GNSO Working Group.
21 June 2008 (pm session)
Paris, France
Agenda
http://www.gnso.icann.org/meetings/paris-agenda-21june08.shtml

7. New Issues for future consideration – Blue Sky (facilitated by Olof Nordling) (16:30 - 17:30)

Presentation
http://www.gnso.icann.org/correspondence/blueboard-21jun08.pdf

>>AVRI DORIA: Good, thanks.

 Okay. So that then brings us a few minutes early to our next item and I've had several people ask me what was it all about. And, basically, there's -- right, he is going to tell us but I'm going to tell us first and then he is going to correct me.
 But, basically, there has been some discussion of doing some long range planning and just starting to think about -- because we certainly do a lot of policy work but it is almost all in reaction. It is emergency process. It's oops, there is a problem; oops, there is an issue. And are there policy issues that should be worked on that sort of fall through the cracks because they never make it to emergency status? Are there things that we should be working on? So that's what prompted the question.
 The last thing I'm going to say is what's going to come out of today, the next step with it will be -- it will be reported on on Wednesday. In other words, I will ask Olof or someone to get up there and sort of give a list of these were the items so that in the open comment period, people can have further comments to make about it. Now, I'm not sure. Did you arrange for somebody to take notes of all these while you were facilitating? Because I didn't assume you could both facilitate and note what we're saying.
 >>OLOF NORDLING: Well, basically, I assumed I could.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Of course, we have the transcription also.
 >>OLOF NORDLING: We'll see.
 >>AVRI DORIA: Right. And it's yours, thank you.
 >>OLOF NORDLING: Could I just get the connection?
 >>AVRI DORIA: You certainly most can.
 >>OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, Avri. Well, in all honesty, I'm thrilled to be appointed facilitator but I have absolutely no idea how and why, but I'll do my best. And I trust that both Chuck and Avri and all of you will facilitate might job as a facilitator.
 And, well, Avri's introduction, I think, says it all. The purpose of the exercise is to think a little bit around the corner, perhaps Blue Sky would illustrate -- think away today's clouds, of which we have a few, and see if we find some new ones ahead or perhaps some sunshine; I don't know.
 And then try to see if that is something with which we as a GNSO should address one way or another as appropriate for dealing with as policy or perhaps to produce as a consensus policy or perhaps advise upon.
 And it's also pretty clear that this is supposed to be the starting -- perhaps meager start of what will become a revolving document that we can have use of in our planning exercises and trying to develop it further as we go along.
 So a living document will be the outcome hopefully. And, well, to start with, okay, there are a few ways, of course, we can address a session like this. And I suppose that the best thing to do is really to -- well, if not completely clear our minds but at least try to forget what we're doing right now and try to look ahead with a cooperative effort. And I suggest we do that in two steps.
 So starting with, well, brainstorming rules, any suggestion is okay. And then we can in the second half of the session perhaps look back on what have we come up with and is there something we should weed out or something that leads to a corollary thought that we should add as a very first thought.
 And while you're thinking about it, I also -- in case we don't come up with anything, I thought of something.
 [Laughter]
 >>AVRI DORIA: So you are going to tell us something first. Oh, wow, he is digging into a bag.
 >>OLOF NORDLING: When it comes looking into the future, I brought a very traditional old user interface for such purposes, notably a crystal ball.

[Laughter]
So whenever the need comes...
Oh, what was that? You don't want to know that, it was sort of about petroleum prices.
[Laughter]
So why don't we start and perhaps also have a little -- something to write upon. Let's see if I can get it.

>>AVRI DORIA: Should I do the tracking of the names or would you like to do that.

>>OLOF NORDLING: If you can do the tracking of the names and I will try to track the contributions.

>>AVRI DORIA: You track the ideas. I missed a bunch. J. Scott was the first one that I saw. Kristina has the first and then I saw Mike and then I see Tim. And who else did I see to start? Okay. Go ahead, Kristina.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Could I just interject well, now, since it is supposed to be a Blue Sky, I produced a blue board; and instead of having it black, I used a sunshine yellow.
[Laughter]
And by coincidence, it happens to be the colors of the Swedish flag, so end of Swedish culture imperialism with that.
[Laughter]

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Can I go? Okay. I think we should think about whether or not -- well, actually, I think we should start thinking about developing baseline guidelines for accreditation of new UDRP providers because if we are going into a world of 50 to 60 new gTLDs, none of which are required to have Rights Protection Mechanisms prelaunched, you're going to have a lot more UDRP disputes and there's no way that the current providers are going to be able to handle them.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. I have Mike, Tim and then myself.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Okay. I have a little list here.

>>AVRI DORIA: A list?

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: He's our futurist.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Most of these things relate to the registration agreement, essentially, registrar accreditation agreement, I should say.
Proxy services obviously with WHOIS. I think that that issue could be separated out from the overall WHOIS morass in certain ways possibly and we might want to look at those.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: [inaudible]

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: We may want to look at that as a distinct issue within the broader WHOIS problem.
And then the RAA amendments that have been recirculated, the proposal that was negotiated between the staff and the registrar's constituency has now just been sent to all of us, that's, obviously, something we all need to look at. And so not only proxies under that but also warehousing of domain names by registrars is clearly a longstanding issue that there is a provision in the RAA now that says, basically, registrars will adopt any policies that are ever adopted and none ever have been but several people, Susan Crawford and many others have suggested that's an issue that needs to be looked at that I certainly agree.
And then, finally, abusive domain name suspension of some sort. I mean, there is all sorts of bad things that are happening with domains that are clear violations of acceptable use policy of registrars that are contained within the RAA and within the registration agreements with registrants. And we simply don't have effective means of taking action in a lot -- a lot of those cases, I won't say vast majority, but that's my impression.
So that's, I think, it for now. Those are very broad Blue Sky topics, I think.

>>AVRI DORIA: Tim was next.

