EN

BEIJING – BOARD with NCSG
Tuesday, April 09, 2013 – 15:30 to 16:30
ICANN – Beijing, People's Republic of China

ROBIN GROSS: Okay, could we get started, please? Great, thank you. This is the -- my name is Robin Gross, and I'm the chair of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, and this is the meeting of the members of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group and the members of the ICANN board of directors. So thank you very much for having us. We appreciate it.

And we came up with a list of four and if we can possibly add a fifth topic to the agenda, we would really appreciate that.

And the four topics that we suggested was protecting the bottom-up multistakeholder model and the WHOIS privacy issue and new gTLDs and registrant rights and human rights and ICANN policy development. So you can sort of see what our primary concerns are and what are the issues that we wanted to raise with the board of directors.

So if we can get started with our first topic, I'm going to actually ask Avri if she can kick it off -- oh, Ray, yes, I'm sorry.

RAY PLZAK: I just need clarification. You have the word "WHOIS" up there. Are you talking about the current system? If not, would you please change that to the "next generation of directory services." It is an entirely different topic.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

[Laughter]

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you.

Avri, did you want to kick off the discussion on protecting the bottom-up multistakeholder model?

AVRI DORIA: Sure. I think I was sort of struck almost speechless on the WHOIS issue.

On the bottom-up multistakeholderism versus ICANN staff/board unilateralism, now, first of all, I was asked not to use -- actually we were asked perhaps we shouldn't use the word "unilateralism" because we might offend the board and offend the staff. At which point they decided to ask me to be the one to introduce it because why not.

What has seemed to be a problem -- or rather a progression over the years starting a while back with what seemed like a preemptory decision by board and staff and, of course, it is always hard to know where the line is drawn between board and staff on any of these things, with the first issue of, you know, one of the versions of the application guidebook showing up with thick WHOIS required for all new gTLDs. There has never been a policy process on that one.

Then there was the trademark clearinghouse. There had never been a policy process. The changes to the RA, the changes to the RAA, one can argue whether that gets a policy process or not. But there seems to be a progression of changes being made by the board and staff together. As I say, we can only assume it is the board and staff making these

decisions together, that seem to not involve the rest of us in a policy decision.

We may get to comment at the end of the day. But even then it is hard to be sure that those comments really figure in to things because often the decision is hardened before the end of the comment period. The decision seems to be hardened before a report comes out that analyzes the answers and the responses to all the comments that come in.

And, in fact, sometimes I'm not even sure we do get a detailed response to the comments that come in about these new policy issues.

I understand that there's some issue of where does an issue go from being primarily policy to primarily implementation, and we'll be talking about that later. But at the moment, it seems that there are issues that are unquestionably policy issues that are being treated as pure implementation issues. And it seems to be withering the multistakeholder nature of our enterprise.

So that has seemed like a real issue to us and, of course, it has been an issue among others in the GNSO. But in terms of our concerns, it becomes difficult to get our concerns for privacy, for the various freedoms in, when decisions are already made and there's no policy time to talk about it.

So I think that's my introduction to that first issue.

ROBIN GROSS: Great. Thank you very much, Avri.

Do we have any responses, reactions, or comments particularly from the board or really from anyone? This is an open discussion.

STEVE CROCKER: Ray.

ROBIN GROSS: Ray.

RAY PLZAK: First of all, Avri, I would tend to agree with you in certain areas and stuff like that where things have happened that probably should have been referred to a policy process, should have been developed as policy. And I would have agreed with you at the time. I did say so in some regards. But that's neither here nor there. That's happened.

With regards to implementation and policy, just because the policy is done, implementation can't be done in a vacuum.   There is a responsibility that has to occur where the policymakers, i.e., the community, because they are the policymakers, do have to exercise a responsibility with regards to implementation and find good ways of taking on the implementations.

In other words, implementation generally takes the form of processes and procedures.   And if you are not satisfied with the process or procedure that's been developed, then there needs to be a dialogue that starts out on that as well because in the end, a lot of transparency comes from policy -- from procedures and processes. That's how it's shown.

