

**Registration Abuse Policies Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 11 January 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 11 January 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-20100111.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

Present for the teleconference:

Greg Aaron - Registry stakeholder group - Working Group Chair

James Bladel - Godaddy Registrar stakeholder group

Berry Cobb – CBUC

Mike O'Connor – CBUC

Rod Rasmussen – individual

Faisal Shah – IPC

Philip Corwin – CBUC

Robert Hutchinson – CBUC

ICANN Staff

Marika Konings

Margie Milam

Gisella Gruber-White

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Martin Sutton – CBUC

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg Aaron and this is the Registration Abuse Policy Working Group meeting for 11 January, 2010. Let's begin with our roll call. Gisella, would you be so kind?

Gisella Gruber-White: With pleasure. Good afternoon and good morning to everyone. On today's call we have Greg Aaron, Berry Cobb, Mike O'Connor, Rod Rasmussen, Faisal Shah, James Bladel, Philip Corwin. From staff we have

Glen DeSaintgery, Marika Konings, Margie Milam and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies from Martin Sutton.

And if I could just please remind everyone to state their names when speaking. Thank you. Over to you Greg.

Greg Aaron: Thank you Gisella. Did we get everyone? Did we get Mikey?

((Crosstalk))

Mike O'Connor: I was on the list.

Greg Aaron: Okay great. Okay well let's start by beginning our - reviewing our action items from last week and then we'll talk about the rough draft document we have together and then we'll go into our agenda and figure out all those places that we need to devote work so we can finish the report.

Martin couldn't join us today but he says that he working on the - redrafting the cybersquatting recommending so we'll wait for that from him. Myself and Mikey and Berry volunteered to write text for the registration versus use issues including indemnification.

And I went ahead and took a shot at that. And I've inserted it into the document I circulated yesterday so we'll talk more about that and that's open for everyone to comment.

Mikey and Berry were going to rewrite the uniform contracts recommendation so I think we have something new to look at today. Mikey was - has written up the issue of reporting compliance and notification so we'll look at that today.

Rod has provided text regarding kind of the support of the organization, dissemination, maintenance and best practices. We have some material on

the list from him. And I tweaked the master document. That document is the one I sent yesterday. As I noted Marika had gotten a template together and then she started taking material off the Wikis and slotting it in trying to organize it.

She got to a certain point last week then I took a look. Slotted in what I think is the rest of the remaining material from the Wiki then I also indicated some new material that I'd put in as well. So this is our attempt to kind of put the information in kind of some standardized places and give it some flow.

I think we, at this point, have a slot for all of the issues we've reported but maybe not text for all of them. There certainly is some formatting issues and roughness there but that's mainly administrative and Marika will help us take care of that.

Of course these sections about final recommendations and an executive summary are to come because those will be among the last things we do after we do some more work.

So anyway I think our job mainly now is first of all all of us should read this document to make sure nothing obvious is missing; anything that we spent time discussing in the working group and we think is worthy of putting in this document.

Marika and I tried to do, you know, basic editing and cleanup. We want your opinion to make sure we haven't accidentally dropped anything or miscopied. And then the new material that I've offered also is open for everyone's comment.

This document basically represents the - kind of the master we'll use going forward. Marika will be the main keeper of this document. And what we should do going forward is if we have any edits you can do one of two things,

you can indicate an edit in an email and you could put it up to the list and then Marika will track those or you can take this document and mark it up.

And I think from this point forward the best thing to do is do redlines. So if you're making edits turn on the editing function and then we'll see exactly what's being marked up and so forth, we can discuss if everyone likes those edits. And then that will also allow Marika to incorporate those edits that maybe coming in from more than one direction.

So does that process seem okay to everybody? Are you comfortable with that?

James Bladel: I'm good.

((Crosstalk))

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

Greg Aaron: Okay well it's - I found it kind of - it took a lot of work because we've actually discussed a lot and created a lot of material. So it is gratifying though to kind of see it coming together. We've got an idea at least of the shape of things. And over the next four meetings we have to be very diligent in filling in the missing sections. And so we'll start taking a crack at some of those today.

I imagine though that we're going to have to continue to do a lot of work offline during the week as well though just because of the number of things we have to tackle. So I would encourage you to continue to post your comments or edits up to the list. I was a few days late in getting this done so apologies. It turned out to be a little more work than I thought but I think it was worth it.

Please continue to work during the week and that'll give everybody a chance to react to your work. We basically have one month from today to finish up

our work because on February 12 we need to ship off the document to the staff. Marika will need to submit that over to the GNSO because that's our deadline for materials to be submitted before the ICANN meeting in early March.

Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: First kudos both to you and Marika for a job incredibly well done. But a question and that is do we want to prepare some sort of summary slide show or are we going to be on stage going through this report with - in any of the meeting and if so do we want to do a PowerPoint spiel at the same time?

Greg Aaron: Yeah, the answer is yes because probably two things might happen in Kenya, one is we need to give an update to Council and then second we could use the same probably presentation in an open meeting. In the ICANN meetings we've always had a meeting to invite everyone who's interested and to hear about our work.

We probably can't create that slide show though until after the 12th of February because then we'll have our recommendations and so forth finalized. So I think we get the paper done we'll tackle that.

Mike O'Connor: Cool. Sounds great.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Marika did - you have the floor.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just wanted to add as well that of course the idea is as well to have a very good executive summary for this document, to make sure as well that for those that don't have the time to read through the whole report which will, you know, be quite a number of pages, that people can as well refer to the executive summary and then hopefully in combination with a presentation and a slide show we'll be able to have, you know, constructive and substantive discussion in Nairobi.

Greg Aaron: That's absolutely vital because it looks like our paper is going to be at least 70 pages if not much longer. So it's really important for us to - especially focus our work in the next month on those recommendations because that's what the Council and all of the other readers will really concentrate on.

So we have to do a good job of working out our recommendations and then those will probably appear collected somewhere maybe even in the executive summary so we draw people's attention to them.

Okay so if no more questions I invite you to read that document and start discussing it on the list and so forth. And we could move onto the work that folks have been doing on recommendations and other things. We could start with uniformity of contracts and I believe we have some material from Berry that's new.

Berry Cobb: Hi Greg, this is Berry. I'm driving right now so I don't have what I wrote in front of me. Basically I just restructured or combined Recommendation 1 and 2 which you wouldn't be able to tell that I combined them. And then Recommendation 3 basically is sunset and has evolved into Mikey's material and Recommendation 4 and the best practices stuff has - is evolving into Rod's material.

So if somebody would like to just reread what I wrote for the only recommendation for UFC and I think we can wrap that part up hopefully.