>>TIM RUIZ: Mine's -- it's a little different. Perhaps you can tell me if it is not quite for this forum. You know, in the GNSO improvements it talks about better communications between the GNSO and the other parts of ICANN. And one of the concerns that I have in particular is with the ccNSO in that it seems to me that going forward, we're going to see more frequent situations where the policy work that we do can affect them or the policy work that they do has serious impact on the gTLD space.
And so right now the improvements recommendations talk about better coordination of activities, keeping each other informed of views through meetings or conference calls, but I wonder if we shouldn't consider proposing something more formal in situations where we feel that there needs to be a cross-policy development effort between the two SOs and one that comes to my mind obviously is the fast track and the whole ccIDN idea. But I think that's just one instance, and I think we are going to see potentially many others as time goes forward. So that's something I would like to throw out there, something more formal that would allow us to request or at least an opportunity to have reviewed an opportunity for a cross-SO development policy -- policy development effort.

>>AVRI DORIA: That's also something we should get up on Thursday not to get out of this blue board thing.

>>OLOF NORDLING: I think it is perfectly okay to introduce. We can talk about policy, advice but process proposals as this one, most certainly right now. We are just adding to the list.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay, I've got me. Then I've got Jeff. Then I've got Mike and Alan and Chuck. Any other names I should put on the list while I am writing names on a list?

The one that I wanted to throw out for the list has to do also with the UDRP and that's to ask whether there is a time -- a reason or chance to review it in that it is sometimes a very difficult process for the mom and pop or me, owner of a domain name, to deal with the massive legal onslaught of a corporation or whatever. That the process is incredibly difficult for the individual.

So there is a chance to look into the UDRP to see whether there is any way to lessen the pain for the individual that has to respond to one of these processes.

And next I had Jeff.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Mine's kind of -- you took part of mine, I think.

>>AVRI DORIA: Sorry.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: That's good. We are on the same path. Because I know a lot of individuals have been asking for review of that. I think it should be reviewed to develop common standards. I see different dispute providers have different rulings based on different factors and I would like to see that kind of standardized. I would like to see some sort of predictability, and I think there should be some sort of mechanism to take the last ten years, almost, of cases and see if we could come up with some general rules to modify it so that there is consistency.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks.

Mike?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Registry failover in the world of 1,000 TLDs, I imagine a few of them are going to fail. I know there's been efforts by staff. I don't think that we've really been involved in those efforts in any way yet, at least not in my tenure on the council. And I think it is something that we probably ought to have a chance to look at.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Correct me just on that issue, they are going to put it out for public comment so I don't know if the council needs to do a formal -- something on that. But certainly I've seen the plan, and we've been participating in it and it's something that we would like public feedback on. I'm not sure a PDP on that. But I think you're right, that it should be subject to comment.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Alan?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: The item on warehousing slightly covers this, but I think someone needs to do something and I think it may be in our domain on what I'll call back running, which is the use of domain names as they expire. Now, we're covering part of it in the new rules which will bring resellers into it to make sure that the resellers send out the notices that they are obliged to send out. Right now they often don't. But the use of those names, which is very close to frontrunning, except at the other end, certainly the single item that we get most feedback from users on that "I had this domain name and suddenly one day it was monitized."

>>AVRI DORIA: Now I had Alan. Now I have Chuck and then I have Mike again. Hi, Ute.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I mentioned mine this morning on our most popular subject, WHOIS. Am I missing something here?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Olof didn't put the item on back running up on the notes.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yes, I did but I put it together, use of back running included with the warehousing.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: My apologies.

>>OLOF NORDLING: It's there but you didn't get your own line. Sorry for that.

>>CHUCK GOMES: This really isn't related to the WHOIS policy issues, at least not directly. That is the WHOIS protocol. It is severely outdated. The SSAC has come forward with a paper in that regard and one of the big needs, even if we never change WHOIS policy, one of the big needs where a change in protocol that would be helpful is in regard to IDN names. WHOIS as hopefully most of you know won't display IDNs well. So you're going to see XN-- and it is going to be fairly confusing. It is a fairly important need that we begin to look at that. I won't say it is non-controversial but it's controversial in a different way than our WHOIS policy issues because there will be an impact on registries and registrars, a financial impact in terms of changing that protocol. So that will be a big issue and it is not a trivial one, I don't think, for registries and registrars.

But I think that's a very important thing for us to focus on.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Can I a question? Chuck, what are the policy GNSO issues -- yeah, yeah, please.

>>AVRI DORIA: Basically, whenever -- this is something I actually talk about in another context. The software is very often hardened policy. When you are writing the protocol requirements, when you are putting together, "we need a protocol that does X, Y, and Z," many of the decisions about X, Y, and Z that you need are policy decisions. Most often they are made simply on a bunch of people Blue Skying around an engineering table, saying it could be cool if it collected this, this and this.

But in a WHOIS type of process, even what you -- what you decide to collect at a certain point has a policy overtone. So the requirements for such a protocol could well have policy implementations. Most code is hardened policy at a certain point.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I understand that. It doesn't mean that it is GNSO policy. I can describe a lot of things as "policy" but there are certain things that the technical community may come back on and then up for public comment.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yes, yes, I'm out. We're brainstorming, no questioning.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: You're right.

>>AVRI DORIA: It was a good question. I got to say something. It was a good question.

[Laughter]

>>OLOF NORDLING: While I actually got the floor, I think it's -- well, one of the easy catches really when trying to look around a corner, seeing the recent trend that whatever [inaudible] tends to end up on the GNSO table has been the case with domain tasting, has been the case with frontrunning, it is the case with Fast Flux. Indeed among the studies ongoing with the SSAC right now is the WHOIS protocol or the directory services and crisp, I thought that was something you got with a beer in England. Usually called a chip otherwise.

There were a few others which I think may be worthwhile to add to what they're doing right now, looking at DNSsec, investigating industry readiness on that and they are looking at phishing attacks and registrar in-person nation. Sounds creepy.

So I would just like to add them for the time being and we can delete them if we don't like them.