So -- and, also -- there's also responsibility to comment -- and this is probably one of the better forums to do it in -- to comment on the way something that once there is a process, the way it's being followed or not being followed. And so you're perfectly right in saying everything you've said. And you have a lot of empathy from me.

I've said this several times this week already, that the entire community has got to be ready to accept the fact that if something takes a policy to be done to do it, then programmatically you have to be willing to accept the fact that you may have to stop it. You may have to delay it and so on.

And so, of course, that's always the golden opportunity for an obstructionist to stop a program. But responsible policymakers will do that.

And so I think that is incumbent in any policy discussion, to be willing to compromise -- never compromise your principles. But there are a lot of compromises I've seen that could be made that don't get made because people start protecting themselves. So I think a little bit more open dialogue in the policy process helps move us forward and does away with stalemates.

So in the end, I really agree with a lot of what you said in principle. I don't necessarily want to go into any particulars because in my mind, what's done is done. Let's learn, and let's move forward and get something done the right way.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you.

>>   I just wanted to comment. Avri gave a pretty good general look at this process. And I want to make -- first I would just like to say, I support all of the things Avri said and she mentioned a lot of different processes. This is both issues with the multistakeholder model and also with a lot of things both in principle and in the application where those things are getting filtered through staff comment in a way that we're beginning to find losers, the original multistakeholder view.

I would like to focus on one specific issue just to illustrate how the problem seems to have reached a sort of level, which is the straw man solution in the trademark clearinghouse.

In particular, you will hear a bit more about what has been called the trademark +50. The recommendation for the domain name labels previously abuse registered. I'm looking at the straw man solution memo, the 3rd of December, 2012. And it says straight out -- it says straight out that this process -- actually, I'm probably looking at the wrong name, sorry. I'm looking at the one -- but the issue here is that the GNSO clearly identified some of the proposals as something that needed to be discussed by the GNSO as policy.

Then the ALAC also agreed specifically, said that these were issues that needed to be discussed by the GNSO as policy. And what do we get? We ended up with an analysis from the ICANN, the memo said -- sorry, the memo of 20th of March, 2013 is what I am looking at. The element of the proposal was referred to the GNSO. The GNSO advice should be a policy discussion.

And then straight on goes having reviewed and balanced all feedback, this appears to be a reasonable add-on, we are going to implement it.

ICANN actually sent us a memo saying, This should be a GNSO policy discussion. But we're just going to do it without any GNSO policy discussion.

We -- acknowledging the problem does not seem to be enough. We need to actually have some sort of -- something more than acknowledgment of the problem. The problem is very obvious. Thanks.

BRUCE TONKIN: Just on that specific point -- I don't think Fadi is in the room. I think Fadi did answer this question on the weekend. You guys don't want to respond, okay.

>> I could take two more quick things. One, this is not just the NCSG speaking. This is something we definitely -- concern shared with our GNSO colleagues that we have been discussing extensively.

The other thing is if the problem really is you are really afraid of the years' long PDP, certainly I think we would be -- GNSO would be prepared to discuss ways that we can come up with some multistakeholder input more urgently.

ROBIN GROSS: I've got Thomas and then Avri.

THOMAS NARTEN: Thanks. Just one point I was going to bring up is ICANN published a paper on this topic. And nobody has mentioned it today as far as I can

recall. I'm just kind of curious whether people have looked at it and have -- whether it is viewed as a positive contribution on this. It is on the topic of policy versus implementation, and it explores this space in quite a lot of detail.

AVRI DORIA: I will comment on that because I certainly did read the paper. I thought it was a good contribution. I even commented on it. I certainly don't think it's ready for prime time yet, but it is certainly a good place to start the discussion. It goes into a lot of the issues.

I think one of the issues is -- and as I mentioned, if you notice when I was speaking, that we sort of go from a place at the beginning where it's mostly policy but somewhat implementation we're talking about from day zero.

And at the end, it's mostly implementation but there is still some policy that we're talking about at the end. And while I don't go as far as Wolfgang has gone in other conversations to say there is no "versus" because they are definitely things that are sometimes in contradiction with each other that need to have something arranged, they are two processes that do work together. And I think that paper brings out a lot of interesting things, and it is good to start.

