

## **Pre Costa Rica Policy Webinar**

**01 March 2012 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Pre Costa Rica Policy Webinar on 01 March 2012 at 20:00 UTC. . Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

**A participant list taken from the audio bridge and the Adobe Connect room can be found at the end of this transcription**

David Olive: Welcome to the ICANN policy update. We are glad that you are participating. My name is David Olive, Vice President for Policy Support at ICANN and the Policy Team will be presenting some of the issues that are going to be discussed in Costa Rica as part of our Policy Development Process.

As you know, it is a regular policy update we do prior to an ICANN meeting, and we hope that it will help all of us to prepare for the policy discussions and other activities in Costa Rica.

I know many of you will be attending the meeting, either in person or through remote participation, and we thank you and welcome that involvement and participation. In addition to the policy team, we do have two guest speakers who are helping us out today on specific issues. In particular, Olof Nordling, Director of Services from our Brussels office, will be talking about address policy matters and Berry Cobb, a policy consultant, will be talking to us about his work with consumer metrics related to the new gTLD program.

A brief (unintelligible). If you see in the policy notes just below our screen, we're putting the lines on mute because of - to avoid interference with the presenters. There will be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the presentation, when we will unmute the lines. But in the meantime, if you'd like to ask a question during the presenter's talk, please put something into the chat. We'll make every effort to answer it while we're talking to you or soon thereafter. That gives you two chances to interact with us -- through the chat and at the end in the question-and-answer period.

The (unintelligible) would be to update you on the current policy work, a few issues to be discussed at the Costa Rica meeting, have an opportunity to talk about upcoming activities and encourage input into those, and of course answer any questions you may have on the topics we are presenting.

In terms of the highlights for the Costa Rica meeting, they are presently here on the screen. In particular, a continuation of our newcomer's track day, to help those who are new to the ICANN meetings or recently involved in ICANN, to learn a little more through special briefings and discussions about the supporting organizations and advisory committee activities, as well as events at the ICANN meeting.

Obviously, there'll be discussions about the RAA Amendment, discussions of Whois -- both the review team and general discussions. And consumer choice competition and trust will also be a topic of a session. And there will be a session on consensus building tools and best practices by Elad Levinson, among the other highlights we have. We ask you to go to the Web site, as listed here, for the full details and the full schedules on the different tracks that are available during the Costa Rica meeting.

On to a (unintelligible), and as you well know, the ICANN supporting organizations develop policy for the Board to consider. The GNSO in the G space, the ccNSO in the country name space, and the ASO in the address

space as well -- we will hear reports from all three of these. In addition to the policy making bodies at ICANN, there are advisory committees, as you know -- they're listed here -- that also provide advice and commentary to the Board of Directors.

Office (unintelligible) today will be the main topics of interest at the GNSO -- Generic Name Supporting Organization. They are listed here and my colleagues will go into greater details a little later.

For the Country Code Supporting Organization, there will be an update from Bart Boswinkel and the overview of the main activities there. And then finally, the recent developments in the Address Supporting Organization -- and Olof Nordling will provide a update for us.

With that, I wanted to say we do have a lot of information and details presented in this Webinar, but it will be recorded and you will be able to access it later for your reference and at your leisure. And so we again appreciate your participation in the session. I will now move to focus on GNSO policy issues. And with that, I turn it over to Liz Gasster, our Senior Policy Counselor. Liz, the floor is yours.

Liz Gasster: Thank you, David. Good day everyone. You'll see on this slide a list of the current issues being discussed in the GNSO, most of which we'll cover on today's call, beginning with the new GNSO Policy Development Process and then the other issues listed there, as quickly as we can go through them today. But I will note that we have - at the very bottom bullet you'll see that currently there are over 20 projects underway and pending in the GNSO, so this will be a quick review of as many as we can cover, and there will be a few that are probably less active. We tried to really focus on those that are planning to be active in Costa Rica to focus on in this Webinar today.

So, I'm going to turn it over to Marika Konings for the first set of issues, then to Margie, then I'll talk about Whois and we'll pick up from there. Thanks.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Liz. Hello, everyone. Thank you very much for all for joining our Webinar. My name is Marika Konings. I'm a Senior Policy Director and many supporting and the GNSO and its policy development activities. And I'll first be talking to you about the revised GNSO policy development process.

Basically, as part of the Board mandated review of the GNSO, the goal was set to also revise the existing GNSO Policy Development Process, or also known as PDP -- to incorporate the working group model, which has become the standard methodology for conducting policy development, and to insure that process is more effective and responsive to ICANN Policy Development's needs.

And so actually following many months of hard work by a dedicated work team of volunteers from the IT community, the revised Policy Development Process in the form of a new Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and a PDP manual was adopted by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. And as a result of that, the revised GNSO PDP has been in effect since the 8th of December of last year, and basically now applies to all new and ongoing Policy Development Processes.

So, on this slide you'll just see a very high level overview of the revised PDP, outlining the main milestones of the process. For those of you that are familiar with the old PDP, this might look familiar, as many of those milestones remain the same. However, as per usual, the devil is actually in the details, and there are a couple of important improvements and innovations that have been introduced in the revised PDP.

Unfortunately, we won't have enough time today to discuss those in detail, but for those of you who are interested to learn more about that, I would strongly encourage you to review the revised Annex A, as well as the PDP manual and also to know that you might want to attend a session that will explain the revised PDP in detail, which is being held on Sunday, the 11th of March from 9:00 to 9:30 at the ICANN meeting in Costa Rica, as part of the GNSO working session that day.

I also wanted to briefly highlight the fact that there is currently a public comment forum open on some of the additional changes to the ICANN Bylaws that are result of the adoption of the revised GNSO PDP, such as updating the section that provides an overview of the applicable voting thresholds, as the revised PDP has introduced a couple of new ones. And the deadline for the comment is tomorrow, the second of March, so if you have anything to contribute on that, please do so as soon as possible.

On the next slide, you just find the links to where you can find additional information on these topics. So that moves you a couple of items that relate to Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy -- or also known as IRTP. So the IRTP is a GNSO consensus policy that was adopted in 2004, with the objectives to provide registrants with a transparent and predictable way to transfer domain name registrations between registrars.

As part of the implementation of that policy, it was decided that it would be helpful to carry out a review to determine whether there were any areas that needed clarification or improvement. It's maybe worth pointing out that this is actually the number one area of complaint when it comes to issues that are raised with ICANN's compliance departments.

As a result of that review, a number of issues were identified that were then grouped together in five different Policy Development Processes, which were titled to A to E and which are being addressed in a consecutive manner.