Okay, I had Mike next.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Subdomain registrars are becoming a very large problem with phishing and other abusive conduct and simply don't have anywhere near the sort of regulatory steps that you have with accredited registrars because often the subdomain registrars will have a lot of legitimate content. Some of their registrants will have legitimate sites but, yet, they'll also have rampant abuse and they don't do anything about it.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Can you define subdomaining?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Like org.come. There are a bunch of subdomain registrars these days.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: They're registrants.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Correct. They're offering for sale registration of subdomains on their second-level domain.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Just to be clear, you're, basically, talking about not subdomain registrars, you're talking about subdomains off of registrations?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I don't know what to call them. All I know is the APWG did a study that just came out and 18% of all of the phishing attacks they found last year were on those sorts of subdomains.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thomas and then I put myself back in again.

>> I guess my question in a similar way as Jeff was. We are talking of registrants here who give certain parts of URL space that they have registered to third-parties. Is that what you want to do or want the GNSO to look at?

>>OLOF NORDLING: That's the next question.

>> Interesting.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Come on, that's the second part again.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah. I want to add a meta-item to this, which is, I understand that three-plus years ago the GNSO went through a previous one of these exercises and actually did a prioritization. So I would say at some point in this exercise, we should go back and look at this list and make sure there wasn't some piece of it left dangling that we didn't think of now. And also to be curious just as a historical piece to see how a previous one of these exercises got reflected in the following three years' reality.

So it is a meta-entry, such as check the previous exercise to see that there isn't something that was on that that would be curious to find something on that one that is on this one that hasn't been touched in three years?

>>OLOF NORDLING: When exactly was that? Bruce will know.

>>BRUCE TONKIN: I think we did two exercises and Philip Sheppard probably, you can assist here as well. At one point we did an exercise about policies in generally and try to rank them in terms of what we thought was important. That was probably about four years ago or so.

We also did a specific one on WHOIS itself because WHOIS had about ten subtopics let's say and we did prioritize those ten subtopics at the time. We have done it a couple of times but it is worth doing.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. And still taking -- because we're still in the open Blue Sky, right?

>>OLOF NORDLING: Oh, yes.

>>AVRI DORIA: All right. So Jeff?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: All right. So one issue that's been bothering me but it's not a -- it's -- well, sure it is a policy.

I would like a policy process on minimum qualifications for registrars as far as what goes into ICANN -- in helping define ICANN's process for accrediting registrars. Right now it's a complete black hole as to what they do. I think there should be minimum qualifications. And I see their accreditation agreement describes a couple of things, but I think that is a policy process.

I think it also should be studied as to what goes into allowing a registrar to transfer an accreditation to another party and I'll tell you from a registry perspective, that gives us heartburn because even though we technically certify the first registrar, you know, ICANN's got in its process that it allows assignment to another registrar, and even though ICANN says now in the accreditation agreement it will be do due diligence, I got to tell you it's an operational headache from a registry perspective because we have to retest them and half the time they're clueless on the technical aspects.

So there's registrars that have basically registrar accreditations for sale, and I think that's something that needs to be looked at and so I'd like -- I'd like that added.

>>OLOF NORDLING: How -- could you put that in a short format? Three words?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I think it's basically accreditation process of registrars and transfers of accreditation.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Okay. Actually, Bruce is -- it's accredit ace criteria.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I might add warehousing of accreditations as well.

[Laughter]

>>OLOF NORDLING: All right.

>> I would actually like to add the same thing for the registries so I would like to see --

>>JON NEVETT: Who said we get along?

[Laughter]

>> There is.

>>AVRI DORIA: I think you sound like you're in complete agreement.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: There actually is a process. When we submit a bit. ICANN does a formal evaluation on our technical capabilities and they have to certify it and I do agree that before new gTLDs are selected they should do the same thing, that they should certify that a registry operator meets those qualifications. I'm absolutely a hundred percent on board with that.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Any other suggestions of what belongs on a long-term list un-prioritized after of yet. Okay. You got the crystal ball there?

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah. I think I should add one obvious aspect because what we do already --

>>AVRI DORIA: Not you but the fates.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Huh.

>>AVRI DORIA: Not you but the fates from the crystal ball.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Oh, yes, yes, yes. But I'll get to the crystal ball in a bit. This is just thinking about what we usually do and should do and that is to check out the implementation of existing policies and we're busy doing so, we've been busy doing so for WHOIS, we're busy doing so for transfers big time. There are a couple out there which are obvious candidates, I would say, and one has been touched upon in a certain sense and that's new gTLDs. Policies there. And once it gets launched, that was also an agreement for -- within the GNSO that it should be checked out for -- quickly, and that has to be timed properly to when it's actually launched and so that we can draw the conclusions for the subsequent run.

So that's one. And the other one is the RCEP procedure, which is out there and we do have some experience from, as of recently. So I would certainly put in those two as candidates for review, if they're doing -- or will do exactly what was intended.

>>AVRI DORIA: Well, that gave four people a chance to get their hands up.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah.

>>AVRI DORIA: So we've got Kristina, Mike, Jon, and Jeff.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: This may be slightly covered by what Alan was referring to, but I'm offering it up in case it wasn't, and that is, I think we need to take a look at the implementation of the redemption grace period.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Mike?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: This is shorter-term, but just wanted to make sure it got on our list. The meetings and travel policy. There's more -- proposals out for comment, and I'm wondering whether the council wants to deliberate those and possibly respond as a council.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, that's a much -- much shorter term. Like if we don't do that in the next couple weeks, we've --

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Missed boat.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, missed the boat, speaking of boats. Jon?

>>JON BING: Thank you. I notice that Mike mentioned the RAA review. To me, it would have been very satisfactory to have a critical look at the whole contractual structure, which so much of ICANN's power really relies but which is unclear to me on which principles are formed. Thank you.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Jeff?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I think I was going to just add, you know, we're kind of thinking of these Blue Sky items as to what -- you know, what we can do for registries, registrars, or what we can look at. But I think it kind of needs to be turned on ICANN as well. We need to look at things of how ICANN is conducting its business. I think there should be formal statements or GNSO should review basically how ICANN does staff papers and how it presents things and so kind of a GNSO Council review of ICANN's relationship or dealings with policies or recommendations that we put forward to the board.

