council does need to discuss, budget for the studies and the timing for that, since the budget will be - you're already being asked to comment on the budget and with the goal of finalizing the budget, I think, in June. So, it's going to be important to take a

look at the information there, and for, you know, the Council to make subsequent decision on what it wants to recommend.

So I'm going to move on to this progress report on WHOIS service requirement with the reminder that - or just mentioning again, that Steve Sheng is really the author of this report. He's also on the line and happy to answer questions if people have questions on this.

Just one sec. I think the genesis really of this study was that there have been increasing community concerns over time that WHOIS service is deficient in a number of ways, such as data accuracy, support for internationalized registration data, and such.

And so the thought was that having a compilation of all of the potential requirements for WHOIS as well as existing requirements for WHOIS would be useful for the Council in addition to the other studies that they requested us to look into as a way of moving forward on the potential replacement for WHOIS protocol.

So this request for this study was actually - came later than the first request. It was requested in May of 2009, and we're just about to complete this compilation. And so the next few slides are just kind of a preview of what we've - we'll I gave you the text of the resolution and that's just for your records, and the goals, which I think I've already stated the current features as well as features to support past proposals and features that might be recommended by the SOs and the ACs.

So, the previous recommendations, for example, that the SSAC has already made, as well as subsequent recommendations as well.

So this is a list of just topics that we have included in our preliminary compilation. The first is a mechanism to find authoritative WHOIS servers. Currently there's no easy way to find out the domain names and IP

addresses of Who IS servers for a given TLD or registrar. So with ccTLDs and new gTLDs, this could become a bigger problem. And so the notion here is that there perhaps should be a mechanism to find authoritative WHOIS servers for a given domain.

You know, one thing I didn't mention, it was in the slide, but I want to just reiterate again here that we're talking about technical requirements for WHOIS, not policy requirements for WHOIS in this compilation. That was the intention of the compilation.

So the second element that will be included in this compilation is structured queries. Today, WHOIS server applications vary with respect to how they expect clients for format query data. WHOIS client applications also vary with respect to how they have compensated for the server variability. So these factors effect the user experience in a negative way as the query syntax can change from server to server and can also adversely effect automating.

So this requirement is that there perhaps should be a standard query structure that clients can implement and then gTLD registries and ICANN accredited registrars might support.

Third is a well defined schema for replies. The WHOIS protocol doesn't specify a format for data response. So registrars and registries return the WHOIS data results in different ways. The lack of a standard format or data structure makes it difficult for us to interpret the results and also for programs to (parse) the results.

Okay, just moving on with additional compilations of elements, we're also including issues related to the quality of domain registration data. Accuracy, how current data is, the internationalization issue, there's no mechanism today to indicate characters that are in use.

The third area is security, that there are few requirements related to verification or authentication. Thick versus thin WHOIS. Steve Del Bianco mentioned that earlier. For new gTLD, staff has recommended thick WHOIS. Many current registries have thick WHOIS, but not all registries have thick WHOIS. So that would be included.

We also would be including a registrar abuse point of contact as a possibility. This was an idea recommended by the SSAC. So again, I've touched on the next step, but we're going to be releasing a draft, hopefully by the end of March. We're going to conduct some Webinars, Steve Sheng will do this, and also consult with the other (SOs) and (ACs) on the draft as well as consulting with the GNSO, which was a particular request of the GNSO when it approved this resolution. And hopefully we'll release the final report in - by May of 2010.

So, let me stop there, and ask if there are questions.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks very much, Liz. Just a couple of points before we move onto the questions.

First of all, Marika would like to explain how people can use the chat, the online chat, which I think you can access from the Nairobi Web site, the Nairobi meeting Web site, as well as being on Adobe Connect. And also to point out the fact that might not be obvious to everybody, anybody can ask questions, not only GNSO Counselors. So please feel free to do so if you want to ask questions. And Marika, how do we use that chat.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So, indeed the chat room can be accessed through the Nairobi Web site. If you go to the information on the session on the remote participation, you'll find the link there.