Greg Aaron: Okay. So it sounds good. You want to walk us through this version that's on the screen?

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. Let me do that since Berry's driving, you know, and we don't want him to trash his car while the...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: Oh okay.

Mike O'Connor: So I'm going to read it for Berry just so he can remember and then we can go through it. The recommendation is that UFC recommends - and it might be something like the UFC sub-team recommends that a formal PDP to evaluate whether a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions should be created for all in-scope ICANN agreements and if created how such language would be structured to address registration abuse.

And the second part reads the workgroup also recommends that while outside our scope a similar process be undertaken that addresses malicious use of domains. Berry and I kind of stared at this bit and I think it's pretty darn good myself but there it is read out loud for Berry. Berry, do you want to add anything to that?

Berry Cobb: Nope, that's good. Thank you.

Greg Aaron: Okay. James has raised his hand.

James Bladel: Hi, thanks Greg and thanks Berry and Mikey for putting this together in such a concise bit of text here. I did have a couple of thoughts about perhaps I think friendly edits but I'll leave that to you guys just how friendly they are. The first part is that in the - at the tail end of the last sentence there where it would say, for example, and if created how such language would be structured to address - I'd like to insert the most common forms before registration abuse.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think that's a friendly edit that I'd accept. I think that what we'd run the risk of otherwise is getting lost in very long tail kinds of abuse and I think that that's a good idea to sort of zero people in on the main channels.

You know, as I read this I think one of the things that we always want to do is also leave it available to update these in the event that new abuses pop up. So we might want to also add a clause to that effect because that way what we could do is take on the most common ones now and then leave an avenue open for revisions if a new one becomes common. How about that for...

James Bladel: Yeah, I think that that's good to capture in there as well. And I agree with your concern, Mikey, and it was one that I shared that if it's not limiting in some respect it could turn into kind of a rabbit-hole exercise where you're chasing new contracts for something that has happened once or twice in the universe.

And the second point is - and I want to say this in such a way that isn't controversial. But I think that if we are calling for a PDP that is recommending new responsibilities for contracted parties we have to make sure that we phrase the language of the recommendation so that it's palatable and something that doesn't sound necessarily onerous, that's something they can get behind as opposed to something that they feel they have to defend against.

So I just think that, you know, it's important to keep that in mind when we're constructing these recommendations. That's not to say we should water them down so that they're not effective but we should be looking for ways to enlist the help of the folks that are ultimately going to have to implement these things.

And then the second point that - I see Greg raised his hand - I apologize for jumping ahead, Greg. But the second point that I wanted to make here is the second sentence - I'm not sure how - I'm struggling a little bit with the concept that the working group is recommending something that it acknowledges in that in the recommendation is outside of its scope.

So I feel like that's kind of a - kind of a (mobius) loop there, I'm having trouble with that language. One thought would be to - if we could somehow insert the phrase voluntary best practices in there at some point, because I think that when I see the phrase similar process be undertaken, I'm thinking first of all the recommendation says it's out of scope. Then it says similar process be undertaken, similar process being that all in-scope ICANN agreements so I feel like that's a self-contradicting sentence.

So I'm having a little bit of trouble with that and I don't really have a good rewrite for it yet but I wondered if anyone else saw that kind of recursive issue there or maybe it's just me.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey, let me take a crack at that one. I think that maybe the way we addressed that is that instead of saying our scope why don't we say while outside the scope of this working group - outside the scope of this working group's effort? Because that way we're aiming the scope question at a different thing than we are in the first sentence where we're aiming it at contracts. I think that that solves the (mobius) loop problem.

It probably doesn't solve the underlying issue that you're raising. But I think it's important to hold onto the notion that even though we pruned the branches of the tree pretty aggressively through this working group to only focus on registration abuse that there is a giant issue out there in terms of use abuse that needs a look from the ICANN policy community.

It gets into all that stuff we talked about in terms of rapid takedown and indemnification and language to enable things, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

James Bladel: Okay but - and I'm sorry - but does it belong here then with the UOC or does it belong in a more general or, you know, it almost sounds like it is more of an overarching conclusion or, you know, part of the executive summary or

possibly part of the text that Rod is working on relative to registration abusers as the use abuse.

I'm just putting out suggestions here because does it really fit with this particular section?

Mike O'Connor: Oh I could get behind moving it just as long as we don't lose the notion that we recommend that somebody takes a look at it. And Rod's section could probably be a good spot for it. I just don't want to lose the recommendation. I don't really care where it goes.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. May I step in at this point I have a couple of thoughts.

Mike O'Connor: Go ahead.

Greg Aaron: Okay the first part of the recommendation would actually be a recommendation from the entire working group, that's what we insert into the report. So that would need to be changed, yeah, to the (RAP). As far as the malicious use you probably haven't had a chance to read it yet but we have now a section of the paper about malicious uses of domain names because it's this big issue as Mikey said.

And what's in there so far is it kind of outlines the issue. It says we've got these issues that are not wholly registration issues, they're what people are doing with their domain names and everybody is kind of concerned about them.

And then it talks about basically how takedowns work today, who has the authority to do that kind of thing, it talks about the indemnification. What is to come there is any recommendations. And I think the issue is that the pure use issues are out of scope in general as we've discussed but there are these intersections. And the question is where are the intersections with registration?

You know, for example, we've toyed with the idea that WhoIs available is one of those intersections because if people can't figure out who owns a domain name or who's administrating it then you can't mitigate a problem with it, right?

I think that the malicious use thing could be - we shouldn't lose the issue but maybe it just moves down into that malicious use section. And we'd have to have some more conversation about what the recommendations and intersections with registration issues are.

Mikey, you want to jump in?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, I just raised my hand again. Maybe the way to handle that is to take that whole malicious use section and stick it in our meta issues portion of the report because it has a lot of the same issues and attributes. It spans a bunch of working groups, it's an issue that doesn't lend itself handily to the existing PDP GNSO policymaking process and a lot of working groups are sort of bumping into it.

And then maybe we work a recommendation in at the end of that in the same way that we're working them into the other meta issues. Does that sound like a...

Greg Aaron: Yeah because - and because it's a big issue - I've broken it out as a new kind of (TSC) 1 level issue. I don't know exactly how many other groups it touches. I suppose, you know, like when registrars are doing transfers for example if you can't figure out who owns the domain name there's some issues there with verifying who the registrant is etcetera, etcetera.

But there are certainly some touch points. The other point I wanted to make about the recommendation is that in general what has happened I think historically is you identify a problem and then you figure out the appropriate

solution to the problem. And so identifying the problem is the first step in policy or in engineering.

