

---

CR - Geographic Regions Review WG

Thursday, March 15, 2012 – 12:00 to 13:00

ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

David Archbold:

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. I'm sorry we started a bit late, but it wasn't our fault. Welcome to the workshop for the Geographic Regions Working Group. The agenda for this afternoon is very flexible. We have received feedback from many parts of the community. The Working Group has not had an opportunity yet to go through those in detail, and so I'm not in a position to say what the Working Group's reaction to all of it is, or what it will be doing.

Clearly, we are going to be meeting over the next few weeks. We'll produce the final report, which will then be circulated to each of the SOs and ACs for their formal comment. That formal comment will then accompany the report to the Board, so that's the procedure.

I'm open to suggestions on how people want to proceed. What I have got is the Public Comment Issue Tracking Sheet that we have got, which is try to highlight the main issues that have happened or comments that have been made. I am happy to put that up on the screen and we can use that as a basis for going through and touching on various comments, or I am happy to throw the floor open and you can raise any questions/issues that you want. Can I get a feel for what you would rather do – up on the screen?

Marilyn Cade:

My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm with the Business Constituency, for those of you who don't, but I know you are used to seeing me at the

---

*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.*

microphone, so you probably recognize the back of my head. I just have a question about you said, okay? I bring Zayed's regrets - he had a conflict.

When you said that the final report would be sent to the... I need to understand whether you are saying it will go out for ICANN-supported public comments, or it is going to be directed to GNSO Council, or the GNSO, since those are two different things. They're related to each other, but the GNSO is a bunch of constituencies, so I just need to understand where you're sending the report.

David Archbold:

Rob, you're poised there to answer that in detail.

Rob Hoggarth:

Not necessarily poised, but I'm happy to try and flush out of it. According to the charter of the working group, the final report is shared with the SOs and ACs. In the case, for example of the GNSO, it doesn't specify the Council, but it would go across all. And then presumably after that - once the Board receives the compiled package - it may choose to instruct staff to pose for another public comment period - that would be their decision.

Marilyn Cade:

To the point of clarification, what that says to me is, it will go to... because there is a list that has all of the AC and SO - including the ALAC -

---

but it is not open to the general public. It is within - and I'm not questioning that, - I just thank you for that clarification.

Dave Archbold:

The public consultation period is essentially over. We are producing a final report, and everybody else has opportunity to comment on that, and that comment will accompany the report to the Board. Is everybody clear?

Okay, I put on the screen, starting at the top. I can make some comments on each as we go down. If people wish to amplify or ask questions, please stick your hand up.

First one asks about the ongoing scenario with the RIR. There is no suggestion that I have had from the Working Group that there will be any ongoing link between the regional structure and the RIR, so the proposal is to use the RIR current structure as a starting point for any proposed changes. Thereafter; no continuing association is my understanding. Any comments, questions on that one?

Marilyn Cade:

Is it okay if I save my questions til after we go through all of these and then maybe others will answer?

Dave Archbold:

Okay. 1.2 – ALAC says the current framework should be maintained. It asserts that aligning the regions to the RIR model “does not enhance diversity. It will not ensure international representation in the current

---

model.” My comment on that is that I don’t get from the... this is a summary of what the ALAC submitted. I have difficulty understanding the point here so...

Speaker:

I will explain it to you. The RIR, the model, will not enhance the diversity; which is the origin aimed of the geographic region and ICANN. Why? Because this model will put Iran and Europe, and in this case the difference between Iran and the European countries in terms of access and in terms of competencies, etc., will make the Iranians not have any chance to be on the Board anymore, and then I am talking about Iran, but there is Iran, Kuwait, etc., etc. There is no rationale to bring those countries to Europe at all.

Second point - the proposal you made according to the real model will bring other problems - problems related to sovereignty - and the big problem of the Malvinas of the Falklands; which is really bothering us. We have people from all over the world in ALAC, and we know that people are really worried about this point.

Dave Archbold:

I think there is a big difference between the definition, if you like, of a country and territory which we are not touching. That is still coming from the [ISN] standard - not being changed in any size, shape or form. We’re not getting involved in the finding of what is country, and what is a territory. It is only an allocation, so to me I don’t see the big political issue there.

---

Marilyn Cade: If you don't mind, it's Marilyn speaking. Can I just clarify what we're doing? I heard you rebutting a comment, and I'm happy to debate my points of view with you as the Chair, but I thought what I was doing was expanding and explaining the question. Is that okay?