One of the things that's not clear to me -- first of all, there's two things. And I think it is good that Fadi made a comment and Fadi has taken certain responsibility for things.

One, I think that the process precedes Fadi. And I think if we are being fair, he came into an environment where we already had a habit of

implementation being jumped at because we didn't want to spend the time in the process. He came in and just made the process more effective.

But I don't think he was the first one to do it. And, also, in looking at that paper, while that starts a good discussion, I'm not sure that it solves the problem yet. I don't yet see anything that sort of says and I'm not going to be able to end another chapter to the end of the list.

And I guess one last comment I have to Ray is those things happened in the past but they aren't all done deals yet.

RAY PLZAK: I agree.

AVRI DORIA: Right. So I'm not quite ready to say, you know, it happened and I'm ready to sit with it. I think a lot of those issues, all of those issues --

RAY PLZAK: And I'm not either.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Ray. That was my last on it. Thanks.

ROBIN GROSS: Okay. So I see Mike and I see Bruce and then we'll move onto the next topic. Okay.

MIKE SILBER: Mike Silber. Recognizing that mistakes have been made --

ROBIN GROSS: Sorry, can you speak closer to the microphone.

MIKE SILBER: Sorry. I'm not used to swallowing the mic. Recognizing that mistakes have been made, sometimes out of pure frustration, I think we also have to acknowledge that we generally don't have any stupid people in our staff. And having seen things come and go in other processes, it doesn't necessarily mean that they have to start a process from the beginning just simply because the issue is slightly different, that they actually can take input that's already been given on the same topic previously or on similar and related topics and can consolidate some of that coming into the process going forward.

And I think that this suggestion that staff is usurping the process is oftentimes staff actually using a bit of an initiative and taking input that has already been obtained and already been given and then extrapolating that into the process because they're not fools. They're actually cutting out months of work by taking the process going forward. And I think we are being unfair on them by suggesting that's top-down. It is taking bottom-up from a different process and using it as an input into a process that's now ongoing.

I don't think staff wake up in the morning and think "how can we upset people today" and then make things up.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, Robin. Just a comment. I think the general theme of your message is consistent that we've heard from every GNSO stakeholder group today. So, you know, I think you can accept the board as heard the concern.

I think it's also true that the board recognizes that as an issue. In fact, that's why we're having a session on Wednesday, tomorrow, on this topic of policy and implementation. And I think the key messages I've heard so far, which I think have been good, which go back to the weekend GNSO council meeting as well as the stakeholder group meetings, and that is that the GNSO looks at policy and implementation. And then I think what the GNSO constituencies or stakeholder groups have been saying is that as the policy is implemented, at different points, particularly when major changes are being made, it's appropriate to go back to the GNSO and seek some potential, some advice or some feedback.

Where we need to work it out end to end, though, is actually make sure we have a clear process and timelines for how that works. Because clearly, you know, the board has asked the staff to implement the gTLD program. At different points the staff has probably been afraid to send some things back to the GNSO because it feels that that might add six months, a year's delay, and so a lot of these things are interdependent. So I think you can lay out a process and say, I think we can all agree that the GNSO stakeholder group should be consulted as the project goes from the high-level policy into the implementation. But at the same time, there needs to be certain commitments from the stakeholder groups to be able to respond in a timely manner so that an overall project can be implemented. So those are sort of the tensions, I think,

and hopefully we'll flesh that out some more tomorrow. But I just want to be clear, we're hearing you. If you're thinking the board looks a bit passive it's because it's been hearing this all day and has got the message, and we recognize it's a problem.

ROBIN GROSS: Great. Thank you very much, Bruce. I want to turn it over to Wendy to queue us up on the second topic, please.

WENDY SELTZER: Great. And accept the revision of the subject to the new gTLD directory services and privacy because we very much welcome the board's commitment to rethink the provision -- the collection and provision of domain name registration data from the ground up and include privacy in that review.

Our concern is that the -- the group seems -- has only one privacy expert on it and while we very much welcome the input that we're seeing from Stephanie Perrin, it would be problematic if that were the only privacy input. So want to encourage the group and the board, if necessary, to provide avenues for other privacy input as well.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you, Wendy. Ray.