And what we're talking about is if there are mandated solutions a lot of times those either get worked into contracts or they become consensus policies which are by definition applicable to everybody.

So my question is can you create a baseline without really talking about a specific problem you're trying to solve because every time we do create policy we do create requirements and solutions. It's kind of amorphous and I'm having a hard time getting a handle on it.

So okay I see several hands up. I see - maybe we should go Margie then James then Mikey.

Margie Milam: Okay, yeah, I'm actually commenting on an earlier point on the whole scope issue. And I think I've tried to clarify this throughout the working group meetings but the distinction that you've been making about, you know, whether it's, you know, it's related to use or registration, that analysis related to consensus policy issues.

So it's not necessarily out of scope if you're trying to suggest that there be work done and things that may not lead to a consensus policy for example, a best practice, you know, or a concept change or something to that effect. So I just want to, you know, make sure that we're not limiting in our report because that's not the way we've - at least from the staff perspective - have looked at the scope issue.

It's just, you know, there's different kinds of policy work that can be done and, you know, and maybe you can't rise to the level of consensus policy but it could be, you know, a recommendation for a best practice or a guideline or something like that.

Greg Aaron: Right and a guideline or a best practice wouldn't be policy.

Margie Milam: Well I think that's not true actually. We look at policy from a number of perspectives. And in our (PDT) working group we talk about the very fact that policy can be - can be a best practice. It's just not a, you know, enforceable consensus policy like what, you know, what we all understand if we're trying to address something that's within the picket fence for example.

Greg Aaron: Yeah and, Margie, to clarify when I was talking about policy I mean binding policy.

Margie Milam: Oh okay. And that's - I just want to make sure we're not mixing up, you know, phrases in our report because there is certainly work that can be done on making recommendations for best practices for example.

Greg Aaron: Oh absolutely and it looks like we're - we're currently working on how to do that in several spots. So I just wanted to clarify that when I talk about policy - when I was talking about policy I was specifically talking about something that's binding either consensus policy or contractual changes or something like that.

We do recognize that we have a number of options available to us and that includes best practices, absolutely.

Margie Milam: Okay great, thanks.

Greg Aaron: I think James is next.

James Bladel: Hi Greg, James here and I wanted to go back to something you touched on briefly about the effectiveness of whether or not a policy or a recommendation can recommend the consensus policy without containing - excuse me - without containing specifics about what forms of abuse it's attempting to address.

And one of my thoughts was that, you know, without being too prescriptive a consensus policy can be something to the effect of, you know, a registrar with have an abuse team. It will be staffed. It will have, you know, these methods of contact and it will participate, you know, in the, you know, and coordinate with other registrars and registries to, you know, to address these types of sites.

I mean they can be more of a generic what registrars should be doing without really - it can describe the infrastructure or the facility without really diving into what those facilities and infrastructure are doing. I think there's some value in that.

The second thing I wanted to mention is I'm just a little concerned about the idea of what we're putting - the pond that we're dipping the toe into a little bit here is that, you know, I keep seeing that if we wedge this door open a little bit and start to say that, you know, it is within ICANN's remit to address content and use issues when it comes to abuse - I think I saw this also in the strategic plan about building up registrant trust on the internet and that's also, you know, I think an expansion of ICANN's scope here.

Because I think what's going to happen here is that we will ultimately have different efforts to look at how we can enforce those from a compliance perspective and how we can convert best practices or recommendations into binding policies.

And I think that that's just one step down a road that really has no end and results in a much larger expansion of ICANN's role in the idea of being the policeman of the internet. So I just wanted to get that on the record that I'm concerned that when we even take a small step in that direction that it's not too hard to see what's going to follow-on on that maybe a year or two down the road.

Greg Aaron: Okay thank you James. Mikey, I see your hand up.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Greg, it's Mikey. A couple of points, to James's issue - not issue but comment - that this is indeed the nose of the camel in the tent. I think that the camel is already in the tent in the high security TLD discussion. That discussion is moving very rapidly in that direction. And I think it's going to startle folks at the breadth and scope of the recommendations.

So I think that's perhaps one that's already out of the gate. And I think that this gets me back to the meta issues rant - I really think that this is one where we probably need to acknowledge and coordinate with at least HSTLD and maybe some of the other working groups that are out there to make sure that this discussion is orderly. But it's (rocking) HSTLD.

The second thought that I had is to your original question, Greg, which was we need to have a problem statement before we start working on a solution. And one approach to that would be to sift pretty quickly back through the list of abuses that we started with and assemble the part of the list that we moved into the use column, and said during that discussion okay, these aren't registration abuses these are use abuses and include that list in sort of the preamble to this meta issue discussion.

You know, the more I listen to this the keener I am on the idea of moving this whole thing into another meta issue not unlike the two that Rod and I have whipped up and that, Greg, you've already started working on.

Greg Aaron: Okay. By the way I see Berry is back. Berry, did you catch all the discussion?

Berry Cobb: Yes I did, I've been on the line all the time.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Does anyone else have any comment?

Rod Rasmussen: This is Rod, I just wanted to put a nickel in or whatever on that. I think that - and I think most everybody knows that I have different ideas about what ICANN's scope is so we're not - I don't know if we'll ever have agreement because there's a lot of people with different opinions about what the scope is, use versus registration, all that good stuff.

But that's why we're talking about it and getting this down on paper. So - but I think that it's important to get these things defined and have the organization and the community take a stab or a stand at where they want to draw the line. The things are well defined so I think this work is important no matter what.

Because I had a fear that if people want to say that we're not, you know, we don't want to talk about certain issues or we don't want to deal with certain issues that that will create a vacuum. And into that vacuum, you know, nature abhors a vacuum so somebody will step in with some of bright ideas. I don't know who that somebody would be but I have the big G, government, is a thought there.

So I think it's very good for us to really figure out where we're going to, you know, to pigeon hole these different issues and having some meta issues that are then discussed in other forums that come out of this is I think a - hopefully an important outcome. So I just want to throw that in there and - since we're talking about this at this point. Thanks.

Greg Aaron: Okay thank you Rod. James?

James Bladel: Yeah real quickly if I could just clarify - and I don't think that - I know how this seems with the registration, you know, sounding evasive of some of these issues.

But really what I want to get across is the idea that if we start to address, as Mikey said, the camel in the tent, which is that ICANN is responsible through its contractual arrangements for use, abuse activities on the internet. I think

that, you know, it's less about actually solving and addressing those problems and it becomes more of an exercise of putting someone's neck on the chopping block when they do occur.