So the Part B PDP in this series is nearly complete and most of the recommendations were already adopted by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board last year and are about to come into effect. An update on the status of implementation of those recommendations is foreseen on Saturday from 3:00 to 3:30 during the GNSO Council working session in Costa Rica.

For two of the recommendations from the IRTP Part B, the GNSO Council requested a proposal from ICANN staff. The proposal relates -- one, to how to lock and unlock domain names and the other one relates to standardizing and clarifying Whois status messages relating to registrar lock. So these two proposals went through rounds of discussions, as well as public comment and they have now been approved by the GNSO Council and will be considered by the ICANN Board for adoption next.

For one of those, relating to the standardization and clarification of Whois status messages, a public comment forum is currently open as well, and comments on that issue can be submitted until the 25th of March.

So in the meantime, the IRTP Part C Working Group has already kicked off its activities as well. This working group is looking at three charter questions - - one relating to the issue of whether there should be a change of control function for gTLD registrations, as it currently does not exist. And secondly, they're looking at whether the form of authorization which is used to initiate a transfer should be time limited. And thirdly, they're looking at whether there should be requirements for registries to use IANA IDs for registrars instead of proprietary IDs.

So this working group has set itself a very ambitious schedule, and hopes to deliver initial report for community review and discussion by the ICANN meeting in Prague. And currently the working group has started its deliberations on charter question A, which relates to the change of control and is in the process of exploring processes that are being used in the ccTLD

community to see if there are any potential models or ideas that could also benefit the gTLD community in this aspect.

So if you're interested in the topics that that IRTP Part C Working Group is addressing, it's not too late to sign up and become a member of the working group. You can send an email to the GNSO secretariat if you're interested. And in addition, the working group is also organizing an open face-to-face meeting in Costa Rica, which will take place on Wednesday the 14th of March, from 8:30 to 10:00. And the working group is also scheduled to provide a status update to the GNSO Council on Saturday from 2:30 to 3:00.

Moving on to the next topic, which is SIC Whois, the IRTP Part B working group recommended that the GNSO Council request an issue report on this topic, which is the first step of a Policy Development Process. And so the GNSO Council resolved to request and issue a report, basically indicating that they should consider any positive as well as negative effects of a requirement of SIC Whois for all gTLD registries.

So following - the revised PDP Preliminary Issue Report was published for public comments in November last year. And as a result, nine comments were submitted. So the following review of those comments by staff and updating the report accordingly, the final issued report was submitted to the GNSO Council on the 2nd of February. And the report itself provides an overview of the differences between thick and thin lids. It describes the current situation of gTLD registries, as well as the requirements for new gTLDs. And it provides an initial list of issues that should be considered, should the PDP move forward.

These issues include specific benefits and/or downsides of SIC Whois, such as consistent response and stability, cost implications, privacy and data protection and concerns. But it also highlights a couple of other issues, such as scope of the PDP, a potential relationship with other Whois activities, and looks at the resources available.

So the staff recommendation of the Final Issue Report, which is a required element of each issue report, basically recommends that a PDP initiated on this issue is considered within scope of the ICANN policy process and the GNSO. So now, it's actually up to the GNSO Council to decide whether or not to proceed. And so this issue is on the agenda for consideration during the open GNSO Council meeting in Costa Rica, which is on the Wednesday from 2:00 to 6:00 local time.

So again, here on this slide you can find some links to additional background information, if you want to have more details on these specific issues.

So, next up is a brief update on the post expiration domain and recovery PDP. So this is an issue that was originally brought to the GNSO by the Ad Launch Advisory Committee, which raised a number of questions in relation to the predictability and transparency of existing expiration and renewal policies and practices. And the working group that was created to address these questions delivered its final report to the GNSO Council in June of last year. And the GNSO Council approved the report and its recommendations in July.

Subsequently, the Board adopted the recommendations at a meeting in Dakar. The 17 recommendations that were adopted overall aim to provide additional guarantees to registrants when it comes to expiration and renewal of domain name registrations. And they intend to improve registrant education and comprehension and they are largely considered to be in line with the existing registrar practices.

As part of the recommendations, a post expiration domain and recovery implementation review team has now been formed, consisting of community members. And the team is tasked to assist ICANN staff and the development of the implementation plan. An update on the status of implementation is scheduled to be provided on Saturday from 3:00 to 3:30 during the GNSO



Council working session. And again here, you have a link to the final report, where you can find all the details of the recommendations and the deliberations on that.

And so, next up is a PDP that is just getting started, really, into the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings. So this PDP follows from a recommendation of the IRTP Part B working group to address this issue as part of a possible review of the UDRP, as well as the issue report on the current state of the UDRP, in which this issue was also flagged as a problem.

So the Council decided to initiate a PDP on this specific item only for the time being, as currently there is, according to the policy, no requirement to lock a domain name in the period between the filing of a UDRP complaint and the commencement of proceedings. And in addition, the UDRP does not define what status quo means in relation to the locking of a domain name.

So following the initiation of the PDP by the GNSO Council, a drafting team was formed to develop a charter for this PDP, which aims to set out the scope and requirements for the working group that will be addressing this specific issue. And the drafting team is due to submit the proposed charter to the GNSO Council, which will consider it for adoption at its meeting in Costa Rica. And once adopted, a call for volunteers will be distributed and a working group will be formed. So if you're interested in this specific issue, please keep an eye on the GNSO Council - on the GNSO Web site where a call for volunteers will be published in due time, and as with any GNSO working groups, anyone is welcome to join and help.

And then the last but not least -- at least for me -- fake renewal notices. Fake renewal notices are misleading notices that are sent to registrants from someone claiming to be or to represent the current registrar with the intention of getting the domain named transfer to this entity. This is an issue that was discussed as part of the Registration Views Policies Working Group, which recommended that the GNSO Council should consider initiating a PDP on

this topic. However, following further discussions on this issue, the Council decided that it would be appropriate to first obtain further information on this type of abuse, to help inform its deliberations on whether or not a PDP would be the right approach to take.

So as a result, the GNSO Council requested a drafting team to develop a request for information for the registrar (unintelligible) group and based on the feedback received, and report back accordingly. So the drafting team got together and developed a survey outlining a number of questions relating to fake renewal notices, to determine that - better determine the size and scope of the issue. And based on the feedback received from the registrar community, the drafting team is now in the process of finalizing its report to the Council, which will provide an overview of the results of the survey, but it also contains a number of options that the Council may want to consider when it discusses the next steps.