>>AVRI DORIA: Part of that might actually fall into some of the improvements, and as the improvements is not only what we do, but then if we're defining a PDP process, what comes out of it. Bruce?

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Just one comment and I'll probably wear a number of hats when I'm making this comment, but...

One of the hats I wear is I'm an observer on the ICANN board Finance Committee as well as being on the ICANN board, but my observation of the current sort of planning process is, there's a lot of fairly generic goals. And examples of that would be to say, you know, we're going to spend $2.5 million on improving IANA and I think we're going to spend $5.8 million on broadening participation, but there's no measures that go with that.

So there's broadening -- I could spend $5.8 million and I've got one new person in the room. That's broadening participation, but is that good value for $5.8 million?

So one of the things I think the GNSO should start thinking about, I guess, in terms of direction to ICANN as the organization is, in some of the areas that are relevant to the GNSO, what are the performance pressures? How do you know whether ICANN's doing a good job? What would you say the performance measures are, firstly?

And then second, what should the value of that performance measure be?

And so, you know, picking up something Kristina was saying, we might say as the GNSO that a performance measure is that the policy should be implemented within three months of it being approved by the board. Or, sorry, that a performance measure is how long does it take to implement a policy as a performance measure? And you might say your expectation is that it should be three months.

And then people can report on that, and you can say, "Yeah, the staff is doing a good or bad job." But we don't have any of that right now.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE:

[Speaker is off microphone]

>>BRUCE TONKIN: Read the operating plan. I didn't see any performance measures.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Any other suggestions for things that should go on Olof's blue board of policy work we might consider in the future. Nope? Nothing missing? We've covered everything?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Just one comment. I'm not going to add to the list, but just I want to reserve the right to add to the list later.

[Laughter]

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: You know? NI don't want anyone to get the impression that this is -- we're going to be developing this sort of plan. We have always have to retain flexibility to take on new issues, of course.

>>AVRI DORIA: Oh, yes. No, I don't think that ever occurred to anyone that this list would be, "No, sorry, you know, this new thing isn't on the list and that is it." Yes, Kristina.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: I just wanted to ask Mike a clarifying question, and Alan, because I want to make sure that some things I've been thinking about are covered.

Alan, can you give me -- can you talk a little bit more about what you mean when you say "backrunning"? What that covers?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I guess essentially it covers a domain owned by a domain owner which suddenly, from their perspective, is now monetized or taken over by someone else, either when it has truly expired, with notice, conscious -- they consciously decided not to continue it. Is there -- does the registrar have a right to take it over at that point?

And the more insidious one of registrars or resellers not giving notice and taking it over at the expiry date.

I mean, all -- the great -- you mentioned the redemption grace period. Those are all, as I understand it, essentially optional, that they -- that the registrar may offer them or it's the registry offers the -- gives the registrar the ability to offer them, but they're not required.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE:
[Speaker is off microphone]

>>ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding is that they're required that the registry give the registrar the option, but the registrar does not need to pass that on under the current rules, I believe, to the registrant.

>>TIM RUIZ: Yeah, I think it's -- well, for certain with the renewal grace period, that's certainly true. With the redemption grace period, once the name is deleted, it goes through the redemption grace period at the registry because the registry is required to implement it.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: It's the renewal one that I -- the expiry one that I was talking about, yeah.

>>TIM RUIZ: Right. Yeah. It's the 45 days that the registry gives the registrar, and then the registrar is free to use that however best they feel fits their model.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: And in general, in many cases the registrar uses that to monetize the domain and see if it's worth anything at that point.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: All right. Then in that case, then I think we could probably group what I had in mind when I was talking about reviewing the implementation of the redemption grace period with what Alan is suggesting.

And, Mike, as to the proxy services, were you thinking that we would cover -- what is it, 3778, what constitutes reasonable evidence of actionable harm?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Yes, that would be part of it.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Okay.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Also, you know -- yeah. Whether registrars have been complying with their obligations, too.

>>OLOF NORDLING: I think --

>>JON NEVETT:
[Speaker is off microphone]
[Laughter]

>>JON NEVETT:
[Speaker is off microphone].

>>OLOF NORDLING: We're supposed to be fun, come on. I think we've sort of gradually, by consensus, drifted into the second half of this session right now, so why don't we have a look at what we've written, and see whether it makes any sense.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Yeah. I just want to comment on the renewal grace period. Keep in mind that that was not part of any consensus policy. That was just incorporated into agreements as a particular need that was observed early on, so that's why you see the situation. It's not as if registrars aren't required to comply with the consensus policy. That was not a consensus policy, but, rather, a contractual issue that was put in there.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Anyway, could we just take it sequentially and see if -- well, is there anything we should just plainly delete?

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Alan wanted to comment on something.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I just wanted to comment on what Chuck said. You're correct, but the way most people read the rules is they think this is a registrant right, and it's not that at all.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Back to Olof.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Right. Back to where we all started, and this is Kristina's first proposal, and I've now made it into caps, at long last.

It was difficult, but...

Guidelines for new UDRP providers. Well, any -- is that sensible? Something --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Should we group like --