But also, for those of our India Adobe Connect, they'll see the same chat window. So, either you can ask a question in the chat room, or those that are

also in the audio bridge, they can either raise their hand in Adobe Connect to be recognized. Or if they're not on Adobe Connect, they can maybe when Stéphane takes the cues, state their name to indicate that they want to be - that they want to ask a question or comment.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks very much, Marika. Steve, you had a question, and then I had Marilyn in the cue.

Steve Del Bianco: Thanks, Stéphane. Steve Del Bianco. Liz, when you mentioned the RP that's underway for what we'll call the Reveal Studies, I want to ask you about that. The (BC) was particularly interested in that and helped you to work with on how to structure that.

I realize that it maybe that we'll compose scenarios of abuse to try to test how quickly the proxy services reveals. But we also, I think, said we were going to look imperially back at anyone who had prepared well structured requests for reveal and learn how quickly they were followed by the registrar.

So some of it's prospective testing, probing, and some of it was going to be retrospective analysis if the data could be found. So my question is this, are some of the thick registries today offering privacy protection services?

Does anybody actually know any answer to that? Do the thick registries offer privacy protection today? Only registrars then? It's only registrars then? They couldn't? Right.

So we don't - we can't really test the response time from a thick registry privacy protection services versus a registrar because the only data universe we have today are registrars running privately. And third parties, right? We have registries - registrars and third parties running privacy.

Liz Gasster: Yes, that's right.

Steve Del Bianco: Okay. Because that to me is an important distinction on thick and thin, but it sounds as if we're not going to get any registries offering privacy protection.

Then I had a second question, which was the WHOIS international character situation. Now, I realize the SSAC is doing the working group right now, and I've read Dave Piscitello's notes about how that working group is proceeding. And Dave is well aware that Council has formed one of our questions with respect to WHOIS on this, because Dave helped me to form those questions.

And yet when I read the analysis and what the working group's doing, it's not clear that that SSAC working group is endeavoring to answer GNSO Council's questions - the GNSO Council, with respect to international character. We adopted a resolution that included a very specific phrase question on international characters.

Is the SSAC working group aware that Council has that in front of it and will be wanting to study whatever they come up with?

Liz Gasster: Yeah, it's in their charter.

Steve Del Bianco: It's in their charter? Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Marilyn, do you…

Alex Gakuru: My name is Alex Gakuru. I would like to know whether the study - you mentioned something to do with the queries, that they are non-standard. Returning data on WHOIS found out that many queries have different structure that deliver and return the data.

I hope the study can find out if - or perhaps what would be the situation or the status of so many of those servers that have queries that are uniform, and likelihood of maybe how they have received sort of attacks in the past, so that we see whether if it's standardized too much, then you may have some sort

of denial of service on the server that returns different type of information. I would be interested to see that kind of data from that study. Thanks.

Liz Gasster: So just a comment on that, it's not - those, that's actually going - that's work that's underway by this joint working group, the SSAC GNSO working group, not one of the studies that I'm looking at right now. So my suggestion is there is a session on that, you can - there's also the availability to participate in that working group if you're interested.

But I think that's the context, that's the place where that issue is really going to be examined, not one of the GNSOs, at least for the moment, not one of the GNSO studies. Unless we find that like as Steve says, that they bring that work then into that working group.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Liz. Marilyn, you had a question and then I have Chuck in the queue.

Marilyn Cade: My question is related, I think, to the point that Alex was making and that's the need for (constant) feedback and linkage between that additional work that is going on of the work in the SSAC. So the work related to IDN characters.

And right now, if there's overlap between - so there's these parallel work efforts going on and there's…

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: So that group is...

Marilyn Cade: I just have one final other question.

Liz Gasster: If I can remember these questions.

Marilyn Cade: Go ahead.