So the report is expected to be delivered to the GNSO Council in time for a discussion at the open council meeting on Wednesday. So if you're interested to hear more about the report and the Council discussion on that, you're invited to attend. And for those that already want to see a draft of the report, you'll go here the link to the wiki offer of this drafting team, where you can find further information.

And with that, I'll turn it over to my colleague Margie Milam, who will talk to you about the RAA.

Margie Milam: Thank you, Marika. Hello, everybody. I'm Margie Milam. I'm the Senior Policy Counselor on the Policy Department and I've been tasked with providing you an update on the - what's going on with the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. As many of you know, the accreditation agreement is the standard agreement that ICANN signs with all its registrars to allow them to be a free registrar. And currently, ICANN staff and the registrars are in a process of negotiating amendments to the RAA.

So essentially, this negotiation stemmed from the Dakar Board resolution where the Board issued a resolution that directed the negotiations to commence immediately, with the idea that proposed amendments would be provided for consideration in Costa Rica.

And specifically, the Board resolution talked about addressing specific recommendations that came from the law enforcement community that had made a series of recommendations to try to amend the RAA to deal with issues that relate to their ability to fight cyber crime and e-crime and also recommendations from the joint GNSO at large drafting team that came up with a list of high priority and medium priority topics to be considered for amending the RAA.

The Board also indicated that these negotiations should look at other topics that would advance the twin goals of registrar protection and DNS stability. So essentially, since Dakar, staff has put together a negotiation team as well as a registrar stakeholder group and they've been very active in trying to meet these deadlines. There's been a two track process with respect to the Board resolution -- one being the bilateral negotiations, which involved the registrar negotiation team and the ICANN negotiation team. And this commenced immediately after Dakar.

The teams have been working very hard since Dakar to try to meet the Costa Rica deadline. There's been over 12 plus meetings, some face-to-face, some telephone, and this has also included consultations with the law enforcement community that brought forth these recommendations, as well as GAC representatives, to make sure that the recommendations were fully understood.

There's also been a community wiki that's been launched to try to keep the community informed with the status of the negotiations. And so, if you visit

that wiki, you'll see that there are a series of negotiation topics that are being addressed and the status of them, as posted on the wiki.

At the same time, the Board also requested an issue report, understanding that maybe not all of the topics that are on - that were proposed for amendment may be dealt with through the negotiations. The Board thought that it would be appropriate to kick off a GNSO Council Policy Development Process along the lines of the new procedures that Marika just described. And since Dakar, a lot of work has been done with respect to that part of this project.

There was a preliminary issue report that was published on December 12. A public comments forum was opened and closed in January. And we are in the process of finalizing the issue reports to deliver prior to Costa Rica, that would outline what issues are appropriate for a Policy Development Process at this time. And then, following the deliverance of the Final Issue Report, the GNSO Council would be expected to commence a PDP, and that should happen right around Costa Rica.

So essentially, on this slide, I've given you a very high level summary of what the original law enforcement requests were. And these have been evaluated in much detail over the last few months since Dakar. As you look through these topics, you'll see that there are very detailed recommendations addressing a broad number of issues that are significant.

For example, there's a request to have an abuse point of contact and some way of tracking - auditable way of tracking abuse complaints whenever there's illegal or malicious conduct involving DNS. You can see that there's a validation request, a request to have a competent point of contact available on a 24 by 7 basis. There's also a request for greater disclosure of registry contact information, including affiliated registrars. And there's also suggestions that there should obligations related to privacy and proxy services and the escrow of that data.

On this slide you'll see the remaining of the 12 law enforcement original requests, some of them -- including, for example, a service level agreement with respect to delivery of Whois information over support 43 servers and issues related to resellers and verification of Whois.

So when you take a look at these issues, you'll see that there's a lot of issues raised by them and there's been a lot of thought between the two negotiation teams to really find the best way to implement these in a reasonable commercial manner.

And so, we were originally anticipating that we would publish amendments to the RAA, but because the progress is still ongoing, we are in the process of finalizing status reports that should be published momentarily, any day now -- certainly prior to Costa Rica -- that would identify the status of each of these recommendations and give a highlight as to what the outstanding issues are. This status report also identifies where there are areas of agreement in principle and this will be the topic for discussion in Costa Rica.

With respect to the Final Issue Report, the GNSO Council -- once it receives the Final Issue Report -- is to conduct a - to initiate the Policy Development Process on what is called the remaining issues. The Board essentially resolved in its resolution in Dakar that once it's clear which issues are no longer on the table with respect to the negotiations, that those should be the topics of a Policy Development Process.

But since the negotiations are currently ongoing, the Issue Report is going to identify the topics that are currently off the table, with the idea that those can be addressed now through a Policy Development Process. And then, as the negotiations conclude, if it becomes apparent that additional topics have not been addressed, then those might be referred to the Policy Development Process at a later date.

And with respect to the GNSO Council, the GNSO Council would have to look at these issues and decide how they would like to prioritize the work over the current work that's being done by the Council. As you can see through this Webinar, there are a tremendous number of issues that the Council is currently dealing with, some of which overlap with current issues that are on the table in the negotiations -- so, for example, Whois is one of them. There's a lot of work being done with respect to Whois.

The UDRP, as Marika mentioned, is a topic that is also in discussions and - as one of the amendment topics. Work related to best practices when dealing with malicious conduct -- that certainly has overlap with some of the amendment topics that are being discussed - being discussed at this time. And so this is something that the Council would have to deal with once the negotiations are concluded.

So, for additional information, I provided a series of links on this slide. The Preliminary Issue Report link is at - is right on this slide. In addition, we will have a session on the - on Monday afternoon in Costa Rica, where we'll go into much more detail on the status of the various RAA amendment topics. And specifically, we'll have a session that deals with Whois verification.

The session will explore various models of validation, for example, and get a feel from the community as to what would be an appropriate model with respect to verification or validation of Whois information. And so we certainly invite the community to participate in that session, because we think it's really important to get all the viewpoints with respect to this important topic.

And then, as the Council moves forward on initiating the Policy Development Process on these remaining issues, we encourage you to join those working groups and get involved in some of these issues. And certainly, for additional information on the negotiations, I've provided the links to the wiki page that has this information.

And with that, I will pass it to Liz Gasster, who will provide you an update on Whois.

Liz Gasster: Thank you very much, Margie, and hello again. It may seem like you've already had an update on Whois, since Marika described the SIC Whois, the Issue Report activity, and the number of Whois elements that were included in Margie's overview of the RAA enhancements that are being discussed, but indeed, there's more.