And I just - I think that, you know, it's something that we should be mindful of and it's something that is going to take just as much innovation and cooperation as it took to build and operate the internet to address these folks, as opposed to just finding this path of least resistance and let's just make ICANN and registries accountable for it and we'll call that abuse issue solved.

So I just want to be careful about in a working group environment just kind of expanding the responsibilities of all those parties.

Greg Aaron: Okay. I would ask everybody to read through the malicious use material that's newly available because it walks through some of those issues. I think one question before us which might be satisfactory is we all acknowledge that the malicious use is a problem.

And all responsible parties want to do what they can to help deal with that because the internet is literally composed of millions of different parties all of whom are in control or supervising various assets, it's an interdependent environment.

I think the question is perhaps what innovations, as James said, might be possible within that ICANN context. The document talks about some of these indemnification and scope issues. There might be some things though that we can find that would be, you know, really substantive things that could help with that malicious use issue. So I encourage you again read that material and we should talk about ideas for recommendations coming out of that.

Okay. Does anybody else have any thoughts on this language? What should be our next step on this language up on screen? Does anyone want to work on it further? Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: Just to summarize what I think I understand and maybe this is a task to take. I think that this recommendation now gets split into two parts; the first part stays the way it is and the second part or the last sentence gets moved to the malicious use versus registration abuse discussion that you've talked about.

And then perhaps we promote that discussion to the issue category. And I'd be happy to work on the gang that sort of pushes that along.

Greg Aaron: When you say meta issue isn't - uniformity of contracts kind of is the meta issue right or is it a different meta issue?

Mike O'Connor: No, uniformity of contracts I think is a solution to a problem and sits pretty much on its own bottom. The three meta issues that I see so far are the reporting ones that I wrote up, the best practices one that Rod wrote up and this one. And there may be a couple more before we're done.

And what characterizes meta issues is that they span more than one working group, they present challenges in terms of getting resolved in the existing policy processes, etcetera, etcetera. And I think that this conversation that we've just had convinces me that this is just like that, it's complicated, it's hard, the existing policy process doesn't lend itself to the discussion.

We've got James's scope issues which I agree with, etcetera. And so for all those reasons I'd like to see it moved into that sort of important for the community but hard to solve in the traditional way pile.

Greg Aaron: What might you call this meta issue? What name can we attach to it so we can refer to it?

Mike O'Connor: I'd call it registration - or use abuse.

Greg Aaron: Use abuse.

Mike O'Connor: You know, I think the title - I haven't gone back and looked at your language but I read it last night pretty late and - but pretty good start. And whatever it's titled in there is fine but use abuse is what I would think of it as.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Thank you Mike. I see James's hand.

James Bladel: Yeah, one recommended title might be the role of ICANN and contracted parties in non-registration abuse.

Mike O'Connor: Oh big scope. You really want to go that wide on the scope? That's everything else in the galaxy.

James Bladel: Well.

Mike O'Connor: You might want to just narrow it - the role...

James Bladel: But if we're saying...

Crosstalk

Mike O'Connor: ...non-contracted parties in use abuse.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I need to know the difference between use abuse and non-registration abuse. I mean I think once we pass the threshold of registration abuse everything else by default kind of moves into the non-registration abuse.

Mike O'Connor: Oh I see non-registration type...

James Bladel: Yes.

Mike O'Connor: Okay, got it. I was thinking...

Greg Aaron: And for me I find a slight reduction to be helpful in my mind. This is Greg. Malicious use are these basically e-crime issues but there are these also other non-registration things like are people doing false affiliation and putting meta tags in their Web pages or using dirty words on their Websites, all that.

I mean some of that stuff is I think so far out of scope just we shouldn't even talk about it for - at all. The malicious use stuff though is a persistent issue within ICANN and it's the stuff that gets ICANN a lot of criticism because people are saying, you know, ICANN should be doing something about these things; the question is what.

I think they're a little different because one of the things people do is they - criminals do specifically register domain names specifically to carry out those issues. So that's why the heading malicious use of domain names in the paper is useful for me to wrap my head around so anyway.

So we have a proposal to take the second sentence and work it into maybe the malicious use section or whatever or we have another proposal to create a meta issue which is everything outside of registration abuse. Any comments on those two directions that are possible? Mikey?

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think - I like the idea of keeping the container around malicious use; that seems like a vague and hasty and difficult topic. And then promoting that container to the meta issue category. I wouldn't want to promote everything outside of registration abuse, I agree that gets awfully big so I like the idea of drawing the line around it as malicious use of domain names, promoting it to meta issue and moving this recommendation into that.

James Bladel: Greg, this is James, I'm sorry I don't have my hand up.

Greg Aaron: Go ahead.

James Bladel: Yeah, just building on what Mikey was just saying there, is it - and I think going back to what you were saying just prior is it worthwhile to draw a distinction between what I would call the criminal malicious use versus the - what we might also call civil or annoyances that kind of encompass all of the things you mentioned before about inappropriate use of meta tags and so forth?

Greg Aaron: In some cases we've kind of done that by saying well, some of these issues actually end up being another type of abuse like cybersquatting. We determined that several things were actually best handled through the cybersquatting thing.

There is that issue we've discussed in the past which is some - the borders get a little fuzzy because some things are defined a little differently depending on jurisdiction or so forth. That said I've always kind of thought that a lot of these things are - I think the hard core criminal stuff is stuff that I think a lot of people can agree upon.

I mean, people, I think, can generally agree that say phishing it's just all about theft and fraud and that's a problem no matter where you are. I do think the criminal aspect helps limit the conversation to an arena in which reasonable people can probably agree, those fuzzy borders aside.

Did that answer your question?

James Bladel: Yeah, I think so. I think there's just some, you know, I think that in our catalogue of all the different abuse types maybe it's worthwhile breaking down what category or level of severity each one of those would be involved in. If we're going to say that we're going to focus on the malicious things and maybe stay away from some of the more just I guess annoyances or vandalism of the internet.

Greg Aaron: Any other thoughts on that?

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. It seems to me that that would be a worthy, you know, just like we went through the exercise in this working group of trying to decide which things to focus on it's probably a good idea for that working group to do that as well. So we might want to just kick the can down the road on that one.

Greg Aaron: Right. So on the screen we've got it split now. Should we insert the first section - I guess - for now put it in the uniformity of contracts area that spawned it, is that okay?

Mike O'Connor: The second section or the first section?

Greg Aaron: The first section. And then the...

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's fine although that's sort of report-style kinds of stuff. You may want to get to the point where they're all in one place so people can read them but however it...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: Yeah. Yeah, yeah, I mean at some point we collect all the recommendations from all the spots throughout.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

Greg Aaron: But each section of the paper will also have a recommendation section so you can kind of - that's the conclusion the group reached. So why don't we put the first section in the contracts - uniformity of contracts section. For now at least can we put the second bit down in the malicious use section? Is that okay with everyone?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, that's fine.