Dave Archbold: Yeah, fine.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I will support very strongly the statement just made by the ALAC, and I may support others of their comments, because that is actually exactly the same problem that we see as business. So perhaps as we go through this, what I will hope to do is just clarify where we agree with these concerns, because my understanding is that your report will be taking these comments, these comments, yes. So my purpose is just to say I support that were expressed by the ALAC and that is how the Business Constituency sees this as well. Thank you.

Dave Archbold: I understand that. What I'm trying to do is to get a better understanding of those views.

Marilyn Cade: That's what I needed to understand is do you wanted me to tell you if I agree with this, or did you want me to explain more?

Dave Archbold: I'm very happy for you all to explain more.

Marilyn Cade: I guess I'm not quite sure from reading the report and watching the work, what business problem is being solved at ICANN, and I don't mean business problem, but "business problem," because the implications of these changes on representation and on opportunities for citizens from countries that might end up being moved to another region, may have very significant impact actually, on their participation in various parts of ICANN.

And that was the point I was saying to you is we have not been able to really trickle down on the recommendations to the end impact if for us, we find that it's very helpful sometimes for certain countries that have a negative view of the internet to be in a region with colleagues to share cultural and geographic technical challenges, *etc.*, and moving them into an extremely well developed region.

While that might work for purposes of IP allocations... and I used to advise AT&T on their participation in ERIN, that doesn't work in terms of non-IP address allocation. I'm not sure that the example scales into the rest of ICANN - that model scales - because of some other implications.

Dave Archbold: I think I'm beginning to understand a bit, but remember - there is no doubt in the mind of the Working Group, or of the majority of people

that we have discussed this with, that the present regional structure has a number of failings, both legal - because it hasn't been ratified by the Board at any time; and practical in that, for example, the Cayman Islands is associated with Europe, which to us is ludicrous.

And I just use that because it's mine and nobody can argue about that. So we were looking - and half looked at initially - looked for some external reference point, and could find no acceptable external reference point. Found this one as a starting point, and it is only... nobody has said and nobody is making anybody go anywhere. And I think one of the things that we've got to discuss is whether there is an opt-in, or an opt-out, because it's quite different. I've got lots of hands going up.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Hello I'm Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I am not a member of this Working Group, and thank you for allowing me to say a few words. When I was on the Board, I had the pleasure of chairing the CCNSO review; which isn't quite the same, but there is some relationship with what you're discussing.

I'd like to make a couple of remarks. The first is that viewed at a distance, now that I'm no longer on the Board, it's interesting to view this at a distance, and what strikes me is that the imperfection of this Geographic Allocation System is such that I can only consider it as very temporary, which means two things.

---

First, we have to improve it as best we can for the unknown duration of the system. In other words, that is the damage control part. But the second remark about that is I think one should cast one's net much wider than that. I don't know if that's the remit of this Working Group, but at a certain point it will be necessary to cast the nets further afield in order to have perhaps more innovative thinking about the whole concept.

So I did notice, Chair, that you said this is a starting point. You mentioned this several times, I agree on that point at least that it is a starting point. But I find - and this I say in defense of the ALAC position which you have just reminded us of - that rather than going into something which is even less perfect, or even more damageable in the case of the Middle East countries being included in Europe for reasons which Marilyn has pointed out very ably, I think that we in the ALAC tend to view this from the general internet user point of view, and that's important I think, in other words from the point of view of the global public interest as risky.

So for those reasons also - and in addition to supporting what has been said by the two previous speakers - I'd say that it's better to keep the very imperfect system we have now rather than tamper with it to arrive at what will in any case be a provisional solution and which will be in my mind worse. Thank you.

Pablo Hinojosa:

Well, I think I'm the only one from the RIR community here and, first of all I think the work in the report has been very extensive, as you saw in



---

our comments made in different sessions like this one - in our written comments and on the working group list.

The work in this report is comprehensive. It includes the history of the process. I think it includes a very good diagnosis of the problem, and it also concludes that there is always the need to have an artificial, discretionary, and ultimately make some decisions on these, and there will always be, sort of someone that will not agree with this approach.

I think that the decision that the Working Group took is a very good one because it says let's have a starting point and flexibility for [it to go], but in a limited way sort of that it settles with time, and I think it was a very good proposal.