And I'll quickly review the four studies that are currently requested from the GNSO Council and update you on those as well as Whois - a survey that Whois Working Group is conducting on the Whois Service Requirements Report and some other Whois activities as well.

So first of all, the four Whois studies -- you may recall that the GNSO Council decided in October that factual basis for further policy making was needed and requested that staff pursue the feasibility of conducting several studies of Whois that were selected to be most relevant to keep policy concerns. And studies have been identified now by the GNSO Council and approved and funded and are mostly underway. So with that backdrop, I'll just describe briefly each one of them.

There's a Whois Misuse Study that is assessing whether public Whois significantly increases harmful acts and also looks at the impact of the anti-harvesting measures. These are actually two studies combined. One is an experimental study that is registering test domains and measuring harmful messages resulting from potential misuse and then a descriptive study that is looking at misuse incidents reported by registrants and others. Carnegie Mellon University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in the U.S. is conducting this study and we expect initial results in early 2013.

The second study is a Registrant Identification Study that is examining information about how domain name registrants identify themselves and

classifying those various types of entities that register domains into different categories. The study was awarded to NORC at the University of Chicago. This study is underway, was launched late October 2011 and we expect initial results late this year.

There is a third study that focuses on potential abuse associated with privacy and proxy services and the extent to which privacy and proxy registered domains are associated with alleged harmful acts. And this study's been delayed for a number of reasons. We needed to recast and provide a little more precision and guidance to a potential bidder and then we've also had the bidder changing their subcontractors who'll be working on this. So this bidding started on - this is the one that hasn't quite started yet, that we're expecting the contract to be finalized in the next month or so and initiated thereafter, but the study will take about a year, once initiated.

And then lastly, the GNSO Council asked us to conduct a study that would analyze communication relay and identity reveal requests. That's for privacy and proxy registered domains to explore how they're processed and identify factors that may promote or impede timely communication and resolution. What we found was that potential bidders were unsure of the feasibility of this study, especially obtaining sufficient data. And so, the Council opted instead to conduct a pre-study kind of feasibility survey to survey potential participants.

This study is just about complete -- this pre-study survey. I had hoped to share it with everyone in Costa Rica, but I think it will just be a little after that, but -- later in March -- when that pre-study survey will be shared.

And then, I also wanted to briefly describe this upcoming survey that a working group in the GNSO is working on. This effort's being supported by Berry Cobb. This is related to a report that the staff wrote at the Council's request in 2010 that is a compilation or a comprehensive set of technical requirements for the Whois service, that reflect not only known deficiencies in



current Whois, but also technical requirements that may be needed to support various policy initiatives that have been suggested in the past.

So the purpose of this working group is to take this final report and requirements that have been identified in it, and survey the community to estimate the level of agreement associated with each one of these potential requirements.

So currently - let me give you first some examples of what the survey would include. They're listed here on your screen -- such as a mechanism to find authoritative Whois servers, a standardized query structure, standardized error messages, importantly internationalized registration data, potential requirement sections, those...

We think this is important because not only will it help estimate the level of agreement with these various requirements among the GNSO community, but I think it will also be useful for future IETF protocol efforts. And is important to note that this is a technical inventory and is not intended to define or suggest policies or rules that should apply to Whois in the future.

So this working group has identified the survey tool they plan to use and developed a set of survey questions -- 63 in all -- reflecting 13 requirements, but it's not final yet. They still need to edit and test the survey, share it for public comment, create a proposed final draft, submit it for dependent review, and then that survey will get conducted and they'll analyze the results and then publish a final report following that work.

I did want to briefly mention two other pending Whois activities. These are not being led by the Policy Department, but they will be widely discussed in Costa Rica, and so I did want to mention them. The first is the Whois Review Team Draft Report, which includes recommendations on data accuracy, privacy, proxy services, and internationalized registration data, among other

important recommendations. So I encourage you to review that report, in preparation for Costa Rica activities.

And then also, the draft roadmap that also was mentioned in the chat to implement (SAC) 51 -- specifically this is a roadmap to a new domain name registration data access protocol that would support the query and display of internationalized registration data, among other capabilities.

(SAC) 51 actually -- which was released by the SSAC recently -- contains two recommendations. One is to adopt a clearer and more precise taxonomy with regard to Whois, distinguishing between Whois -- the data, the service and the protocol -- and then also goes on to recommend that the ICANN community evaluate and adopt a replacement Whois protocol that supports the query and display of internationalized registration data and then other recommendations that have been previously made by the SSAC and other proposals.

So I just wanted to add that additional detail about the roadmap in response to the question on the chat. And there will be a session. Both of those reports are open for comment until 18 March and I know there's a session on the roadmap scheduled for Thursday in Costa Rica.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to Steve Sheng, who will talk yet about another Whois activity -- the working group on Internationalized Registration Data. Thanks. Steve?

Steve Sheng: Thank you, Liz. Hello, everyone. My name is Steve Sheng. I'm going to provide a quick update on the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group, or the IRD Working Group.

So the working group is a joint working group chartered by GNSO and SSAC in 2009 to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing some mission and display specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data.

So these data are - have been traditionally being coded the U.S. as the - but as the Internet becomes more global and internationalized, there's a growing demand for users to be able to submit and show this information in local language and scripts.

So, some of the - so this has support - then supporting the IRD is an important evolutionary step for the Whois service. Despite that, there are - today there are no standard exist for the submission and display. And furthermore, the existing Whois protocol, as defined by RFC 3912, lacked the ability to support Internationalized Registration Data. So as a result, the current Whois implementations do not consistently support IRD and this could lead to poor user experience and interoperability issues.

So the working group was formed in 2009 and they have been working very hard. And they originally released a (unintelligible) report, that in that report talk about the following set of issues. So the first issue we consider is -- is it suitable to Internationalized Registration Data to have them represented in one's local language and scripts. And the quick answer for that is yes.

Then the working group went element by element, you know, in the Whois output and discussed what elements are suitable to be internationalized, and for that data element, what are the possible specifications for that.

So the third issue the working group studied is -- is the current Whois system capable of handling the query and display of Internationalized Registration Data. And the short answer for that is no. There are some work arounds, and to that regard, the working group made some recommendations. So these -- the findings and the recommendations of the report -- can be found in this link.

The next step for this report is the report will be submitted to GNSO and SSAC for approval and action, since this is a joint working group. So that's my quick update on this issue. Thanks.