RAY PLZAK: First of all, to your concern, the output of this group is not going to be a policy, it's not going to be a process, it's not going to be a guidebook, it's

going to be one thing and one thing only if it's done right and it's able to get to the point, it's going to be information that's going to get fed into the GNSO for policy discussion.

Now, this group was formed by the CEO to gather data and gather facts so that issues could be framed. The session was conducted yesterday and so that other privacy experts, among others, could make comment and put it into the process. There was also an invitation from that group yesterday and URLs and so forth were presented so that more information could be fed into it. They certainly want to get as much input as they can. As Bertrand pointed out earlier today, this is not a representative group. Everybody can't be representative. It's a multistakeholder model. You know, it's not a representative model. And therefore, stakeholders have got to contribute. I would have liked to have been one of the board liaisons to this group but I wasn't chosen to do so. But I took the avenue that was given to me to make comments, and I spent a lot of time at the microphone yesterday doing so. So I would encourage others to do the same thing.

So there's no attempts that's been made here, as far as I can determine when Fadi put this group together, to shut people out or anything else like that. And so take the opportunity to keep on commenting, putting stuff in. You did make some very good contributions yesterday, and I hope they weren't the last ones you're going to make.

ROBIN GROSS: Thanks, Ray. Would anyone else like to speak on this topic?

STEVE CROCKER: I guess I can add a little bit. The -- the composition of the Expert Working Group is intended to make sure that we've got the major sources of expertise. It's not a representation or a constituency-driven operation because the output of it is not a decision, it's not a policy. As Ray said, it's intended to help frame those processes and kick them off in hopefully an orderly way.

The privacy issues, law enforcement issues, abuse issues, efficiency and cost of operation, various other pragmatic issues, understanding of how registrars operate, understanding how registries operate, understanding the underneath -- underlying technologies, all of those are important and all of those are represented in various ways by the people that were chosen. And it's only a rough correspondence and not intent to be a faithful correspondence with the constituencies that we have within the ICANN structure.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you, Steve. Okay. I don't see anyone else in the queue on this, so maybe we can move to the next topic, registrant rights. And Wendy, if you could sort of queue us up on that, I'd appreciate it.

WENDY SELTZER: Thanks. We've heard a lot at this meeting about the negotiation of contracts, both the registry agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, and I understand from the registrars that the Registrar Accreditation Agreement negotiation is relatively concluded. Yet these agreements are the foundations of any rights that registrants have as users of this system and we've been unrepresented in these

EN

negotiations. The attached statement of registrants rights and responsibilities that was posted along with the most recent draft of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement is a very, very weak statement of rights. The right is apparently the right to know who your registrar is and to see posted terms of service. We think that that needs to be quite a bit stronger as a statement that registrants of domain names have the right to non-discriminatory treatment. Some of these are already in existence in other places in policy. A right to have the name persist until it's suspended with full due process in place, a right to timely transfer and renewal, rights to privacy in the provision and display of registration data, and no censorship of the domain use or the content or communications there by the contracted parties.

And then so we think that a much more robust statement of these rights, some of which are guaranteed by underlying law or principles of law or human rights, others of which should be guaranteed through the ICANN process representing all of those who have interests in the Domain Name System as a communications platform.

And then along with that, responsibilities of the registrants to help in preventing abuse and to be contactable in the case of problems with their domain names fit naturally.

So we think that it will be important for the GNSO council to review these agreements because of the important policy role that they have, and we look forward to doing that before they become final and binding documents.

ROBIN GROSS: Great. Thanks so much for that, Wendy.

                                Do we have any reaction or comments on this topic? From anyone?
                                Yes, Kathy.

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: Kathy Kleiman, and you'll be hearing more from Wendy and from the
                                noncommercial stakeholders group on the registrant rights because this
                                is very important. And our group is largely registrants. We have a lot
                                of, you know, domain names. And these are well thought out ideas that
                                will be coming to you.