From the RIR point of view, on one hand we felt sort of honored that our approach to regions was considered as a good starting point for this. However, as we have said repeatedly, this model has not evolved or developed, or was proposed to address the particular concerns or principles about the diversity of the Board and the needs of ICANN representation. This model evolved for very different other types of reasons.

So the report says, "Let's start with the RIR model and let's leave space for sort of changes and then let's fix it." I think that there is the chance to improve clarity on that approach - and we will also feel, I think, the RIRs - we [the view] that it's just that the RIR model is just a parameter of reference and it should not be evaluated as a good or a bad model - it is just a useful thing that has been referred to.

---

So that's basically a repetition of what the RIRs have said and also in some way made this disclaimer that there is no interest whatsoever of the RIR to push a particular model and that we don't think that this model is made or may address all of the interests of having good representation of diversity at the Board.

So with all of that said I just think that the report could be more clear on that - there is a starting point, that there is some flexibility and that the RIR model is a parameter of reference and it's not the model to be thought as good or bad. I just found that the Working Group look at it as useful, and I would like just not to expand a lot on whether the RIR model is good or not, because it was not created for this. Thanks.

Martin:

Thanks and I'll add my apologies for not being a Working Group member and thank you for letting me speak. I must admit I actually do think that the points that ALAC has made in this instance are actually quite important points and do have to be taken very, very seriously. And I think one of the things that's actually worrying me is that - and somebody did use the words - that there is a National Sovereignty issue here, and National Sovereignty is always a difficult issue. So I think we need to see this is in the context of National Sovereignty.

When you get to the ccNSO comments; they have made a very specific reference to the need being opt-in rather than it just being *de facto* unless you actually say you don't want to, and there's a specifically good reason for that. There are an awful lot of counties on your list that you are moving from region-to-region that I have never, ever seen in ICANN.

---

They probably can't even spell it, and therefore, you have to leave them to opt-in to the region that is relevant to them, when or if they ever do join ICANN. Thank you.

Dave Archbold:

Interesting and can I just make a comment there - and it's a personal comment, just discussing it. It is precisely because of the countries that don't come to ICANN that tends to make me personally want to go to an opt-out rather than an opt-in, because one of the reasons we think they're not coming to ICANN is that they feel no affinity with the region that they're in. I think the Working Group as a whole has noted the whole question of the opt-in or opt-out, and that's one of the big huge discussions that we're going to have, so I'm not trying to anticipate.

Martin:

May I specifically respond to that, have you actually got any factual information to bear that out? Frankly I don't think it should be a regional problem. If you can find a way of getting a country interested and then they turn around from their ccTLD community, from the ALAC community, and identify themselves with a particular region, then that should be good enough for us. But that should follow on from the fact that they have got interested, and I don't really believe that the regions are a barrier to doing that, but if you've got factual information to show otherwise, I'd like to see it.

Dave Archbold:

To answer the question, I honestly can't remember.

Marilyn Cade:

Dave, it's Marilyn. I think it's helpful to share an experience ICANN had before it was born about the difference between opt-out and opt-in. Seven or eight people, including a representative of a regional intergovernmental organization and a representative of two IGOs met with a few people from the community and developed something called the gTLD-MOU and they posted it somewhere with a list of 300 entities who needed to opt-out, and if they didn't opt-out, then they were going to move the A-root server to the ITU tower in Geneva. Most of the companies on that list had never heard of this issue or this question. So it's either good news or bad news that AT&T starts with A and we had heard of it.

Opt-out does not work. So you know, maybe the fact that my company at the time, the company I worked for at the time, knew what was going on and became involved and helped to enlist other companies raise the question about whether that was the right approach. The question about that led to the green paper and the white paper and blah, blah, blah - the good news is being NewCo and then ICANN. But if we had taken the opt-out model, we would have had a crisis, and the answer would have been you should have opted out.

Pablo Hinojosa:

Let's agree on something. We have a system based of rationales when the Geographic Region was implemented in ICANN - that was a rationale - it was to made of lingual diversity inside both. So let's give this target, this goal, let's keep it and build on it. If the system that we will give as

---

an improvement of the actual system doesn't improve the diversity, the cultural and lingual diversity inside the Board, we don't have to go with it. I don't say that the RIR model is bad - for the use of the RIR it's very good, it works. But I don't see why we change a system by another and say it is a starting point.