Greg Aaron: Okay super. Thank you. Thanks again to Berry and Mikey for tackling this over the last week.

Why don't we move on them to the next thing which could be the meta issue of reporting and compliance and notification. I believe Mikey has the floor for this one.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Greg. This is Mikey. On the screen you see the little write-up that I with the able assistance of my joined-at-the-hip buddy, Berry, put together this last week. It really would be handy to have that transmogrification time-space portal between our two houses that I thought we had at the beginning of the call.

The first part that you see on the screen right now is the - I decided to try and describe what meta issue are. And so this is really a chunk that could probably get flushed out a little bit to explain to folks outside the working group what in the dickens are they talking about.

And those three little bullets were my first try at what makes an issue a meta issue. And I won't reread them for you. But I think that that paragraph is a good start. It's a little thin and might need a little beefing up for the final report.

So anyway I want to just sort of separate that off as one topic of discussion, what is a meta issue is something that I think would be helpful perhaps for lots of working groups.

And then the rest of the document is describing the issue of uniformity of reporting. And as we run down really what I tried to do here was summarize what we said on the call. And I don't know - I think I'm going to hit a few highlights.

In the problem statement I heard on the call really three groups of people who have this problem. One problem is that working groups and advisory groups often find it hard to do our work because we don't have really good data other than anecdotal evidence on which to base a discussion.

Another problem is that end users and registrants have a hard time sometimes figuring out how to report the abuse or what to do if they experience problems.

And then the final one that at least came out on the call - this list could be longer - is that registrars and registries sometimes are frustrated when their customers file complaints in the wrong place or the wrong way or without asking for help first or, you know, I mean, and we've heard a fair amount of this discussion in - especially in (PEDENR).

So, you know, I'm sort of mimicking Michele Neylon, this is the Michele Neylon memorial sentence because this is often his comment in (PEDENR).

Then what we talked about in the recommendations I pulled a few ideas that came out of some of the other working groups that I'm sitting on, (IRTP) and (PEDENR). The first one that's just in time education notion really came out a bunch of times in (PEDENR) that says look, you know, the right time to deliver education and information about this is when the person is in the midst of the problem.

And so there's an opportunity to improve the delivery of knowledge though a process like this. Its goal - one of the goals is clearly to improve the quality of the complaint so that most of them are valid and that as few as possible are just plain erroneous which is another topic of discussion. There are a fair number of erroneous complaints right now.

Another goal would be to be more effective in the policy and compliance kinds - no, this policy-compliance means the compliance activities around a

given policy. And then the next one is really improving the PDP-kinds of process, improving the data availability.

And then the last one is kind of ham-handedly worded but this was a point that Greg raised and I didn't do a really good job of writing this. But there is sort of a question which comes first the discussion of the problem or definitive data describing it.

And Greg's suggestion was that perhaps the way to do this was to do studies. And I thought that was a pretty productive line of discussion for the group that picked up this banner and runs with it.

And so then the structure that we were describing was that every policy should have four things; a mechanism to do reporting of a policy violation by anybody who's impacted. I dropped out words like registrants, registrars, registries, end users and just said whoever is affected. I did that on purpose.

Some sort of standards as to how contracted parties make visible this stuff where to report it, definitions of what the reportable problems are. This is sort of another conversation that's come up a lot in (PEDENR) is plain English or plain language versions of the contracts.

And then some just in time education if the problem that the person has is really better addressed somewhere else. And that piece is a tracking component and a compliance component.

And then at the very end we describe the working groups or advisory groups that are having some facet of this discussion either right now or in the past. So there's my little write-up. I guess I'll hand it back to you Greg and let you run the meeting and then I'll just field questions as they come.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Okay thank you for that Mikey. Thank you as always for your very diligent work.

There was something in that material that struck me as extremely rational which was if you're going to have a policy have a way for people to report when it's not working or violations etcetera. So those four points you mentioned were very practical and I thought wise.

And then it got me thinking about, well do we have some policies right now that we don't have reporting mechanisms for? And some are - sometimes we have good ones or fairly good ones I guess. The Whois inaccuracy reporting system is fairly well known at this point.

And the recent material that the ICANN compliance department sent us shows that over time how they've improved that because they made some changes because they were getting a lot of reports which were not accurate or malformed in some cases and they made some changes. And now the accuracy and relevance rate is way up. That was interesting to see.

And we've got reporting for some other things like transfer disputes. There's a system where registrars have to do certain reporting and they can file grievances or challenges. Are there any - and of course I guess ICANN has also got this general email box where you can make any kind of a complaint so it's a general place to go.

Do we have policies right now where the reporting is notably absent?

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. Let me dive in before even hands go up. The one that immediately comes to my mind is in the (PEDENR) discussion where there is - it's clear that there is some massive confusion as to which parts of the policies apply and which timeframes. There's even massive confusion at least in my mind and if it's in my mind then the typical user has got to be totally blown away on the definitions of the phases of the process post expiry.

And so a lot of this write-up really is prompted by the experience I'm having in the (PEDENR) working group and would use that one as a great example of one where all of these - I think that whole practice would benefit hugely from a good reporting mechanism like the one that we're describing here.

Greg Aaron: And I don't - I'm not tracking the (PEDENR) work at all. In that group for example what - is there an existing policy and then people are trying to figure out - is there an existing policy and are there problems expressing it or people reporting issues with it?

Mike O'Connor: There are a couple other folks on this call at least who are on that, James and Berry, so feel free to dive in, let me keep going. I think it's all of the above. The (PEDENR) discussion isn't as nearly as tidy as this one. Our leader is not nearly as well organized as you are Greg.

And so as a result the conversation itself is very confusing. But in addition to that there - there are clearly a lot of different paths that a domain name takes once it expires that depends on choices by registries and choices by registrars. Some registries offer an auto-renew grace period cycle, others don't. Some registrars incorporate that option into their expiry cycle, others don't.

Berry and I have been sort of working on trying to describe all this and the deeper we get into the more confused we get. And so I think the answer to your question on that is all of the above. There's a lot of confusion, there's a lot of variance.

There are probably a fair number of people in the ICANN registrar, registry community who understand this pretty well but as a sort of middle-aged member of the ICANN community I can tell you that I am completely baffled by it. The longer I sit on those calls the more confused I get as to which part applies and which policy applies and even which version of which policy applies.

Greg Aaron: Any additions and then Marika's hand is raised.