Next, I'm going to hand over to my colleague Berry Cobb to talk about consumer metrics. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you Steve. Yes, this is Berry Cobb and I'm here helping the Policy Team on a few projects, one of which are the consumer metrics work that's been conducted in the recent past.

Basically, in 2010 the ICANN Board requested advice from the SOs and the (ACs) to establish definitions, measures, and three year targets for key terms listed in the Affirmation of Commitments, which are competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice. The advice that will be handed over to the Board and considered by the Board will then be passed along to a future AoC review team that will be set up to review the effectiveness of the new gTLD program. It's expected that that review team will begin about 12 months post the first delegation of the first gTLD.

With that, so in September of 2011, the GNSO Council approved the charter for the Consumer Metrics Working Group and for the last six months, the working group has built a draft advice letter. This draft advice letter has been posted for public comment, starting on the 23rd of February and will continue forward. The comment period will be open through the Costa Rica meeting for all to review and respond to.

Now basically, the contents of the advice letter contain two main areas. The first is the definitions that were defined by the working group and then the second portion contains all of the metrics that are assigned to each definition. For the purposes of this call, I won't review through the actual definitions here, but there are a couple of key takeaways from this slide.

First, I'd like to point you to the order of these definitions. Take note that to define consumer trust and consumer choice, the actual consumer needed to

be defined as well. And it acts as the key foundation for the two definitions of trust and choice.

Secondly, consumer trust and choice are basically in this order as well, given the fact that there is a decent amount of overlap in terms of distinguishing between trust and choice. And so literally, you can almost think the three definitions are combined together or grouped together.

The second area, which is competition, only targets on the fact that this is competition amongst the contracted parties that provide TLD services and the registration of domain names and is somewhat separate. But definitely the order is something to take note, and I invite the community to review the actual draft advice letter in the definition section, as there are a number of footnotes to outline all these definitions.

Next on this slide, basically we have a high level summary of the proposed metrics for each one of the three definitions. As you can see here, there are a large number of bullets at a summary level, so we won't have time to go through them today either. However, just like the definitions on the previous slide, the last section of the draft advice letter contains each specific metric per definition. It will provide what the specific metric is, the probable source, and what the probable three year target will be for that particular metric. So there is a lot of great content in there, and I invite the community to review through the details of those.

Basically, our next steps - as I mentioned, the working group posted a draft advice letter on the 23rd of February. The comment period will be open for 40 days, with a 21 day reply period. We have also submitted to have the advice letter translated across the other five UN languages and the public comment period will remain open 40 days post the last submitted translated of that draft advice letter.

Also, the working group will hold a public session in Costa Rica, which is scheduled for Wednesday at 11:00 am local time and we invite the community to come by, as there will be a very detailed presentation of - across the definitions and the metrics.

Lastly, the working group hopes to submit its final advice letter to the GNSO Council around May of 2012. However, that may be extended into June, given the fact for the extended comment period for the translations, but we'll still target in that timeframe.

Lastly, for further information, there's the link to the public comment period itself and then also a link to the wiki where the consumer metric data is being posted. There you can find iterative drafts that took us up to our draft advice letter now, as well as some other work products that will allow you to see the details of the metrics.

And with that, I think that concludes the consumer metrics. I'll turn it over to Julie and she'll brief you on the Cross-Community Working Groups. Thank you very much.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thanks so much, Berry. This is Julie Hedlund. I hope you can all hear me alright. Please let me know if you cannot. And I'm going to speak very briefly on Cross-Community Working Groups.

Why are Cross-Community Working Groups important? Well, there are a number of reasons. First of all, these are groups that are established by more than one supporting organization or advisory committee. And they are addressing issues of common interest to those SOs and ACs.

These Cross-Community Working Groups have been used in the past and we have some that are currently operating, but there have been concerns about how they operate and their coordination between and among the various SOs

and ACs. Because of this, the GNSO Council is seeking principles to bring clarity and predictability for participants in Cross-Community Working Groups.

Some of the recent Cross-Community Working Groups are the SOAC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group, the Geographic Regions Review Working Group, the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group that Steve Sheng just mentioned, and the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group that Bart Boswinkel will address a little later in this Webinar.

Recent developments are that the Council in October of 2011 approved a charter to form a drafting team that would define a way forward for the effective chartering, functioning, and utilization of these Cross-Community Working Groups. And just in January of this year, the drafting team provided to the Council, for its consideration, draft principles for Cross-Community Working Groups.

These draft principles address both the scope of the working groups, such as their possible purposes, and their relationship to Policy Development Processes. Also considered are operations, such as the formation, execution, and outcomes from Cross-Community Working Groups.

Now the next steps are that at its meeting on the 14th of March -- the GNSO Council's public meeting -- it will consider the draft principles and in addition, the Council is discussing the issue of Cross-Community Working Groups during its planning session on Saturday. And that will be at - from 4 o'clock to 4:30 on Saturday the 10th and the Council meeting is on Wednesday the 14th, beginning at 2 o'clock pm, after which the Council plans to circulate and discuss these draft principles with the other SOs and ACs. And once the principles are approved, they may be incorporated in the GNSO's guidelines for establishing working groups and in the formation of new Cross-Community Working Groups.

For further information, please take a look at the link on your screen, where you will find the draft principles for Cross-Community Working Groups. Thank you very much, and at this point I'd like to turn things over to my colleague, Brian Peck, who will talk about Red Cross and IOC names drafting team. Thank you.

Brian Peck: Thank you very much, Julie. My name is Brian Peck and, as Julie mentioned, I will be providing a brief update on the work of the GNSO drafting team with regard to protecting the Red Cross, Red Crescent, and International Olympic Committee names.

As you may know, in Singapore the Board authorized protection of specifically requested names involving or related to the Red Cross, Red Crescent Movements, and the IOC by placing a temporary moratorium on these names -- basically preventing anyone from applying for these names from the top level in the current round or the initial round of the new gTLD applications. And this moratorium would stay in place until the GNSO and the GAC develop policy device based on the global public interest.

Following that Board adopted resolution, the GAC submitted a proposal in September of last year to the GNSO Council, basically proposing that these names should be permanently protected as reserve names, both at the top level and the second level.

After the Dakar meeting, a GNSO drafting team was formed to work on coming up with a proposal or some options, if you will, on how to handle the protection of the IOC and Red Cross names under the new gTLD program and is currently working on a proposal to which they are - would like to prepare for submission to the GNSO Council prior to Costa Rica.