>>OLOF NORDLING: Can we group it?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: -- like just the UDRP, and have a bullet under that for baseline guidelines and then the one that's down below the UDRP, review to seek common standards or UDRP to --
>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah. Good idea. To have a bit of -- put similar things together. I'm not really quick in this little...
>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Like minimum accreditation standards.
>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Yeah, I think we need to sort of reword one. It's not really guidelines. It's like minimum standards that providers have to meet.
>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Right. Like minimum accreditation criteria.
>>OLOF NORDLING: Right, right, right.
>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Yeah.
>>OLOF NORDLING: That's -- I think we'll -- we need to --
>>JEFF NEUMAN: So I'm sure WIPO would love it if we had a standard that says you can't be involved in lobbying activities for IP owners and be a provider. It's a joke.
>>OLOF NORDLING: Well, I'll try to lunch them together eventually, but it's too hard and this little thingy, I need a proper mouse, actually, to do that.
>>JEFF NEUMAN: I think you could just call it UDRP review and then just have the sub-bullets below.
>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah. Which is -- well, multiple subtopics on that, which are rather different because the UDRP review, that's a far cry from minimum accreditation criteria for providers, I think. It's rather different. But all right. They're both about UDRP.
>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Just call it UDRP.
>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah.
>>AVRI DORIA: And for now, if you don't want to move them all around, just put 1 in front of anything that has to do with UDRP and it's --
>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Okay.
So it turns out to be more difficult than I thought. Okay.
Then we had proxy services, which is, well, part of WHOIS, of course, but is a separate issue. How to deal with that.
That was Mike.
>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Yes.
>>OLOF NORDLING: Yes. And --
>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I don't think we should delete it.
>>OLOF NORDLING: No?
[Laughter]
>>OLOF NORDLING: Okay. You want to expand on it? I mean, to the degree that I understand what you actually mean?
>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I think really, I think we need to look at the practice of proxy registration services. I think it -- in many, many cases, it violates the RAA, the use of these things, in my opinion, the opinion of plenty of other people. The fact that we have a rule that says you have to provide accurate WHOIS information and that you have to be able to contact that individual and the fact is, with most of the proxy services, that's simply not possible.
>>JON NEVETT: So we don't need a new policy if it's already in the RAA?
>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: That remains to be seen. Maybe it's just that the RAA is not being enforced. I mean, I think it's a discussion that needs to be had.
>>OLOF NORDLING: Well, that one survived, I take it.
Review of the registration -- registrar accreditation agreement.
>>LIZ GASSTER: Before you go to that.
>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah, Liz.
>>LIZ GASSTER: There's just one point I want to add. I actually think it would be helpful to add to proxy registration so at least it's clear what you mean, violations of the RAA. I mean, I think Jon makes a good point about whether a PDP is necessary for that, but one of the things I think that would be really helpful in this Blue Sky process is to try to define more of than an issue or a topic.
Like proxy services is a topic. It's not clear what the -- whether there's a problem, what the problem is you're, you know, wanting to look at, and what the nature of a PDP associated with that topic is.
So to the degree that we can just get more specific or granular about what exactly is it that we're talking about here that we would want to engage in a PDP because after this is over, we're going to need to go back and kind of make sense of all of this.
>>OLOF NORDLING: Of course it's good to be very, very ambitious but we have to start somewhere, but I'd agree, if we can dig a little bit deeper on each one --

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Well, Olof, just to follow on the suggestion, and maybe the issues are compliance, user benefits, and public disbenefits. Under that.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: What? Can you say that again?

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Huh? Well, where -- I mean, are there user benefits to have proxy registration services. I presume the registrars would argue yes, there are. Benefits to certain users. Are there public interest disbenefits, costs, other concerns that result from that. And almost -- and then the following issue becomes are there interested simple compliance issues under the existing --

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Well, I mean, partly but I've been told by compliance that on 3778, that, you know, that's not compliance because they don't know -- they don't have any guidance, so it goes beyond that.

>> TIM RUIZ: To me, it's a higher-level issue, in that -- defining proxy service. I mean, you know, there are so many different ways in which domains per proxied. You know, are we talking about something specific? You know, lawyers proxy names for their clients. Hosting companies proxy names for their customers. We have the proxy services that you're probably more referring to. But, I mean, defining what we're talking about I think is important, to begin with. What is a proxy service? Same issue kind of that we were talking about with the WHOIS studies and just defining the terms so that we know what we're referring to.

>>TOM KELLER: Just a question --

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Which that would apply to most of them.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah. Well, I brought it up and I thought that's at least one way of defining a little more what we're looking for here. Public interest disbenefits? What's that? The English word?

>>THOMAS ROESSLER: Cost/benefit analysis [inaudible].

[Speaker is off microphone]

>>OLOF NORDLING: Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, now, this -- I think what we're looking for are some -- well, not the cost benefit as such, but actually when there is unintended use and harm to somebody, and what to do about it.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. I abdicated my role of taking names for a bit, but I'm going to start again because we're losing track of it.

So I had a Thomas, I had Wendy, I had a Kristina.

>>TOM KELLER: Thomas is me?

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. There are many Thomases.

>>TOM KELLER: Well, I want some clarification from Philip what exactly he means with public interest disbenefits. That's something -- it's totally not clear to my mind and seriously up to a definition by whoever is making that definition.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: We don't need to start creating an issues report at this stage for each of our topics Department of Corrections we.

>>AVRI DORIA: No, no, no. This is just getting topics.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: I think we're just -- if you don't like disbenefits, then just have public harm.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Yes, Wendy.

>>WENDY SELTZER: So I'm puzzled to see this on the agenda as something that needs to be discussed. It seems to be an item that can be offered as a business choice by registrars or independent third parties, and getting into either the varying public reasons why registrants would choose them or businesses would offer them seems to be wildly beyond the scope of council.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. But that may or may not turn out to be the case, once an issues report is done and someone goes and looks at it.

At this point, it's a Blue Sky exercise to see what might be a worthwhile topic for somebody to look into.

If it turns out to be beyond the scope, then obviously it wouldn't go further.

>>OLOF NORDLING: May I -- may I add that it may be so, even not sort of within scope for policy development, it may be something that is of interest to a majority of the -- of the council and that they want to express an opinion and advice upon, which I think they're fully free to do.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. I have Kristina and then --

>>JON NEVETT: Just could I ask a quick question. Is this list going to be published anywhere.

[Laughter]

>>JON NEVETT: Because if so, it should be balanced. If you just say -- if you say "harm to public interest" I think you have to make it balanced, because there are certain benefits to the public interest as well, so if you want to characterize it one way or the other, do it either in neutral terms or do both.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Oh, well --

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah. First of all, it is being transcribed and the notion was that we were going to present some notion of this list as part of our -- as part of, you know, our report to the open meeting, unless there's a decision not to, but at the moment, yeah.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yep. Could we, with that, advance to Item 3, review of the registrar accreditation agreement?