Rod Rasmussen: This is Rod. I had a thought on an area where we ran into reporting problems and it was a fairly major issue, and that was on registrar ownership control and involvement of known felons in running a registrar. And that was in the (S) domains case where it was literally, you know, almost impossible to figure out how to go about reporting something that was contractually being, you know, it wasn't - the registrar in question wasn't meeting their contract obligations.

So there's an area where - it's not like it's happening everyday but there's certainly - there's no kind of methodology that's standardized and published or anything like that around that kind of an issue.

Greg Aaron: Okay thank you. Marika has her had raised, why don't we go to Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just wanted to clarify something in relation to the post-expiration domain name recovery discussion. And maybe just to clarify as well that maybe they are talking about, you know, policy with a capital P, and, you know, policies are practices that registrars have because in relation to - there is an expired domain name deletion policy that exists which is a consensus policy which has certain elements that are in the contracts.

But the large part of the things that, Mikey, you were referring to are actually not prescribed in the policy or part of the contract.

So I think, you know, we do need to be careful that, you know, looking at this (anachronism) and, you know, it might not - even if you would have something in place like that it might not work for post-expiration domain name recovery, but for an element around which there is a confusion about what the practice is or what the rules are that actually no rules as per consensus policy. So I just wanted to clarify that.

And the actual, you know, the contractual provisions maybe are reported through the compliance department so any complaints received in relation to those specific provisions are dealt with the normal complaint procedure. And, you're right there, there are no specific, you know, disputes, you know, resolution process or anything like that specifically for that policy so that might be something separate to consider when developing consensus policies whether something specific is needed for that kind of policy that we're looking at like has been done in other - area.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. Let me quickly respond to that, that's part of the reason why I put that section in there about the just in time education because I don't think that - I don't know whether there's anymore policy required.

What I do know is that the mechanism by which a person who's frustrated or experiencing a problem learns about their options and learns which things are covered by policy and which things are not that process today is pretty rugged.

And to the extent that the process of reporting a policy violation could educate people on the limits of that policy and their options, if it's not covered by policy I think would be a huge help and perhaps reduce the amount of policies that we create. Because I think in many cases people have problems and the immediate answer is well let's create a policy around it when in fact what people need to be is educated better as to what their choices are.

Greg Aaron: Mikey, this is Greg, if I may? What you just said I think should be expressed in the written material somehow because you just put a very understandable wrapper around it which is sometimes people don't know what their options are or what the policy is and then they don't know what to do about it if they think there's been a violation or there's a problem. That kind of, like, is a good issue statement in some ways for me.

Mike O'Connor: I'd be happy to insert that somewhere in this thing. I do love these MP3-recorded calls. It makes it a lot easier to do that so I'll take that as an action.

Greg Aaron: I found it useful for bringing it into a focus I could understand. Your plain-spoken homespun talk was good for me. And you know what's a compliment.

Mike O'Connor: We are kidding Marika a lot in (PEDENR) about her use of the word yep; she's got that down cold by the way.

Greg Aaron: Yep, I thought that was...

Marika Konings: I really need to look back in the transcript if it's always me saying that.

((Crosstalk))

Mike O'Connor: No, no, no, we're teaching you that. Lots of us use that term but you've picked up the usage exactly spot-on.

Greg Aaron: Have we folks from Middle America rubbed off on your Marika?

Mike O'Connor: Yep.

Marika Konings: I think you might have.

Greg Aaron: Okay so what's our next step on this meta issue and this material that Mikey has brought to us? Does it need any additional work? And then also where in our report should it be placed? Mikey might do some fine-tuning as we just discussed.

In addition anybody else have any questions or comments on it? James.

James Bladel: Yeah I just want to thank Mikey for bringing this up. And one potential, you know, I think we need to get this in there early. I apologize, Greg, I haven't

done anything more than skim the document that you sent out yesterday but I think that, you know, this - in the discussion of the background or the problem statement of the pre-PDP we should probably get this out there as early as possible.

Greg Aaron: Okay. And no apologies necessary because I just got that stuff out. As a meta issue, yeah, I think could benefit from being up there somewhere in the early discussions in the paper. So let me take what Mikey creates and we'll find a slot for it somewhere up earlier because early in the paper is where we deal with the - kind of these scope and other meta issues that set the scene for a lot of the other discussions.

Okay so let's take that as an action item. And are there - if no other points we can move on. Any parting thoughts? Okay if not let's go to Rod's material which is about best practices, dissemination and so forth. So Rod why don't you take it away.

Rod Rasmussen: I'm going to need about 30 seconds, thanks.

Greg Aaron: Okay. In the meantime if we could bring up on screen - this is the material that Rod had mailed in early this morning.

Rod Rasmussen: All right sorry about that, you caught me just as I was pulling into the school yard here.

Greg Aaron: I understand completely.

Rod Rasmussen: About two week ago I was on this call I watched one parent back their car right into another parent's car in the drop off area. I still don't know if I'm going to have to appear in court to testify on how they smashed into them and drove off so fun. It's amazing what you can do at 5 miles an hour to another car.

So I want to thank Mikey for a great format that I stole and threw some of the thoughts together I had on this topic of collection and dissemination of best practices.

And I did expand a little bit on your definition of meta issues at the beginning of that so there's a couple of thoughts there. And I'm doing this from memory since I'm driving. But...

Mike O'Connor: Oh you're right, I like them. I'll take those as the friendly amendments that they are.

Rod Rasmussen: Yeah. And so I think there's some more flushing out to do but at least a couple thoughts in that direction. The - but I liked the overall thrust of the meta issue topic of, you know, this kind of crosses areas. I guess I'm on my third group so I guess I'm still a relative newbie compared to some people (in the group).

But the same issues keep coming up over and over again in some form or fashion. I think it would be good to, you know, as these working groups are coming along to try and coalesce these issues that keep cutting across the entire gamut and either, you know, deal with them head on or figure out a way to coordinate actions amongst groups to deal with these kinds of things.

The meat of this I added a, you know, did a handy look up of what, you know, best practices means just as far as the Wiki world is concerned. Just to kind of help set some context, and also to get in this concept of the best practices are living and breathing. Because I think it's really important in the context in which they came up with in this case in dealing with abuse issues and many cases malicious use issues and criminal issues and things like that where best practices are very fast moving because the landscape changes, you know, on a regular basis or irregular basis but rapidly.

So it's getting that concept in there. And what I find is that often in these groups is that we'll come up against issues that are hard that are not easily translated into policy or contractual obligations but yet that are really good ideas that people would like to see, you know, pushed throughout the industry so that we could make things work better whatever that is.