The current proposal that they seem to be reaching consensus on would basically protect these names on a permanent basis at the top level as modified reserve names, with certain modifications for - to allow protections



for certain similar strings -- for example, Olympus cameras or Olympic Airlines. As I mentioned, this is a proposal that the drafting team is working on with the hopes of submitting it for GNSO consideration in Costa Rica.

There's still much work to be done in terms of working on the proposal within the drafting team, obtaining GSNO Council approval, gaining consensus with the GAC, and preparing for consideration by the community in Costa Rica. However, the important thing to keep in mind is that even if no consensus is reached on the current work of this drafting team, that these names are being protected and will be in the first round at the top level by the Board of Resolution in Singapore.

And with that, I'd like to turn it over to my colleague, Bart, who will be talking about ccNSO policy issues. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Good day. I want to provide you a brief overview of the structure of the ccNSO. I have noted that a lot of people on this Webinar are not from the ccNSO or the ccTLD community, so it might be useful to do this for once. Then I will provide you a brief overview of the main activities of the ccNSO. And finally, I will touch upon the activities of the joint working groups in which ccNSO participates, noticeably the joint ccNSO GNSO IDN Working Group -- the (JIG) -- and the DNS Security, Stability and Analysis Working Group, which Julie already mentioned.

Yes. First of all, the ccNSO comprises, in fact, of two elements. One is the ccNSO membership and the second one is the ccNSO Council. The ccNSO membership is open to all ccTLB managers -- so 250 plus ccTLB managers -- and currently not open to IDN ccTLB managers. And this is part of the IDN Policy Development Process, which I will touch upon just a bit later in this presentation.

To date, 125 members -- that means 125 different ccTLDs are a member of the ccNSO. The latest members is -- as you can see different (dot PF) French

Polynesia. And there is one application pending. You can see the distribution among ICANN geographic regions. And over time, there has been a steady growth in membership. Please note that this figure of 125 is a little bit distorted, because some entities manage two or more ccTLDs. For example, (UniNet) from Norway runs (.NO) -- so Norway -- but also (.BV) and (.SJ).

So what should be noted as well is that the ccNSO is open for the ccTLD community at large, so that means all ccNSO or all ccTLD managers. The main difference is that members of the ccNSO can vote in the ccNSO and they abide to the policies developed by the ccNSO. So there is a slight distinction, but during ICANN meetings, you'll see members and nonmembers of the ccNSO or ccTLD managers.

The second entity is the ccNSO Council and the ccNSO Council is - say, has a role in insuring the continuity of the ccNSO activities. So it has more an administrative role and this is set in the Bylaws and in the rules of the ccNSO. One main example of this administrative role is the ccNSO work plan which it maintains. At the Costa Rica meeting, the ccNSO Council will review this and update this working plan. And one of the new additional features is to look at the volunteer capacity, in relation to the activities and whether the increase in activities -- or the anticipated increase in activities is - can be coped with.

The ccNSO Council comprises of 18 councilors, three from every ICANN region, so 15 ccTLD managers and three noncom appointees. We have four observers on the ccNSO Council from the regional ccTLD organizations and two liaisons -- ALAC and the GNSO.

Now I want to turn it to the main activities of the ccNSO and the main activities of the ccNSO are mostly organized through working groups. One of the main ones is the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. The purpose of this working group is to provide a consistent and enduring interpretation of the current policy relating to the delegation and re-delegation

of ccTLDs. It was established some time ago and at this stage -- and in preparation of the Costa Rica meeting -- it has already - it has published its final recommendations on obtaining and documenting consents and it has also, for public consultation, published a interim report on obtaining and documenting support from significantly interested parties, formerly known as local Internet community.

With regard to the first report -- the final recommendations -- it is submitted to the ccNSO and the GNSO, seeking their endorsement for the recommendations. And once endorsed by both the ccNSO and the GAC, it will be submitted to the ICANN Board to be implemented.

A current work item for the working group itself is the recommendations on unconsented re-delegation, which will be discussed during a meeting of the working group. Future working items are the recommendations and - on IANA reports and the glossary of terms.

A second one of the main activities which I already mentioned is the IDN Country Code Policy Development Process. It has two elements. One is the selection - is the overall policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings. Currently, it's focused on confusing the similarity issues and on updating process, taking into account the experience from the fast track process, which is already in use for the IDN - for the delegation and selection of IDN ccTLDs.

The second element, as I said, is on the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. To date, due to the Bylaw provisions, IDN ccTLDs are not eligible for the ccNSO, so part of this overall - part of this PDP will be recommendations to change Article 9 of the ICANN Bylaws.

Finally, in say the policy-related main activities of the ccNSO, I want to mention the work of the study group on the use of country and territory names as TLDs. To date, it has provided an overview of all policies relating to

the use of country names. It is completed and in draft form and at the cursory committee, it will discuss a typology of country names and this typology will be used, first of all, to test and to understand the impact of the policy and secondly, whether to conduct a pilot survey to test typology and to test the process in order to see whether the typology is meaningful and discuss - this survey will be conducted by UNESCO.

In the next two slides, I will show you some other activities of the ccNSO which are more related to the ccTLD community itself or directly impact on ICANN processes. The first one is what is called the Finance Working Group. The Finance Working Group is focusing on the financial contribution of ccTLDs to ICANN. Part of its mandate is to look into the ICANN expenses attributed to the ccTLDs and to understand the underlying methods and to present this to the ccTLD community and discuss with - discuss it with ICANN staff.

The second part of the mandate is to come up with different models or - and seek consensus on a new model for financial contributions to ICANN. The current statuses of this working group -- there is a survey on ccTLD contributions to ICANN and the results of this survey will be presented at the San Jose meeting and will be shared with the other SOs and ACs and with the ICANN Board. Again, this is - this Finance Working Group is not representing the ccNSO in any form, or individual ccTLDs for that matter.

A second working group, which is more focusing - and as an example of focusing - or an example of the activities of the ccNSO -- this working group focuses on the ICANN Strategic and Operational Planning Processes. That's why it's called the SOP -- Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group. Currently it has submitted its comments on the ICANN - on ICANN's framework 2001 - or 2013 operation plan and budget. And you can view this at the link which is included. Again, this working group does not represent the ccNSO or individual ccTLDs.

And finally, again, as I said, the joint working groups in which the ccNSO is participating -- one of them is the joint DNSA - DNS Security and Stability and Analysis Working Group. Please note this is truly a Cross-Community Working Group. It is - participating SOs and ACs are ALAC, ccNSO, GNSO, and NRO, and individual members of SSAC participate as well and some external experts.