What's wrong with it?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Well, just at a basic level, I mean, we've got all of these proposed amendments. I think there's really no doubt that the council needs to look at those, and --

[Speaker is off microphone]

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Yeah, the RAA amendments that have been proposed.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Oh, sorry. Oh, RAA. Registrar accreditation agreement. Isn't that interesting.

But Mike, you're talking about what's happening right now or should there be sort of an independent review --

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Well, yeah. No, I think this is definitely a short-term issue for us. It's on the table now, but we have not started talking about it as a council.

I also think it's going to open up a lot of these other issues once we do start discussing it --

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, because a lot of those issues seem like they would fall under that category.

>>OLOF NORDLING: So that's a nearby cloud rather than a Blue Sky, in a sense.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I'd say, it's an approaching hurricane.

[Laughter]

>>AVRI DORIA: Kristina. Forgot one?

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: I forgot one and -- well, actually two. One, I'm wondering whether it may be helpful to what we're doing to perhaps reach out to the compliance folks and see if there are any areas that have come across their desks in which they need policy guidance that we may not have thought of.

>>JON NEVETT:

[Speaker is off microphone]

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Well, I'm just saying if we're going to do this, we might as well be comprehensive. I mean, you know --

>>JON NEVETT: Right.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: And the other thing that I personally would like to see on here is registrar ownership of registries.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Could you repeat what you said last? The registrars and registries? What?

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Registrar ownership of registries.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Oh, yeah, okay.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE:

[Speaker is off microphone]

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Okay. Then cross-ownership generally.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I think that needs to be addressed at this meeting or before new gTLDs are launched.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE:

[Speaker is off microphone]

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So I mean, it's Blue Sky but I think that's -- I've been pushing on ICANN to decide that issue for --

>>TIM RUIZ: I mean, there's already an economic study being done but I don't think it's completed yet or they've completed partly of it, and then there was questions and then it got sent back. So I don't see that getting done by end of this meeting and if it's not, I don't see them making a decision.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Well, they -- without getting into a debate, they need to because companies -- well, I mean, Go Daddy, you're working on new registries. It's not a secret. eNOM is working on it. You know, everyone's --

[Laughter]

[Speakers are overlapping]

>>JON NEVETT: It wasn't until two seconds ago.

[Laughter]

>>JEFF NEUMAN: There's no secrets out there. So I do think that that's something we need to decide today.

>>TIM RUIZ: We might make a decision on it today, or I don't -- I don't see how we can make a decision on it today. I'm not even confident we can -- we can discuss it this time. I don't see how we can come to any kind of an agreement by the end of this meeting.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Oh, yeah, I agree with that.

>>TIM RUIZ: And ICANN definitely isn't going to come to any --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: If ICANN decides, at the time the RFP is announced, that all of a sudden registrars can't own, directly or indirectly, any registries, I think you guys would be kind of annoyed at all that business development you guys have been doing over the past few years. And I'm not picking on Go Daddy. It's a lot of --

>>TIM RUIZ: I'm going to have -- I'm going to have to get a little closer to you, Jeff, because you know a lot more about what's going on at Go Daddy than I do, but --

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Tim --

>>TIM RUIZ: But I understand your point and I agree. I just think -- but you had said, you know, by the end of this meeting or the end of -- that's a little --

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: But with respect to that report, Kurt did say that -- I know it got sent away again but do we know where that's at at all?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: No.

>>JON NEVETT: --

>>TIM RUIZ: I think they're still contacting --

>>JON NEVETT: Yeah, they're investigating so they're interviewing folks and preparing the economic report.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Is there an ETA? I know when I ask consultants to do work for me, I usually ask -- give them a decline.

>>TIM RUIZ: I think we've asked several times. Since the last meeting in --

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Can anyone from ICANN speak to that?

>>AVRI DORIA: Can somebody track that down?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Excuse me. I'm not exactly sure what the title of the report is. But it was into the competition between registries and registrars, and there was a study performed, and when we had the GNSO Council meeting in L.A. to discuss the implementation issues, Kurt said that it was due that day. Apparently it did come in serendipitously, I believe, was the word he used. It did come in and then was sent out again for further questions or more study or something, but that was quite some time ago now, and, you know, I'm -- I'm with Jeff Neuman on this. I think that we need to get some resolution on this fairly quickly, because there's a helluva lot people doing a lot of business development that would like to get some visibility on the answer. Bruce?

>>AVRI DORIA: Bruce, yes.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS:

[Speaker is off microphone]

>>AVRI DORIA: Bruce.

>>BRUCE TONKIN: I want to answer the question, but I will say is that it is a reasonable question to ask Paul Twomey in his report on Monday. He is giving the CEO's report. Ask him as head of the organization when that report is due in. But as far as I know, it is not yet complete.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: How do we find out when, Bruce?

>>BRUCE TONKIN: I just told you, you ask Paul Twomey on Monday.

>>JON NEVETT: Ask Twomey when gets here.

>>AVRI DORIA: In the meantime, someone from the staff can let Twomey know the question is coming so he maybe can answer it without even having to be asked.

>>OLOF NORDLING: I think we're trying very, very near to the current date actually, so it's not the far future. We're talking about the coming days here.

>>AVRI DORIA: Right.

>>OLOF NORDLING: But so, I think, what we're doing now -- I don't think we will be able to finally weed out things that we perhaps cannot address --

>>AVRI DORIA: And I just wanted to mention --

>>OLOF NORDLING: We can make up some sort of wish list.

>>AVRI DORIA: And I think what I'll do, because I think this is going to be a little too raw to put the whole list up in the public meeting -- obviously the whole list will be up on the recording and in the transcript. I will probably work with Olof after we finish to sort of do an abstraction of policy issues in various areas that would need to be looked at but try and not in the open meeting necessarily go to necessarily the full depth that's in there but we can deal with that. I don't know. That's what I was thinking because I know there were some concerns about making sure that everything is nicely balanced in terms of what we present and not make it a promise and sort of say these are open issues.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: You could just entitle it the highly contentious issue and be done with it? But we haven't had tomorrow's discussion about the scope of contentiousness. Until we have the discussion of contentiousness yes want to go there.