And so people tend to say well that's a best practice, let's make sure we capture that as a best practice. And you'll see ideas and things like that coming out of papers and things like that. But there really isn't a central repository or methodology or anything like that to, you know, kind of codify what those best practices are, make sure the industry participants are actually aware of them.

You know, and then, you know, getting - touching the other measurement issue of, you know, figuring out well are people actually implementing them? How are they implementing them, things like that. So there's not really - there's this kind of this great idea of well we're going to capture this as a best practice but there's no follow through.

So the concept here is that - to putting kind of some sort of stake in the ground and say well let's propose that the ICANN community come up with a way to handle its best practices. And, you know, and I don't really want to stipulate at this point how to do that, that would be up for that other, you know, whatever group would work on it.

But, you know, try and drive something out of this to say, you know, we really need to look at this and we're going to keep coming up with best practices how are we going to handle them? How are we going to, you know, collect them, update them, distribute them? Who does it? How do they do it? How do you measure it, all those issues.

So I've got kind of an outline on that and some questions in my analysis section mainly, and a couple comments around the security. Because one of

the things about best practices when it comes to security and things like that is typically you don't want to put those out in public because then the bad guys know, oh okay well they're doing that, this and this so I'll just go and do this other thing and get around that.

So you've got that whole - we've got a community - the ICANN community is supposed to be open and have transparency etcetera and that, you know, fights against the idea of providing things secure and keeping criminals and malicious abuse at bay. So, you know, how do you balance that?

So those are all questions I brought up in that. That's I think kind of the outline of what's there. And just my thoughts and stake on where that should go. That's it.

Greg Aaron: Okay thank you. I see Mikey's hand.

Mike O'Connor: I just wanted to congratulate Rod on a great format, boy what a nice format. But also to comment that, you know, best practices could fall outside of security as well. And I think one of the things we might want to do is make it clear that the security ones we want to keep secret or at least keep inside the family but that the non-security ones we'd really like to disseminate quite publicly.

You know, I think that the (PEDENR) discussion would benefit a lot from some best practice archives that are, you know, completely out in the public internet. And so that's the only thought that I would add to that particular part of the analysis is, you know, not necessarily limiting the scope of best practice collection and dissemination is a security related issue.

Rod Rasmussen: Now Mikey, this is Rod. That was my intent and I apologize if it didn't come out that way. But...

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

Rod Rasmussen: ...I certainly was just trying to differentiate between the two but we should be collecting them all and disseminating as much as possible the ones that are not sensitive.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, yeah. And I, you know, I think we can amp that part of the analysis up and get that point across.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg, I have my hand raised so I'll go next. Yeah, what I see happening is we've toyed in this group certainly with some ideas for best practices and they could certainly be very useful across the spectrum for all kinds of issues at ICANN.

And I think we'll - in our paper we can make specific recommendations if we want for a topic that should maybe have best practices created for it. And then what I see is Rod is saying in general meta issue is that ICANN needs a way to foster the creation and maintenance of those because you can recommend that best practices be created but then if you don't have a structure for doing that that's difficult.

So this would be another meta issue we put into the paper. I have a question for the staff which is is there any group currently working within ICANN, in the GNSO or elsewhere, that's thinking about the structures we use to do this kind of thing?

I know that there's been, you know, there are groups looking at GNSO process for example. Are there relevant places that we should specifically reference or that could take this issue on if we referred it to them?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm not aware of any groups that are specifically looking at that but I'm happy to check. I mean, all the groups that are looking at GNSO improvement are looking more at the processes and procedures of the GNSO and doing their daily business.

And as far as I'm aware they're not looking at, you know, what to do, how you do - develop best practices and how that should be done. But I'm happy to look further into that and, you know, if this issue gets to the GNSO Council the GNSO Council might decide to task a certain group with such a - with such a subject if they deem that it fits with their mandate or what they've been doing there so far.

Greg Aaron: Because I've heard of the GNSO improvements group, I don't track what they do.

Marika Konings: That's specifically related to, you know, GNSO - improving the functioning and working of the GNSO Council as, you know, as a body not specifically looking the output and, you know, sort of mechanisms they might have at hand apart from, you know, the PDP. I think Berry reports that operations working group and the comment that they're specifically looking as well at the operational procedures of the GNSO Council as a administrative body.

But again, I mean, it's, you know, if you feel that a certain group might be specifically fit to take on this role, you know. Because many of you are maybe active in some of the other teams, you know, I think you definitely can include it and the GNSO Council can consider whether that fits or whether a separate or new group would need to be created to address the question at hand.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Because what Rod's recommendation is basically that this be addressed somehow, he said either via PDP - now PDP by the way would just be for - kind of within the GNSO or an ICANN advisory group.

I suppose one thing we could do is we kick the question to the Council, say we have a problem, what's the best way to address it? And by the way we might have some specific (VP)s we recommend to you in this paper.

So I throw that question out, should we basically ask, you know, in a recommendation ask the Council, okay we recommend that you examine the best way to examine this issue and move it forward. Is that what we want to do?

I see Mikey's hand up.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks Greg. It's Mikey. I think that this is - the scope of this is beyond the GNSO. This is - and I think we ran into this in the fast flux working group too that I remember generating a fair amount of electrical sparks when I brought up the fact that, you know, a lot of the issues we were talking about in fast flux really spans more than just the gTLDs, they spanned ccTLDs, etcetera, etcetera.

And I think that these meta issues, both of them actually, are like that. Certainly given our charter we should check with our sponsoring body which is the Council and ask them what to do next.

But I think that our recommendation might want to highlight the fact that the conversation should probably take place amongst a broader group of stakeholders than just within the GNSO because, you know, for example this best practices thing isn't just an issue within the GNSO. It's clear that there's a need to disseminate, collect and disseminate best practices across all the facets of ICANN.

And that while the GNSO might be able to sponsor it or champion it I think we need to make sure that it doesn't accidentally stay just inside the GNSO boundaries because I think that would be a big opportunity lost.

Greg Aaron: My - this is Greg. My thinking was maybe do both because my strategy was, well, the GNSO has some control over what it does, it doesn't have any control over what - less control over what happens within the huge context of ICANN itself.

I was thinking if we recommend it be looked across ICANN and specifically within the GNSO at least we might be able to spur some action within the GNSO.

Mike O'Connor: Well and, you know, there's always the copout of a pilot project. But I think the key deal is to make sure that we don't limit the scope to just GNSO because ultimately I think it's a broader issue than that.

Greg Aaron: Fair enough. I see James's hand.

James Bladel: Thanks Greg, a little on the mute button there, thank you. So I'm going to go ahead and contradict an earlier statement that I made earlier about this - these meta issues being introduced early as possible into the report.