The goal of this - currently the working group is working on identifying and analysis of threats and vulnerabilities of the DNS and it's a very thorough process. The analysis is based on the use of (unintelligible) 830, which is one of the standard guidelines which can be used in analyzing and identifying threats and vulnerabilities.

The individual co-chairs will present for all the participating SOs and ACs during the Costa Rica meeting. And there is a lot of material -- the DSA -- available at the included link.

A second joint working group in which the ccNSO is participating is the joint ccNSO, GNSO, IDN Working Group -- the (JIG). Currently it has - the public comment period is open on its interim report on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. The working group will discuss aspects of universal acceptance at its open working group meeting on Monday in Costa Rica.

Secondly, the ccNSO and GNSO secretariat have sent out a call for volunteers, because the working group feels there is a need for additional volunteers. And finally, this joint working group -- on the basis of the work of this joint working group -- both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils sent a letter to the Board on the introduction of single character IDN TLDs. Both Councils reaffirmed their support for the introduction and included some questions on - relating to the ICANN Board resolution of August 2011 on the introduction of IDN TLDs -- or single character IDN TLDs.

Finally, for those who are interested, I have - you can view the ccNSO meeting -- on what is happening there -- at the ccNSO meetings in Costa Rica. I want to draw your attention to two sessions. The first one will be on Tuesday afternoon, 13th of March, from 2:00 pm to 3:20 pm. That will be on the regulatory and legislative -- oh, what a word -- legislative developments in some countries with - and their impact on the global DNS and the Internet. And it will focus on SOPA and ACTA Internet government control in Mexico, China law enforcement, and DNS filtering and Internet governance in Korea.

And a second session which might be of interest is on Wednesday from 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm, the usual panel discussion at the ccNSO. And this one is - will be focused on marketing ccTLDs with the advent of new gTLDs -- strategies and reactions to the changing environment. And, as always, the sessions of the ccNSO are open for all interested and not just for the ccTLD community.

And with this, I end my presentation. I want to hand it over to my colleague and friend, Olof Nordling, to inform you on the ASO.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, boss, and good evening from Brussels, everybody. Time for the ASO, which is an entity that deals within numbers in the ICANN world. And by numbers, we mean IP addresses and autonomous system numbers.

The ASO is subject to policy development big time. But let's first start with a little bit of the structure of the ASO, which is perhaps not universally well known. And there is some concepts which are key here. RIR -- Regional Internet Registries -- these are key players in the allocation of IP addresses. And the food chain works a little bit like this -- the IANA function or the ICANN hands huge chunks of the IP addresses to the RIRs, which in turn delivers or allocates still very big chunks to the ISPs, which in turn allocate them to the individual users, so you can get taxes for the Internet, which is a good thing.

Now there are five RIRs, which neatly are covering the globe -- one for Africa -- AfriNIC, one for Asian Pacific -- APNIC, one for North America -- ARIN, one for Latin America and the Caribbeans -- LatNIC, and one for Europe, which is RIPE. And they all cooperate through a global entity called the NRO -- Number Resource Organization.

And now we can define the ASO, which is the other supporting organization which was set up through an MOU between ICANN and the NRO and the RIRs, actually. And it stipulates that the NRO should undertake the task of being the ASO. So in - essentially, the ASO is an alias for the NRO, if you so like -- crystal clear, I hope.

Now, so much about structure. What about policies? Well, according to the MOU, one major task of the ASO is to have global policy proposals, which is a grand name. And behind that fancy name, what is actually happening? What is a global policy? Now, it's so that the RIRs develop a lot of regional addressing policies and a few of those -- but really, very few -- they effect the IANA allocations and actually dictate the IANA allocations. And only those are called global policies. So this, from an RIR perspective, is the tip of the iceberg, but from the ICANN perspective, it's fundamentally important.

And currently -- as I said, they are few and far between -- and currently there is one such global policy proposal in pipeline addressing how to deal with the recovered IPv4 address space post the time of exhaustion of their fees -- IPv4 (unintelligible) and IANA.

So let's have a closer look at that. It's all about recycling, really. And, as you know, last year the IANA free pool of IPv4 addresses was exhausted. And for around about two years, the RIR have discussed the potential to develop a policy that could enable IANA to hand out smaller chunks than what is prescribed in the original IPv4 allocation policy, which says they shall allocate a slash-8, which is 60 million addresses. And if IPv4 address bases recover and return to the IANA, well this would be all too big. So they should have the

ability to do - to deal with both the receive - returned IPv4 address base and hand it out in suitable chunks.

And current phases of this one is that - well, there have been actually three proposals and two have been abandoned due to disagreement between the RIRs on the actual rewording of them, since they all have to agree to identical formulation of the, you know, the policy in their regions in order for it to become a viable global policy proposal.

Now the third one has really made a mark and has, as of recently, been adopted by all the RIRs, which means that it's now addressed by the NRO Executive Committee and by the ASO Address Council in order to verify that the process has been followed and such. And then comes the time when it's delivered to the ICANN Board for ratification within a window of 60 days, when the ICANN Board can either ratify it and put it forward for implementation by IANA or pose questions and start a dialogue with the ASO in order to clarify whatever needs clarification.

So, that's where we stand. It may surface and get delivered for that process in - well, a month, probably two months time. So, as I said, this is only the tip of the iceberg, and if you're interested in such matters, there are - the place to go is perhaps not to the ASO in this global sense, because they take care of the final handling of the matter. The development takes place in two bottom up traditions within the RIRs. And you are free -- very, very open community in that sense, the addressing community -- you can join in and make your voice heard in any RIRs of your choice. And they conduct open meetings and have open mailing lists for such matters. And that will, of course, also cover the regional policy development.

And last but not least is that on Wednesday in Costa Rica in the afternoon, there will be a particular workshop given - provided by the ASO on the developments all over the globe, global policy proposals as well as the



regional policy proposals. You would get an excellent overview at that workshop if you have a budding interest.

And with that, I conclude regarding the ASO and I hand over, regarding participation and engagement -- not really to Filiz Yilmaz as shown in the picture here -- but rather to Brian Peck, which takes over that session from now on. So Brian, the floor is yours.

Brian Peck: Thank you very much, Olof. And as Olof mentioned, Filiz is currently on travel right now and so just want to point out a couple highlights with regards to developments in participation and in engagement.