                                I want to raise something new based on something I just learned last
                                night which is there's a group of registries negotiating the base registry
                                agreement. You can't hear me? Okay. Move closer. Then I'll really be
                                echoing.   And there's a group of registries negotiating in the base
                                registry agreement, and this seems to be a little different than the RAA.
                                The base registry agreement does not have any existing parties on both
                                sides. It's part of the Applicant Guidebook. And it was negotiated by
                                the community.   And to the extent that there are changes being
                                negotiated, that particular team should probably be very diverse. And
                                I'd strongly recommend it. You know, if there's a way to encourage it
                                being diverse, that would be very useful because there are a number of
                                rights involved with it, including registrant rights. And I know that has
                                to go through quickly and that's going to be going through rapidly. That
                                one really should have representation.

ROBIN GROSS: Thanks, Kathy. Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you. Wolfgang Kleinwachter. I want to add one dimension. In the joint meeting between the GNSO council and the GAC, the chairman of the GNSO council, Jonathan, said to the GAC that while the governments have certain responsibility towards the citizens, the GNSO has a special responsibility to the registrants and we have a shared responsibility here. And because registrants are also citizens and we have to work hand-in-hand between the governments and the constituencies of the GNSO council.

This brings me to the point that while the main role of the governments with regard to their citizens is just not to give them the rights but to protect the rights of the citizens. I think this is an important thing. That it's the duty of the governments to protect the rights of the citizens. And if you take this model to the relationship between the registries and registrars and their relationship to registrants, then it's the main -- or an important task of registries or registrants to protect the rights of the registrants. I think this is the way we should approach it and we have two less invested in the past to be more clear what are the natural rights of registrants. And so this is a great opportunity to move forward and to add more to the plan to have such a charter. Thank you.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you, Wolfgang. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I'm just going to tie this a little bit to the first topic, the kind of unilateralism. I mean, we were kind of baffled or non-plussed when this document came out. It's like, where did this come from? The

registrants rights and responsibilities, 7th March 2013 document, the concept of rights here, really this clearly was not written by, was not made with any consultation from, or in no way reflects anything that a registrant would actually be interested in. This is about people who want to regulate registrants, negotiating with registrar services providers about whatever disputes they have. And I just want to know, how does that happen? Because one of the things about the unilateralism issues is not just that there's a process breakage but that the process is always broken for the same reasons in ways that serve the same interests. And so here it is again, and it's just -- it really is a question. It's just where did this document come from? What were people thinking when they prepared this. And why didn't they actually consult, you know, the people who represent individual rights of registrants in the formation of it?

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you, Milton. Do we have any response, anyone who -- from board or staff who could maybe answer the question? Anyone know where the document came from?

SAMANTHA EISNER: Hi. This is Samantha Eisner from staff. The document actually was drafted by the registrars as part of the negotiation, so the -- this document was created by the registrars. That's where it came from. And one of the important things to note about it is that the document actually has -- it's tied to specific obligations within the agreement. And so there's -- there's a nexus to it. I know we don't have reference to

underlying policy or to other legal standards or declarations of human rights, but it's tied to specific obligations in the agreement.

ROBIN GROSS: Thanks. If I could just follow up on that, I think that really needs to be made more clear because it doesn't appear to -- it appears to portray itself as a list of the -- all of the rights a registrant would have when they register a domain name, but it sounds like you're just saying it's just as pertains to this contract and I think that's a really important thing to -- distinction to make.

Wendy.

WENDY SELTZER: Just to follow up on that, I -- when I heard Fadi refer to it in the opening ceremony statement, I went to look for what is this exciting document that will present a registrant's bill of rights, and when I found that it was only this white anodyne statement of terms and conditions, I thought we really need the bill of rights document and would be happy to propose one.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. Just to give a little bit of history on it, too, Robin, there is actually existing a summary of the rights and responsibilities of registrants. It's actually been on the ICANN Web site for years, I think. And that was a very legal description of what essentially was in the registrar accreditation agreement as it pertained to registrants.

I think the latest draft that's gone ahead with the -- or has been presented with the RAA was an attempt to simplify that a little bit and have something that -- the intent was that registrars should make it readily available to registrants, et cetera. But I think the point's rightly made that it is really as it pertains to that agreement, not a wider set.