Liz Gasster: That group is chaired by someone from the SSAC and someone from the GNSO. So the SSAC chair is Jeremy Hitchcock, and the GNSO chair is Edmon Chung. And so there is a linkage and they are updating the GNSO and the SSAC and - regularly, you know, to keep them informed.

                  But we're still at a fairly nascent stage of that working group because it was really just convened after Seoul, so.

Marilyn Cade: My other question was the status of the discussions, and I may have missed it in the updates. The status of the discussions on the role of (KRS)?

Liz Gasster: So, there's not a specific discussion going on right now on the role of (KRS), per se. I think part of the rationale behind the WHOIS service requirement study was to then take a look at, you know, once you have this comprehensive list to, you know, consider as far as next step, what a replacement might be.

                  But I think the Council was actually careful in their phrasing of the resolution back in May not to pre-define any particular protocol that should be examined in the process.

                  The other place, though Marilyn where I think that could come up is also in the SSAC GNSO internationalized working group, because there could be benefits to potentially in (KRS) or other potential protocols that could address some of these concerns.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay, well, let's - there's - I see (Jocelyn) is either asking questions, or discussing something on the chat, which is not easy to follow. Let's go a little to Chuck, and then maybe ask (Jocelyn) if he wants to ask a question directly.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stéphane. Can you hear me okay?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, we can hear you fine.

Chuck Gomes: Good, okay. This is my first try at this.

Hello to everyone. Sorry I can't be there in person. But one comment on the (KRS) issue, just for clarity going forward. I believe the protocol is (IRIS). (KRS) was the name of the working group and probably we should refer to the protocol as (IRIS). Technical people can correct me if I'm wrong on that.

But Liz, I think you accurately captured that with regard to that. We did not specify anything with regard to what protocol should be used. So you did that right.

And then secondly, since I don't want to jump in too much remotely, I do want to thank Liz for an excellent report and especially for all of the hard work that's gone into this request for WHOIS studies on top of everything else that's going on. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Chuck. (Jocelyn), did you want to jump in there? Or anyone else participating remotely?

I guess that's a no. Any other questions from the room? Okay. Liz, do you have any closing remarks or can we move on?

Liz Gasster: You know, the only other thing else is I started by talking a little bit about the WHOIS Accuracy Compliance Study, and I just wanted - I'm going to just say as sort of a closing couple of words about that. Because I think the purpose of that study was to get a baseline measure of what proportion of WHOIS records are accurate.

But there are some interesting, I guess, conclusions if you will, imbedded in that report about barriers to accuracy. And I just want to encourage people who are listening attentively to me because they're interested in WHOIS studies and about all these issues related to WHOIS studies, to also really look at that compliance study, and think about whether there's content in that compliance study that also might help in some way, in forming the policy debate on WHOIS.

I just want to make sure that because it's emanating from the compliance group, and not from the staff work related to the GNSO, that you know, those of you who are interested, be sure to take a look at that as well.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks very much, Liz. Question from (Paul Stahurra), just behind me.

(Paul Stahurra): Just regarding that study, I was wondering - this is (Paul Stahurra), I'm representing myself. I was wondering if we could get a list of the - I think there was 1500 names in the study, approximately? A list of the names in the WHOIS information for each, so that we could look at it for ourselves. Can they publish the list in the WHOIS? That would (be useful).

Liz Gasster: (Paul) we're going to - hang on one sec. (Pam Little)'s here from the Compliance Department. I'm not prepared to answer that.

(Pam Little): Okay, I'm not very (close) about a list, but I would inquire about whether the list can be made available to the public or anyone who is interested in. Is that okay? I'll come back to you and see whether the list will be available and how we can make that available to you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry Stéphane, I have, and before you go away. I have a - sorry it's Marilyn Cade out of Clarifying Questions. If the list includes personally identifiable details of any kind, it (can be) published, right?

(Paul Stahurra):   Well, they took a list of 1500 names, they looked up in the WHOIS. I just want to see the name and the WHOIS for each one. It's already public. Yeah, let's just say the 1500 names approximately, what's the WHOIS for each, that's all.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay.