First of all, of course, is that the new public comment system has been implemented and has been in place since the first of this year. They basically have implemented - the new system has implemented the ATRT recommendations, particularly with regards to categorizing and tagging all public comments. All public comments now have two cycles -- the initial comment period, with a minimum of 21 days and then reply period as well, also with a minimum of 21 days. The reply period would not exist, of course, if there were no initial comments. So that system has been in place and has been working.

In addition, staff and a group of community leaders have been working on a wiki-based threaded discussion environment for public comments. You can see here on this slide basically the steps that have been taking place over the course - since June of last year, basically.

The - we've had several - the features and functions that have been subject to the testing by the volunteers include the overall site layout, navigation, the discussion threads or interactions, notifications and topic registration, public sign-up, user help resources, and the overall solution usefulness and viability. I think we - I believe we have a few of the volunteers on this call. We

appreciate very much their support and time in helping us to develop this particular wiki-based environment.

The next steps -- now that the review has been completed -- is the reporting to the Exec team and the PVC on the status of the testing of the comments received, the cost benefit analysis, the impact analysis on ICANN departments, and it's asking for a go, no go decision. So that's where that particular process currently stands.

In Costa Rica, there will be several public comment and engagement and participation activities and events taking place. We urge you -- or encourage you -- to take advantage of them -- PPC consultation with the community on several issues as well as the newcomer's lounge and newcomer's track on Sunday. Filiz also will be there in Costa Rica and, of course, will be available to discuss any of these matters or answer questions that you may have at that time.

So with that, I'd like to turn it back to David Olive. Thank you.

David Olive: Thank you very much, Brian. I would just like to, before opening up the questions, (unintelligible) on the policy development activities and the (unintelligible) very good source, which we, as they say, do before each ICANN meeting, but of course published mid-monthly is our monthly update. You can read it online here at the Web site indicated or subscribe on our icann.org Web site and it can be delivered to you in the various languages that we offer for that report. I think it's the best way to keep you informed about these policy developments, issues under public comment, as well as other activities in the SOs and the ACs.

Of course, the policy staff worked hard to present these materials to you and appreciate working with you on the policy activities of the SOs and the ACs. And we thank you for your cooperation and participation, not only today, but during our work sessions and we look forward to seeing all of you in Costa

Rica in person or remotely online. And we thank you for your time and attention.

With that, I would open it up to any other questions you may have, either by putting it into the chat -- I see there's one from Steve Metalitz -- or just raising your hand in the Adobe Connect and we'll all try to answer those questions.

The consensus building session, I think is in the (unintelligible) and Steven, we'll get to you those details of the time. Thank you, Marika. From 10:00 to 11:00 on Wednesday, Elad Levinson will be doing his consensus building session. Thank you.

Are there any other questions?

(Sheryl): David, it's (Sheryl) here. There was a number of questions posted through the chat, so you might want to get staff to have a quick peruse back through the chat, because I think you'll find there's a bit of a line up, actually.

Liz Gasster: So I think one was -- this is Liz -- and I think one was Steve Metalitz noting concerns about the links and the schedule, which we think is perhaps a technical error, because a number of the links we provided aren't there. So we're going to get to the bottom of that and figure out what's wrong with that.

John Berryhill, the monthly policy update is published once a month, except, I think, we do a combined publication in November/December and otherwise, I think it's actually once a month.

Let's see -- the consensus building session is - David, you might want to talk a little more about what that is, but Elad Levinson, who's our Vice President of Human Resources, has - and who has had a history and experience in consensus building in working groups and task forces, was going to provide tips and other tools to help communities reach consensus. David, do you have more you want to add there?

David Olive: He will providing some of his experiences, as well as best practices to be given to a community as well as to - by other groups that may want to look for his approaches or consensus advice. So he will be providing that and using his many years of training experience in the private sector and in the - in civil society.

Liz Gasster: And then the question about the Trademark Clearing House -- yes, we don't actually have answers for any questions around the new gTLD activities today. I'm not really prepared to address those.

If anyone else can help me with any other questions that we may have missed - I tried to go back through and I know Margie and others were answering as well, but please feel free to ask a question if you feel we haven't addressed...

David Olive: I'm sorry, I didn't catch that question. If there are other people wanting to ask questions included in the chat or raise your hand -- if someone's trying to ask a question but cannot hear...

Liz Gasster : There is a question for Berry from (Evan), David. I don't know if there - if others can mute their phones for a sec and if Berry can unmute his to answer (Evan's) question. And then if others have questions, please do type them in the chat. That seems best.

David Olive: Okay, Berry, have you seen (Evan's) question?

Berry Cobb: Yes, this is Berry. Thank you. If you don't mind, I'm actually going to take this - take the note and answer this question offline. I'm not sure I follow all of it.

Liz Gasster: Okay. (Evan), please note we're taking that question offline, but we'll make sure to get back to you on that. And we're just giving everyone a moment to ask any other questions. And I'm jumping in a little, because I think David's

transmission is spotty. And David, I apologize if I'm speaking over you, but I'm not hearing you well, so I'm sure others aren't either.

If there's any other questions, please feel free to ask them in the chat. Okay, well, I don't see any other questions. I want to thank everyone for participating, contributing in this Webinar. I don't know if David has - wants to make any closing remarks, but in case his line is still problematic, thank you all from all of us, and we look forward to seeing you all either in person in Costa Rica or remotely. Thank you again for your time and interest.

David Olive: And let me thank everyone for their participation. With that, I wish you a good evening, good afternoon, or good morning. Thank you very much.

END

Participant list – audio bridge and Adobe Connect room:

Svitlana Tkachenko  
Kristo Helasvuo  
Wilson Abigaba  
Adela Danciu  
Yaovi Atohoun  
Siva Subramanian  
Baudouin Schombe  
Pascal Bekono  
Lanre Ajayi  
Andy Coombs  
Joshua Jarvis  
Puhettako Oy  
Ruth Puente  
Sheri Falco  
El Financiero  
Holly Raiche

Samantha Demetriou  
Kiran Malancharuvil  
Alain Berranger  
Evan Leibovitch  
Elisa Cooper  
Brian Winterfeldt  
Mason Cole  
Luca Barbero  
Krista Papac  
Beth Bacon  
Darcy Enyeart  
Andrii Paziuk  
Anne Aikman Scalese  
Beth  
Byron  
David Maher

DP  
Emily Murray  
Esther Nunes  
Gabriea Szlak  
Gordon Chillcott  
Hossam Hossam  
Jberryhill 2  
Joyce Lin  
Philip Marano  
Shawn Gunnarson  
Warren Kumari  
Bob Wiegand  
Sandra Hoferichter  
Carolyn Hoover