Just a suggestion. If you look at what the GAC did in the early days of looking at both WHOIS and new gTLDs, they developed a set of principles, and one of the things that might be really useful, I guess, on either of the topics on the registrant rights and human rights and so on would be for the noncommercial constituency perhaps to work with the ALAC and create some principles around registrant rights. And I think if you created those as principles, then those principles could be used when we're looking at the policy development process.

So, you know, just something to think about.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you.

Okay. Not seeing any other hands on this topic, let's move on to the next topic, human rights and ICANN policy development, and I was going to ask Joy Liddicoat if she could get us started on this topic. Thanks.

JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Robin. Joy Liddicoat, for the record.

And just wanting to step back a little, actually, from some of the matters of the day that you've been discussing and take a slightly more strategic look at some of the trajectory of human rights discussion in ICANN.

This is sort of to look at some developments that have happened since we last met with the board.

And in particular, the independent objector has released a number of public comments in response to the submissions received on new gTLD applicants, and really, we just wanted to reflect back that we've been particularly encouraged by sort of the quality of the comments that the independent objector has made.

We know that this is a -- this is a particularly experimental mechanism for dealing with public interest objections to new gTLDs, and we think that it's quite clear from the independent objector's comments that he's taking very seriously the objections that have been raised. He's applied a broad-based public interest legal approach to the objections he's been considering, and I think that it's a very helpful contribution to the wider human rights discourse in ICANN, for which perhaps historically we've been a little -- for some, a fear when the thought of human rights has been raised in relation to the very technical mandate that ICANN has.

So we're year encouraged by that. We think it's a good development.

We see that the results are a public comment period opened on the closed generics issues, and while our community does have quite divergent views on closed generics, I think nonetheless it was encouraging to see this referred to the independent objector and to have his input into the ongoing community debate.

So really just wanted to reflect that, ask if the board's had any opportunity to look at that at the meta level. I'm not asking the board to comment on particular applications at all, but sort of that mechanism and how it's working.

And I have one follow-up matter, but perhaps just to deal with that one first and open it up for discussion.

Thank you.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you very much, Joy.

Do we have any reactions or comments on this topic, please? Yes, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: It's maybe too broad, my comment, but I think we are in the very early phase in understanding all the interconnections between the area of our interest and public interest discussion, closed generic human rights. Even the topics you mentioned before on data privacy relate to it, and many more. I think it's a very, very -- very early phase, and like it is always in technology development, when you look back, it's -- in different other areas, it will be very interesting to see how individual cases will play out. That's why in my view, I looked at the objections and the comments from the independent evaluator as well, how he observed this. So I think it will be very interesting how this process will shape out.

I mean, there are many, many ways of shaping it in the process, but for me personally, I have a deep interest in the public interest -- the question if one can, for example, define "public interest."

I do have my doubts. I think there are certain ways of approaching the topic, but to come to a clear definition is probably very hard.

The same, it's very hard with human rights. There are certain connections which are automatically given by law, by international law, for example, when you look into certain definitions on privacy rights. There are already some cases on the Internet, and when you take international laws into consideration, there are already certain connections made, but in other areas, it's probably very, very hard and difficult.

So I think it will be coming back to, then, the point Bruce raised.

To the Bullet Point 3, I think it will be -- and on Bullet Point 4 important as well -- really, to define the process very carefully and then to evaluate it, and then I'm sure over time, you know, we will -- we all together will define it, and -- but very important and relevant, of course, that you -- I mean you yourself are as concrete as possible and as legal -- you know, as legal -- you know, legally as -- you know, as you can be as well.

I mean I'm sorry I'm very vague, and this defines probably the topic we are talking about to some degree as well.

WALID AL-SAQAF: Walid Al-Saqaf, an ICANN fellow and netizen.

The thing is that in human rights, when we think about it in terms of the owners of domains, like myself, I find that ICANN, although it deals with IPs and domain names and aspects of technical nature, could actually look into the impact that filtering could have on domain owners, particularly when there is lack of transparency.