I have a car, I drive a car, and I find it is not powerful enough, so I say, "I have to change it for something more powerful." Let's take a military tank - it's not used for that, and the RIR model is not used for the purpose of ICANN [unification]. I am not against it, but I again I say we need to have always in mind the target, which is to improve the diversity inside the Board.

Second point, the ALAC is the voice of the end users, and so we are aware of the interests of those people, and it is the interests of those people that we are expressing here. That's why we want the system to be interesting for those people. Thank you.

Male:

I'm the remote participation manager for this session as well, and Darlene Thompson provided a comment. I think it's a little behind, only because of timing in my part in the queue. She said a good example of this is Armenia. They are an APRALO, but all of their ties are with EURALO. They do not wish to participate in a RALO if they are limited to being an APRALO for obvious reasons. Thank you, Darlene.

Wolf Ludwig:

Yes, thank you for this. My name is Wolf Ludwig; I'm representing EURALO here at this conference and I would like to thank Darlene who just by remote participation made this valid contribution which is a constant discretion at EURALO since at least three to four years.

There are so many cases - just to give an example of references - when I see how many countries are members of the Council of Europe. We have two big institutions - we have EU, Europeans Union where even Switzerland is not necessarily a member, but doesn't cover of all of Europe at all. And on the other hand you could refer to the Council of Europe model which is sometimes including countries far in the East, where one could say that does this make sense to slowly by slowly include half of the world into the Council of Europe. There are some good points or reservations to be made in this direction, but I think there are a lot of strong points. The example of Armenia shows clearly - for any historical, for any cultural and whatsoever reason, Armenia is clearly 100% oriented to what's Europe. An active part of the Council of Europe, as applicant, we have to consider now, is working closely with the Council of Europe Commission, European universities, *etc.*, and the focal part of AfriCANN clearly told me, "We have no, and never had any contact with Asia. For us it would be completely ridiculous - once being certified by ALAC - being officially part of Asia/Pacific." And one hand we always try encourage organizations representing users in Europe to become members of the regional At-Large organizations, but if you have geographic model which doesn't reflect certain diversities, or certain specialties - culturally, language and more - this may prove to be a bit counterproductive. Thank you very much.

Maureen Hilliard:

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. I'm not part of the Working Group, but I did contribute to the consultation. My name is Maureen Hilliard and I'm from the Pacific. I think just reflecting back on what the gentlemen behind me said, I'm with the Pacific Chapter of the Internet Society, so we represent 22 countries in the Pacific. And many of those countries are listed amongst the groups of countries that are recommended to be shifted back and forth and I know for a fact that many of them do not know what ICANN is, and there's only very few of the Pacific region that has actually attended ICANN meeting.

I mean, I happened to be at the Cartagena meeting, and at a Board Meeting heard about the consultation process that was going to be undertaken, and I immediately thought to respond, because at that time, understanding that we were going to be with Asia-Pacific.

Now we're in a lot of things with Asia-Pacific, and Asia gets all the recognition and the Pacific doesn't get any. And so for me, I really wanted to impress on everybody that the Pacific is there. It's a ginormous region. Twenty-two countries actually are within that region and I didn't feel that we've had a voice. So I was very, very strong that we should get some sort of recognition as the Pacific.

In the meantime, in the interim since Cartagena since I have been very involved in ALAC and APRALO, and I have changed my thinking. I found that the contact that I actually had with APRALO has actually set me in a comfort zone of finding out more information, getting support, advice. And one of the things that we've actually realized is that how lacking in

---

capacity and understanding of why ICANN works. We do not have the capacity to be our own region. Thank you very much.

So I have really appreciated I think, so like I mean the association that we've actually had with APRALO and as a Board we have actually opted to - in public forum - to actually state that we will remain with that system. But I do appreciate the support that you actually get within the RALO system and I think that, maybe it's APRALO - they are a great team to work with - but we acknowledge that the system as it is.

Now one of things too though is that we have within our membership, (inaudible) ISOC membership, the 22 countries - some of those countries belong to the RALOs, but regardless, because they're within our ISOC region, they still get the support that we provide, and that will be ICANN training and I don't know, any of those things, they'll still get it within the region. Thank you.