>>OLOF NORDLING: I think it is an aggregated list from Santa Claus.

>>AVRI DORIA: It is, basically, if we go around the room, which we did, it is the list of policy issues that at least one person believes, if not more, believes need to be investigated, not necessarily issued report, not necessarily PDP but investigated is what I'd say, discussed. Right, we need to understand whether there is more we want to do on them.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Right now I would like to proceed, if we can manage to go through all of them and see that we really understand at sort of a second level what we are talking about in all cases. Warehousing of domain names compared to the provisions in the registrar accreditation agreement and provisions adding there, and use of back running. I am not sure I entirely sure what back running is. Is it a well-known term?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I just made it up.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Okay, good.

[Laughter]

>>TIM RUIZ: If we are going to make this public, that's the kind of thing I would like to see defined a little bit. Backrunning implies something bad and we haven't necessarily decided what that is, right?

>>OLOF NORDLING: Well, yeah.

>>TIM RUIZ: [inaudible]

>>ALAN GREENBERG: My creative process was frontrunning was the use of a domain name before it is registered. This is making use of the domain name at the end of the registration.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Sounds like recycling. That's pretty popular in many circles. Sounds like recycling in a certain sense, which is pretty popular in other circles, in a green environment and such.

>>TIM RUIZ: Let's call it domain name recycling.

>> Go green.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Okay. Hopefully we do understand that a bit. What about abusive domain name suspensions I've written. I don't know why and I think it is Mike again. What do I mean with writing that?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: What do I mean by saying that? So, basically, we're talking about where domain names are used in a way that clearly violates registration agreements acceptable use policy. Currently today there is no way to take care of that other than filing an UDRP or suing somebody. Some registrars will act, many will not.

>>OLOF NORDLING: So ways to suspend abusively used domain names. Is that something?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Mike, I think that's a little bit broad. I think what the anti-phishing working group is really specific with phishing, pharming, malware, bots, that kind of thing as opposed to anything that is somewhat defined as abusive.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Obviously I think that is a good first step, but I'm not -- I wouldn't say that I would be willing to narrow it to that at this point.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: I think also in the spirit of Blue Sky thinking, I think what we are trying to suggest here whereas phishing, whatever, may be a reason for concern you would want to do something about, this is looking at the end point which could be the end point of a whole number of things. And what would then be the process of terms of suspension once you've made a judgment because of some issue down the line. So it is trying to look at it from a slightly broader perspective.

>>OLOF NORDLING: All right.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I do not think pharming belongs there. Pharming is not the scope of this issue.

>>TIM RUIZ: [inaudible]

>>AVRI DORIA: Microphones, please.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Acceptable use but it is not only policy.

>>JON NEVETT: There is no consensus policy on acceptable use policies for registrars, so I'm not sure how we could enact a policy that says you have to enforce some kind of AGP that is not required on you.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Well perhaps we need to have an uniform acceptable use policy as a first step.

>>JON NEVETT: Sure. Bring it on.

[Laughter]

>>OLOF NORDLING: Is that what we want to call it?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I would like to have a standard acceptable use policy for e-mail companies, please. Can we add that to the list? I'm just saying, guys, we need to understand there are other issues that are beyond the scope and there should be some market condition and -- yeah, never mind, it is a Blue Sky.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Do we actually, seriously, want to call it uniform acceptable use policy? Is that such a useful term?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I certainly think you can develop a uniform acceptable use policy with some minimum standards.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I would like to add getting ISPs under contract with ICANN.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, Robin. Robin had a comment. I'm trying to let Robin get in here.

>>ROBIN GROSS: I'm just concerned about this suspending domain names. I'm particularly concerned about due process rights. How are we just going to decide you are a bad actor and I'm going to take away your domain name outside of an UDRP action, outside of a court of law? So I just want to flag this as a concern on that issue.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Robin, is it better like that, "uniform acceptable use policy"? Not?

>>ROBIN GROSS: How about something like "while respecting due process of law."

>>OLOF NORDLING: Hmmm.

>>JON NEVETT: Is there some morality of public order we could add in there?

[Laughter]

>>OLOF NORDLING: We can have an objection process for that.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes, Wendy.

>>OLOF NORDLING: This is a popular topic, eh?

>>WENDY SELTZER: Perhaps in counterpoint to that, uniform guaranteed availability policy for the registrant who might be concerned his or her domain name might be suspended arbitrarily under supposed compliance with such a policy.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: All at 6 bucks a domain name.

[Laughter]

>>THOMAS KELLER: And going up.

[Laughter]

>>ROBIN GROSS: I didn't say the word "more formal," I said "due process of law." So that's what the board should say.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'm sorry, contracts -- private contracts do not have to have due process of law. I would --

>>ROBIN GROSS: I don't see "due process" up there anywhere.

>>OLOF NORDLING: You want to have "due process" into 7 somewhere or replacing that? This is becoming complicated.

>>AVRI DORIA: It's becoming complicated and almost silly.

>>OLOF NORDLING: I think we will lead to the next one.

>>AVRI DORIA: Because we're not making policy now. We're just picking topics, and that's just a topic.

>>ROBIN GROSS: Due process of law could be a very good topic.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: That would be great if we are regulated by a government. These are private parties to a contract. There is no -- it should be registrants -- maybe what you're talking about is a registrant rights or what the term that individuals -- Registrant Bill of Rights, maybe that kind of fits that. But due process of law is not really -- I don't even think that should be in there.

>>ROBIN GROSS: Everyone else's issues got in there.

[Laughter]

>>OLOF NORDLING: I think we covered everything in seven.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'm sorry, I don't mean due process shouldn't be in there. I'm just saying due process of law, if this document goes out for public review, I think governments and others might have a harsh reaction to that.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Do not fear, Jeff. I do not think it will, not what it looks like right now at least, as long as I'm alive.