And if you are going to talk about multistakeholders, the main biggest chunk of stakeholders are the users, and if we were to look into the interests of users, we need to understand that they need to be informed when they access a Web site and learn that this Web site is filtered for a particular reason.

So I'd like that ICANN pushes the agenda of transparency and letting users, as well as domain owners, know that the filtering happens for a legal reason, perhaps; that they're not being in the dark or being misled because that creates some doubt in the minds of users and owners of domains.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you very much. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. This is a difficult area because much of what you've just said focuses on Web sites, and while domain names are commonly used for the addresses of Web sites, there is a sharp distinction between a domain name and a -- the use of a particular domain name as a support for the Web.

Domain names are used for e-mail addresses, they're used for service centers -- service sites and all sorts of things, and the -- this is really a protocol layering issue that I'm alluding to here.

There's -- it's not the first time that filtering applied to domain names has been used in -- as an attempt to prevent access to Web sites. A lot of legislative efforts in the U.S. and other parts of the world. And it's quite troublesome because it is the wrong level to get at whatever the issues are.

ROBIN GROSS: Thank you, Steve. Any comments? Questions? Yes, Joy.

JOY LIDDICOAT: Thanks. No. Just as a follow-up -- and thanks, Erika, for your comments. I don't think -- I'm not at all bothered that they were at a particularly high level. I think that's appropriate for a meeting like this. And just really wanted to encourage the board to -- you know, I think that basically those objector comments we've seen so far really strengthen, if you like, the public interest provisions that were laid out in the guidebook that were so keenly fought over in the community, in the community development process of that, and it's interesting that at the end of the day the independent objector has refuse- -- you know, the preliminary decision is not to launch objections and I think that's a very rights-friendly approach and I think it's quite encouraging. So I think -- or that's my view, anyway.

The only other follow-up I've got is I believe at the last session that the NCSG had with the board, there was some discussion about ICANN

considering membership or joining the Global Network Initiative, and I was just wondering if there's any update on that.

Perhaps -- I don't know if Fadi is able to comment on that or not.

ROBIN GROSS: Anyone want to respond?

STEVE CROCKER: So Fadi, that was directed at you, if you want to.

I'll ask the embarrassing question.   What is the Global Network Initiative?

JOY LIDDICOAT: The Global Network Initiative is basically a consortium of global corporations which have a certain commitment to upholding human rights. It's an initiative that's grown out of the work of John Ruggie, the special rapporteur on human rights and business. It's a private sector initiative, particularly for organizations that have sort of public purview, and it's one that seemed to fit comfortably in the mandate of a corporation like ICANN.

I think we've raised it on a few occasions now, encouraging the board to consider the -- ICANN's participation in the Global Network Initiative, and just really wondering about an update.

But I wasn't at the last meeting in Toronto, so perhaps someone else could correct me if I'm wrong on that.

ROBIN GROSS: Thomas?

THOMAS NARTEN: Yeah. I mean just a simple question. Is there a written proposal to do this? I mean because I'm just questioning who would have taken an action to follow up on this.

JOY LIDDICOAT: Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. There was discussion in the Toronto meeting, and I think Fadi suggested that he will work on that, but I think there is no update.

JOY LIDDICOAT: I'm not aware that it's a written proposal. I understand it was a verbal exchange with a verbal indication of follow-up, so it's really just an update that we're seeking. That's all.

ROBIN GROSS: Mike?

MIKE SILBER: If I may, our CEO tends to have about 700 action items around him. Write it down.

JOY LIDDICOAT: Sure, Mike. We'll do that.

ROBIN GROSS:	Great. Any other comments?
	Well, we've gone through the issues on our -- on our agenda. I thought we -- we've gone through the issues on our agenda. Was there anything -- any other issues people wanted to raise?
	Kathy, was there an issue that you wanted to raise?
KATHRYN KLEIMAN:	I think I already did, with the registry -- base registry agreement. I just shoved it in there early.
ROBIN GROSS:	Okay. Thanks. Any other comments?
	Great. Okay. Well, thank you very much. We really appreciate your time listening to us.
STEVE CROCKER:	Thank you, Robin.
	[Applause]

[End of Session]