Pablo Hinojosa:

To compete the position of ALAC, ALAC proposes that we keep the actual geographic regions and let the possibility for any country who wants to go to another region than the one in which it is now, to give it the possibility to do it, and to give this possibility on the sovereignty principle. That means we will not bring this part of this country and make them ask for changing to the other region. Thank you.

Dave Archbold:

If we go down through this list, I think the UK also talked about something similar, about having aligned - I can't remember where it is



---

exactly, I think it's up a bit, but we don't need it on the screen anyway - but I think the UK said something similar about allowing individual countries to [ALAC].

What I didn't understand in that submission, or in ALAC's comment was whether they felt that that ability to change regions, self-select if you like, was an ongoing continual process with no restrictions whatsoever, because my only concern - again I'm speaking personally, not as the Working Group - my only concern with that would be what's that going to do for representational issues. Surely for representational issues you need some degree of stability and you also need to prevent countries doing gamesmanship.

Pablo Hinojosa:

In our proposal it was done. We said that it has to be done not more than once every 10 years or something like this for each country. We said we give some restrictions.

Dave Archbold:

So did we in the draft report - we said the same thing, but others I thought were looking for even more flexibility. Can you comment on that one, sorry.

Dev Anand Teeslucksingh:

No, I'm afraid I don't represent the UK government, so I can't interpret their views, but I think underlying it all is and go back to those two words National Sovereignty - people find wars over National

---

Sovereignty and therefore we need to be very, very careful about telling countries where they belong. It's got to be the right of the country to make the choice.

Dave Archbold: Fine. I hear that comment, my question more is, but how often can they do that and what sort of restrictions is put on that in order to make it manageable?

Dev Anand Teeslucksingh: How are you going to tell a sovereign nation that you do not agree with their current interpretation of their best partner relationships, their best location, their interests, their cultural diversity, and their linguistic interests - how are you actually going to do that? And I think the UK point is probably just simply flagging that you have to be realistic and at the end of the day, if a country turns around and says; "Well we don't actually feel at home in this region," that you have to listen and respond to them, and can't write a rule that turns around and says, "Oh but you've already changed, and you can't change for another nine years and 363 days."

Dave Archbold: How do you say that? You say it politely.

Dev Anand Teeslucksingh: I don't think there's a way of saying something like that politely. It will be taken as an insult.

Female:

Dev, I'm going to have to apologize, I thought we were going to have an opportunity in more detail to do these. I know that this was intended to be a public participation opportunity, so I'm not going to apologize for not being a member of the Working Group - I thought you wanted additional strangers here. But I need to say now that obviously what I'm going to have to is send you our written comments on this because they are quite detailed comments that others have made and I personally find there's a lot of merit in the concerns that have been raised. I'm sensitive to the idea that the present allocation to regions is not perfect. I also note, however; to take center as an example; certainly there are countries (CCs) who are not physically located in Europe who participate in center. So I think I need to think more about the, again, the business problem we are trying to solve, and whether there is flexibility for the substructures of ICANN, which may be the RALOs and others to make a choice that may be different in some ways than a choice that a government would make, and I have not thought enough about that. I understand the implications for business at this point much more than I do for others, but I must excuse myself. I think that this is a fantastic summary, I wasn't able to find it, but I think Rob told me that, so we will be able to digest it as well as the full report. Thank you.

Dave Archbold:

Yes, we are getting to end of time.

---

Male: You started late and the room is free afterwards if you want to have extra time.

Dave Archbold: You're neglecting my stomach. How can I summarize at this point? We have done three reports. The first report looked at the problems of the present system. The second report looked at was the regional system working and where was it failing, and the final report was trying to make recommendations to help the Board.

I think we had an expectation that people would have read the first and second reports and therefore, we did not reference them that heavily in the final report. I think as a result, some of the feedback that we have got has been done without appreciating some of the work that has gone before, so I think we have got to expand the final report to give a more complete overall picture.

One of the things that we found way back at the first report - but I think is still valid - is that the present system was allegedly built upon the UN Statistics Allocation. That allocation was created by UN Statistics for statistical and economic purposes, not for diversity within Cayman, anymore than the RIR one is, so both have failings in that point.

Secondly, when ICANN "adopted" – and I put that in inverted commas - the UN statistics model, they moved 40% of the countries into different countries that than the UN allocated to, but declined to say this was now an ICANN model. And I think in the first of thought, we were saying, "Look, you've got to accept ICANN, whatever you do, there isn't

---

another model out there. You're going to have to bite the bullet and accept that you are maintaining a model that allocates countries to regions for the purposes of diversity within ICANN."