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. I'm trying to answer a question from the chat room that...

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, (Jocelyn) is asking a question. He's having problems with the audio. But we're trying to decipher your question, (Jocelyn), which is...

Liz Gasster: It sounds more like an observation than a question, that ccTLDs allow registrants to opt out of display, thanks (Jocelyn). And that there needs to be a distinction between privacy and proxy services. Absolutely, as (James) mentioned. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: You read that question there from (James), please?

Liz Gasster: So, the question from (James) is regarding non-ASCII, he presumes that we mean Web-based WHOIS, and not Port 43 WHOIS. And I think that's right, but again, we're not conducing a study on that, non-ASCII, right now.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. Just to give you an idea of what's going to happen next on the agenda. In a couple of minutes we will have an address from the Council from the Nom Com Chair, who's already in the room. And that will be followed at 12:30 by a lunch break, and we will reconvene at 1:00. One to four, we will have Kurt Pritz here to give us a series of presentations on the new gTLDs, and that is posted on the agenda.

You can go to either the GNSO Council Web site and see that or the main Nairobi site. So if there are no more question on the WHOIS, I will turn this over to the Nom Com Chair.

Oh, and we will - so we're going to meet, this is inconvenient, but we're going to have to ask people to disconnect and reconnect because this is a new meeting. So we'll give - we'll break for five minutes, give people time to do that. And please, Operator, note that it's the end of this meeting and we'll reconvene in five minutes for the next one. Thank you very much.

Attendees:

Marilyn Cade - CBUC
Martin Sutton –CBUC
Ron Andruff -CBUC
Alan Bidron - ISP
Steve Delbianco-CBUC
Flavio Wagner -ISP
Berry Cob-CBUC
Norbert Klein -NCSG
Thomas Roessler – W3C
Werner Staub -Core
Brendan Kuerbis – NCSG
Alex Gakura – NCSG
Amadeu Abril lAbril – CORE
Jon Nevett – Registrar
Jeff Eckhaus –Registrar
James Bladel – Registrar SG
Jothan Frakes -– Registrar SG
Judy Song Marshall –Neustar
Paul Foody - individual
Aysha Hasssan – CBUC
Dirk Krischenowski – dotBerlin
Katherene Olmar - DotBerlin
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Marcello Fernandes Costa –Conselheiro CGI Brasil
James Prendergast – GalwayStrategy Group Fairfax Virginia
Jon Lawrence – aus Registry
Fabien Betremieux – AFNIC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Robin Gross - NCSG
Paul Stahura – DemandMedia - Registrar
Richard Tindall – DemansdMedia – Registrar
Carlos Afonso – Brasil
Sebastien Bachellot – ALAC

Fred Kreuger – mids amd machines

Remote Participation
Mike Palage
Mikey O'Connor - CBUC
Paul Diaz – Registrar SG
James Bladel –Registrar SG
Michael Young - Afilias
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Jothan Frakes - Registrar
Milton Mueller – NCUC
Jeff Neuman – Registry SG
Eric Brunner-Williams CORE
M Bahir

GNSO Council
Stephane van Gelder – Registrar SG
Tim Ruiz – Registrar SG – remote
Adrian Kinderis - Registrar SG -remote
Chuck Gomes – Registry SG - GNSO Chair - remote
Caroline Greer - Registry SG - remote
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben -ISP
Jaime Wagner –ISP
Zahid Jamil – CBUC
David Taylor – IPC remote
Kristina Rosette – IPC remote
Andrei Kolsenikov NCA
Wendy Seltzer – NCSG
Bill Drake – NCSG
Rafik Dammak – NCSG
Mary Wong - NCSG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Staff
 Kurt Pritz
Liz Gasster
Marika Konings
Marco Lorenzoni
Olof Nordling
Tim Cole
Rob Hoggarth - remote
Karla Valente
Tina Dam -remote

END