So I think -- let's address. We've got five more minutes. Eight, communications with other parts of ICANN, especially ccNSO, more formal structures to that. Can we argue about that? Apparently not, good.

>>TIM RUIZ: More specifically what I really foresee or would like to foresee is the ability for the GNSO to formally be able to call for a joint policy effort when it makes sense between the ccNSO and the GNSO. If that's kind of encompassed in what's being said up there, great. I'm not sure it is. I just want to be specific.

>>AVRI DORIA: What do you mean "formally call for"?

>>TIM RUIZ: It's not just let's write in the e-mail and we'll set up some meetings and we'll discuss things. If they let us participate, great. And we can send a letter to the board and that kind of gets things all stirred up.

I think what there needs to be, perhaps it is a change in the bylaws with ICANN. We need to be able to say, look, this is not -- we are asserting that this is not strictly a ccNSO issue or it may not be strictly a GNSO issue, that this is a cross-issue and so this calls for a cross-policy development process.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: How about established joint procedure.

>>AVRI DORIA: That could be called on by either NSO.

>>OLOF NORDLING: All right. More formal ability to cooperate to call for cooperative efforts. We understand that.

>>AVRI DORIA: What about people didn't have to hire big-time lawyers to write thousands of pages of paper for them.

>>OLOF NORDLING: It is there somewhere.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: [inaudible]

>>AVRI DORIA: It was there and it got lost.

>>OLOF NORDLING: No, no. Did it get lost? I'm sorry.

>>AVRI DORIA: I don't know. I mean, I've just received enough reports of people complaining to me about the difficulty for individuals that get hit by one of these, you have 30 days to respond and the response, unless you know a lawyer who's willing to do it for you, is an impossible thing.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Did I have it there before.

>>AVRI DORIA: You did you but I think it disappeared.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Okay, sorry.

>>AVRI DORIA: Do them all pro bono, right. I mean, I have a friend that does them pro bono.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Well, something like that UDRP review from an individual strand's perspective.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Perhaps an UDRP public defender?

>> Now we're talking.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Paid for by ICANN.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, right.

>>OLOF NORDLING: I will write that as well. Or ombudsman.

We skipped the 9. No, we didn't. Seek common standard to increase consistency and predictability, I think that was Jeff that mentioned that. Is it captured like that? Number 10 -- no, 9?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: If other people understand it.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Yeah, well. I'm not sure.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Predictability of decision-making by providers.

>>OLOF NORDLING: Jeff, did you want to add that to that, by "by providers"?

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Maybe "UDRP decisions should be."

>>OLOF NORDLING: UDRP decision review.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Decisions.

>>OLOF NORDLING: 10 was to Avri's liking, hopefully? And 11, registry failover in a new gTLD environment which we have plenty of in our top-level domains. We're not very specific about that, but here we go, we've got plenty of others.

>>AVRI DORIA: And it's 5:30. I don't know.

>>OLOF NORDLING: We's reached our time limit. What do we do?

We had at least one more, Number 12.

>>AVRI DORIA: I would just number them through. As I say, I'm not going to -- I'm going to introduce this topic at the meeting. I will do an abstraction. As usual I will send out my slides as I do them so if there is anything in those slides that people are very uncomfortable with -- but I will, basically, do an abstraction of the themes in which there may be policy activities and open it up to discussion.

>>ROBIN GROSS: We haven't had a chance to discuss any of this with our kin. We didn't know there would be an opportunity to do this so we would like to do that during constituency day. Can we then amend this list Tuesday, Wednesday?

>>AVRI DORIA: I think, yes. I think this list is just a first stab in the dark that, you know -- as Olof said at the beginning, eventually we may build a rolling document, but it is a rolling list, as it were. So I think it is going to get amended and amended and amended. And eventually I think the process of going to constituencies and finding a prioritization of what's important and what's not, I think fleshing these things out with more words, I think combining -- I think there is a lot that's going to happen. This was really just a first stab at getting some words down that then -- so, yeah.

>>ROBIN GROSS: Yeah. All I'm saying, this is something our constituency will want to talk about this week so we would want to make amendments this week.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, I don't -- we're not going to actually do much more on this other than open it up to the floor on Wednesday, and I think it will be later in time that we actually do more work on it.

>>CHUCK GOMES: When you say opening it up to the floor, this list?

>>AVRI DORIA: As I said, I'm going to take an abstracted list of the topics under which -- I'll try to abstract it. I'll try to abstract it neutrally. As I say, I will send out to council my slide before I put them up there.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Again, this is nothing more than a brainstorming exercise. It is no commitment to anyone that we would do any of this, that we would do anything.

>>AVRI DORIA: Right.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: It's trying to transform us from reactive to proactive and in order to do that, you have to have this kind of session.

>>AVRI DORIA: Even though it is painful but amusing.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Painfully amusing.

>>AVRI DORIA: Just before I close today, I want to thank you for the day. It was a long day. However, we started at 9:00 this morning. Tomorrow we have a breakfast starting at 8:15 with the meeting starting at 8:45 so the people have time -- obviously, you get there at 8:30 for your breakfast. You get there at 8:15, you grab a dish -- 8:45, you grab a dish and come to the room. Basically, 8:45 we actually start the joint session with ALAC, but the breakfast starts at 8:15.

>> [inaudible]

>>AVRI DORIA: Rodin is the breakfast room and the meeting room is there, too. And then we'll come back down here at 10:30.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Before people take off, those who -- since I was tasked with leading the WHOIS motion drafting for our Wednesday meeting, those that want to work on that, at least stay for a few minutes so we can decide how we are going to do that. And, Liz, if you can do that, too, I would appreciate that.

>>OLOF NORDLING: And to all of you, thank you for creative input to the Blue Sky. We have 22 interesting lines at least.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yep. And the other thing is our Wednesday meeting, just in case people thought 8:15 was too early to start, it gets progressively worse. Our Wednesday meeting starts at 8:00 and that's post-breakfast or without breakfast as the case may be.

[Laughter]

So anyhow, thank you for today. It only gets worse.