I now think after listening to Mike and Rod and reading some of their checks that perhaps this is both important enough and also distinctly different enough from the core mission of this group that perhaps it warrants a separate report that could be sent to the GNSO in advance of any sort of draft or final.

So just wanted to put that out there. Of course we could reference it in our final report as an appendix perhaps or as a separate section. But I think that drawing, you know, pulling a rope around all of these meta issues and sending them off to something, to, you know, to the body that - one level up might be something we would want to address before we dive too deeply into flushing them out within this group's report.

So I just wanted to put that out there the potential to pass forward.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm going to build on that a little bit. One of the things I was contemplating as a question was whether we should circulate these drafts to the other working groups. You know, like (PEDENR) for comment. And, you

know, James's notion of breaking it out into a separate document kind of lends itself to that. So I could go for that.

James Bladel: Yeah Mikey, that's a great idea. If we can get the chairs and folks that are involved in some of the other groups to, you know, sign on and even add to this I think it - as you guys have identified, it transcends this particular group and probably should be put in front of some of those other folks as well.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. I have a suggestion because first we're having enough of a challenge creating one report rather than two. We also have some time deadlines. But also to maybe what you propose does fit within the process we're currently pursuing which is that by the 12th we have to produce an initial report.

But then there's a comment period and that comment period is designed for sharing an initial report which is not fully baked in every way. And that might be a good time to share it with people because it's gotten to a certain point, you know, it's maybe not fully baked but it's a lot of the way there.

And that comment period is a very appropriate time to share it with other parties and gain input. So, I mean, just as a practical matter I'm a little wary of trying to break out a separate report and go up above the GNSO. But I would suggest maybe the public comment period is a time to actively send this to some other folks and actively invite their comment.

How does that sound?

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

James Bladel: Yes, this is James. I am in agreement with that.

Greg Aaron: Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: This is Rod. I think I agree with that as well. The proposal to get people together and talk about meta issues kind of as a cross group thing is basically forming our own working group and saying we're going to work on this so - which is, you know, kind of cool but at the same time it might engender a little resistance from some corner, I don't know.

Greg Aaron: Okay. So anyway we're coming up at the end of the meeting by the way. What is our next step? Does this recommendation section require some more work?

Rod Rasmussen: I would say yes.

Greg Aaron: Yeah. Why don't folks go to take some work on that during the week. I mean this is material that we should put into the report somehow and - it's a meta issue so we should put it in. I think we need to work on the recommendation and come back to it.

And let's pick up next week. So we got through three pretty heavy issues today. That was very productive I thought. What I suggest for the coming week is read through the paper as it stands. I'm also going to be flagging spots where we're missing material.

Very soon what we have to do is we're going to have to start doing our online polling which we've discussed before. The idea there is we take all the recommendations, pull them out of the paper and we give people, you know, some time to mull them over, suggest edits or minority positions and also do kind of straw polling to understand what levels of consensus we may have.

That is a mechanism for then to have some calls around those specific issues and see if we can, you know, put things into a final shape. As always the recommendations are the thing that people are going to concentrate on when they read the paper.

Marika, I had a question for you. You have a staff retreat coming up, is that next week?

Marika Konings: Yes, that's correct.

Greg Aaron: Okay. So you're available this week but what's your ability to do work of any kind next week during the retreat?

Marika Konings: Well, I mean, I should have some time. I definitely have, you know, two long flights to cover so I'm happy already to start working on your sort of the basic editing and trying to integrate some of the documents we discussed today.

And I think as well there are some sections where maybe we as staff especially on the scope issues we might want to have a look and provide maybe some clarification and, you know, especially what we discussed today as well the difference between policymaking and consensus policy development to get some more clarity around that. So those are parts I think I can really start working on.

And for next week I won't be able to be on the call on Monday as I'm flying at that time. But I think, you know, if the group wants to have a call and I know as well I think it's a public holiday in the US so that's maybe another discussion part but I think Margie is otherwise available to participate in the meeting.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Are you going to Marina del Ray next week is that it?

Marika Konings: Yes correct.

Greg Aaron: Okay. Well tell you what, why don't you and I schedule some time offline this week to talk just about administration of tracking the document and changes and so forth?

Marika Konings: Okay.

Greg Aaron: And we'll also need to start discussing the - setting up this polling as well. So why don't we take that an action item offline? I see James's hand up. James did you want to add something?

James Bladel: Yeah, very quickly I noticed there's a preponderance of Americans on this call and so I just wanted to ask if we are still on target for a call next week being Martin Luther King Day? I do have to make some notifications if I'm going to need to be available that day for a call. So I think just to confirm we are planning on going forward with the call tomorrow or next week?

Greg Aaron: Thank you for mentioning that. I am hoping so assuming that we have enough people to participate of course. I know that it's not a holiday at my company and I will be on duty that day. How about everybody else?

James Bladel: It is a company holiday and I'm - I have to let some folks know if I'm going to be engaged in work activities on that day because I think they - they make it up to me somehow so.

Greg Aaron: Okay Berry says he's available. How about everyone else?

James Bladel: I am available I just want to confirm that we are or we aren't having it so I can get some advance notice, that's all.

Greg Aaron: Yeah, is there anybody else who can't make it?

James Bladel: I have a dream of a Monday without a ICANN...

Greg Aaron: Well up to you.

Rod Rasmussen: Boo.

Greg Aaron: Up to you completely. But it sounds like everybody else is probably working that day. So I would propose that we keep the meeting on as scheduled just because we might be able to produce - and James we'd certainly love to have you but you do what you think is best for you.

James Bladel: No, I will confirm that I will be there next Monday. I just needed to, you know, let some folks know internally that's all.

Greg Aaron: Okay you should get a couple hours off some other time then.

James Bladel: We never really turn it off do we Greg?

Greg Aaron: Well you saw I was emailing at 11 o'clock last night.

James Bladel: So Greg was on the...

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: How about 2:00 in the morning?

James Bladel: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...probably saw the traffic about 2 o'clock in the morning over the weekend so.

Greg Aaron: Yeah, nothing like an upcoming meeting to spur action. I'm guilty. So we're on for next week then. Thanks everybody for today's meeting and the material that you produced in advance, much appreciated. Let's be real focused this week on doing stuff on the list; we're not using that avenue perhaps quite as much as we could. But let's leverage it to the extent possible.

And we'll talk same time next week.

Mike O'Connor: Sounds good, thank you Greg.

Greg Aaron: Thank you everyone. Good job.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks guys, take care.

Mike O'Connor: Bye, bye.

Margie Milam: Bye.

END