And there is nothing I have - and again because I haven't discussed this with my working group, I'm expressing personal opinions - there is nothing that I have had that changes that initial view from the first report - that somehow ICANN has got to accept that it is creating something that is unique to ICANN.

The question then becomes what is it that you are creating? How do you do that? One way would merely be to recognize the existing system, but that has never been formally done and accepted.

Marilyn Cade:

Can I just ask you if you would consider a friendly amendment - it's Marilyn speaking - if you would consider a friendly amendment to your question with the insertion of a couple of words and when? And I say that, Dave, because there's a particularly challenging 18 to 24 months ahead of us as an organization and for the world as we struggle through the ITU Treaty Conference and the WTPF World Technology Policy Forum in May of next year, and we come to 2015 and an assessment of the millennium goals, and ICANN lives in that larger ecosystem. So I think it's coming grips with - do they need to establish their own definition of regions. I think that's actually a fair question, but I'm not sure we've fully answered that question, and then if they need to do that, how would they do it, and what is the appropriate timing I think to me, still needs further analysis.

---

Dave Archbold: I would agree with some of what you say, but not all of it, because I don't think that it is within the ambit of the Working Group to talk about timing, particularly in the overall scenario – that's a Board decision surely.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, but you see I asked the question - that is it necessary for ICANN to try to establish what they consider binding definitions of regions? Is that a requirement, is that something that ICANN must do?

Dave Archbold: We're big on personal views today. I must admit, I think on a number of occasions we have asked the question - why do we need regions at all as part of the Working Group?

Pablo Hinojosa: Another point - shall the final report - or what you call because the final report you did it. Shall the final, final report - would it reflect the comments received, or shall it try to explain more to make those comments invalid?

Dave Archbold: I think we're going to try and improve the report in many respects. I think we do have to come with a recommendation. For example - and

---

I'm just picking this as an example - the opt-in or opt-out - I think we have got to do more study and review in that as one.

I'm not saying that the report will incorporate everybody's comments, because it just won't and can't, but it will then be coming back to ALAC, for example; for formal comment on that final report; which will be attached to it and will go to the Board in whatever timing that happens.

Male: Just a general observation that the Working Group is made up of representatives of the various SOs and ACs and so that's another vehicle in which those views will undoubtedly be expressed in the deliberations.

Pablo Hinojosa: That's right and I asked our representative in our Working Group and she said it was the consensus, but it wasn't in my position.

Dave Archbold: We are over time, ladies and gentlemen. I found this a most useful meeting. I hope it has been for you as well. Any final comments from anyone?

Pablo Hinojosa: I want to thank you, Dave, really, because we are always fighting with you about this report and I know that you try your best. But, believe me, we are trying to find the best model that would be in the benefit of the global public interests, especially for the end users.

Marilyn Cade:

My question is a question to you and to Rob. One of the things that I've noticed is that when I manage to encourage business people to come to ICANN - and I'm saying this with generalization - and they go to the public microphone and they go to the meeting like this, and they make comments, I don't necessarily see those comments included in the summary of public comments.

It's just a question, so it's not particularly to your initiative. So it's kind of a fair question - if I come to participate and give you public comment in this way, it may not be relevant, Dave, to this particular thing, but you know, I think it is relevant to the idea that people go to the public comment mic and then we don't actually see the comments we make about a topic incorporated in the summary?

Rob Hoggarth:

Well that's been a commitment of this working group, holding these workshops, producing the transcripts. In fact I think for example; Tijani's initials are included in the summary report from the past meeting. I think that is a larger question from ICANN.

As I saw in the past as what would happen is part of the some of the public comment efforts - they would call them workshops at ICANN meetings. I know this from a GNSO's improvements effort for example, that there were special forums, those transcripts were produced, the independent reviewers would consider them, the Board Governance Committee considered them. It's a valid question in terms of other



---

things that go on for how we capture that in a programmed way, because I think they are all valuable.

Dave Archbold: Yes, but we have recorded all these meetings and published them.

Marilyn Cade: That's why I wanted to make it clear I wasn't talking about your group.

Dave Archbold: Alright, thank you everybody.

[End of Transcript]