Report of

ICANN 40

San Francisco, USA,
March 13 - 18, 2011

Peter Van Roste
Wim Degezelle

Table of Contents

Executive summary

- While this was the best attended ICANN meeting ever (+1800 attendants), it wasn't the most successful one – significant last-minute changes to the agenda were to blame.
- Exchanges between ccNSO and gNSO were reduced significantly and there was no exchange between ccNSO and Board or GAC.
- Highlights from the ccNSO meeting included:
    o A frank but constructive discussion on DNSSEC
    o Excellent presentation by Vaggelis Segredakis on the issues arising with regard to the Greek IDN request under the fast track
    o Pre-meeting sessions for the Finance and SOP working groups
- Changes at the ccNSO:
    o The ccNSO welcomes Lesley Cowley (Nominet, .UK) as new Chair.
    o Byron Holland (CIRA, .CA) and Hiro Hotta (JPRS,.JP) were selected as Vice-Chairs.
    o Roelof Meijer (SIDN, .NL) and Keith Davidson (InternetNZ, .NZ) join the ccNSO Council.
    o Chris Disspain (AUda, .AU) joins the ICANN Board.
    o Erick Iriarte stepped down as GM of LACTLD

ccNSO Meeting
15 – 16 March 2011

Update from the Finance WG (Byron Holland, .CA)
Update from the SOP WG (Roelof Meijer, .NL)

The group concluded that the process leading up to the previous submission was not satisfactory and discussed a different approach for the submission of ccNSO comments for the Strategic and Operational plan FY 2012.

Heads-up on the FY 2012,
- Significant increase on consulting (+15,3% => almost 25% of budget)
- No invoices yet for FY 2011
- Total budget FY 2012 (+15%) = 69812000 USD

The details can be found here: https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#op-budget-fy2012

The SOP group will submit comments on the 2012 Operational Plan Framework – if interested please contact Roelof Meijer.

IANA root management update

- IANA NoI
- Workflow automation – currently parallel processing and checking for consistency – no date but getting very close
- DNSSEC improvements – 63 domains signed so far – proposing to implement "RRSIC checks" to avoid typos or common misconfiguration errors
- RRSIC Checks will lead to soft fail in case anything is wrong, ccTLD operator will have opportunity to instruct to proceed anyway – implementation in coming weeks
- Country-wide Internet shutdowns – Regulatory shutdown
  - Egypt case: .eg continued to resolve, .masr didn't work any longer
    - Reasons: expiry period + geographical locations of nameservers
    - Combination of long expiry periods and geographical and topological diverse name servers will help protect against these kinds of incidents
  - Naela Sarras has now been promoted to run the IDN Fast track process – recruiting new root zone manager

JIG (Joint ccNSO/gNSO IDN Group) Update

- Issues of common interest:
  - Single character IDN TLDs
    - See final report: http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/jig-final-report-single-character-idns-08mar11-en.pdf
  - IDN TLDs Variants
    - See initial report: http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/jig-idn-tld-variant-policies-initial-report-08mar11-en.pdf
  - Universal acceptance of IDN TLDs
    - Both towards end-users and software manufacturers
  http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-jig-update-15mar11-en.pdf

IDN ccPDP WG II

- How to introduce IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO
- What bylaw changes are needed to include IDN ccTLD managers as full members in the ccNSO (on equal footing)
- Interim report available here: http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idn-pdp-wg2-final-interim-report-22nov10-en.pdf
- "One vote per territory" – principle is being reviewed and turned into a" one vote per IANA code" principle (open for further discussions)
- 'variant issues' will not be taken into account as this would stall the work of this WG for too long

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-idn-pdp-wg2-update-15mar11-en.pdf

IDN ccTLD Fast Track update (Naela Sarras)

- Status update
    o 34 unique requests – 27 IDN ccTLDs in rootzone – 9 more approved strings in IANA delegation process
- Process review
- Main themes from review process
    o Community Support requirement: There is confusion on what the community support requirements are
    o Confusing similarity requirements: Lots of questions about how this is dealt with
    o Transparency: there is a conflict between need for confidentiality and the need to release info about string earlier in the process
    o Disputes and Objections: no appeal process, requesters have asked for one
    o IDN Tables: Tables to be submitted during application
    o Delegation of variant TLDs: concern about the lack of clear definition for variants and a description of the problems associated with delegation of variants in the root zone
- Staff recommendations
    o No immediate changes
    o More outreach events needed
    o Improve explanatory process to improve understanding

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-idn-cctld-ft-update-15mar11-en.pdf

Bulgarian application for IDN ccTLD

- Ask for additional extended evaluation – not possible and rejected
- Could the application benefit from 3-person panel review? No as this is only available if additional expertise is needed.
- Vaggelis: There is no transparency whatsoever…

Rejected application for .epsilon lambda

- There is a fundamental fault that has been demonstrated through unexpected outcome in some recent cases
- Rejected because confusingly similar to .ea (?!)
- Total lack of transparency
- The work from the IDN ccPDP WG I can be used immediately to solve some of the issues raised
- We need a change now!
- SWORD is an advisory tool that is being used by the EU trademark office

DRD WG Update:

Bernie Turcotte and Keith Davidson
All the reports are available on http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg.htm
Presentation: http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-drdwg-15mar11-en.pdf

(From ccNSO report:
During the ccNSO meeting the Final Report of the Delegation, Re-delegation and Retirement Working Group was discussed. The DRDWG recommended the ccNSO Council undertake, as a first step, the development of a "Framework of Interpretation" for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. The DRDWG recommended that the ccNSO should launch a cc Policy Development Process on the retirement of ccTLDs. At the same time the DRDWG advised that the Council consider the development of a Framework of Interpretation as a higher priority than the ccPDP for retirement of ccTLDs
At its meeting the ccNSO Council thanked all members, experts, observers on the DRDWG for their outstanding work, and timely delivery of the Final Report.
The ccNSO Council further resolved to create the Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FoI WG) as recommended and adopted its charter. The ccNSO Council will revisit whether or not to launch a ccPDP on the retirement of ccTLDs at the time the FoI WG has submitted its Final Report as foreseen in the charter of the FoI WG.)

To be formed Framework of Interpretations (FoI) working group:
- This framework should provide a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board on interpretations of the current Policy Statements
- It is a recommendation from the delegation and redelegation working group
- Joint WG ccNSO / GAC
- Deliverables on a per issue basis
- FOI working group recommendations to be approved by both ccNSO Council and the GAC
- Approved recommendations to be forwarded to the ICANN Board within 10 days of being approved
- Looking for volunteers

Regional Organizations update

CENTR – Peter Van Roste

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-centr-update-15mar11-en.pdf

ccNSO Review – assessment of process and final report:

- Positive comments from the room
- With the exception of the quality of the interview(er)s: they lacked proper preparation and understanding of the issues at stake
http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-ccnso-review-update-15mar11-en.pdf

SSAC Briefing to ccNSO

- Patrik Fallstrom is the new Chair since January – following Steve Crocker
- SSAC Workplan 2011 available at: http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/ssac-activity-report-28feb11-en.pdf
- Current activities:
    o SSAC Review: registry transition

- o Source address validation
- o DNS zone risk analysis
- o Orphaned DNS Records
- ICANN podcasts are excellent source of plain language explanation of SSAC documents (SSAC44 in particular addressed to registrants looking for a registrar)

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-ssac-briefing-falstrom-galvin-15mar11-en.pdf

ccTLD Dispute resolution session

WIPO Arbitration service, Brian Beckham
http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-dispute-resolutions-wipo-beckham-15mar11-en.pdf

Dispute Resolution in ADR.eu - Petr Hostas – Czech Arbitration Court
http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-dispute-resolution-adr-eu-hostas-15mar11-en.pdf

A case of LDRP based on arbitration - Margarita Valdez – Nic Chile
http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-dispute-resolution-ldrp-arbitration-cl-valdes-15mar11-en.pdf

Security session

Domain System Threat Landscape, Pablo Rodriguez, .pr & Janelle McAlister, Markmonitor
- Defacement of high profile domain names through security breaches at ccTLDs
- Registries and registrars are used as social and technical vulnarabilities
- Google and Microsoft attacked in Puerto Rico (via registry) and New Zealand (registrar)
- Same group successfully attacked NATO and US Army
- Attack used a SQL injection Username = 'or' 1, PW = 'or' 1
- Passwords were stored in clear text
- Response: Webinterface closed down, database reversed => attack averted and defacement restored in two hours
- Now a custom activity log allows better monitoring
- Also access restriction based on IP address range
- Implemented 2-factor (token) log-in
- Markmonitor: emergency contact number is needed
- In total 4000 customer had to be reached individually

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-domain-system-threat-landscape-rodriguez-mcalister-16mar11-en.pdf

When Your Security Systems Fail; The Last Line of "Defense", Rodney Joffe, .US
- Security failure is not an option – it is guaranteed to happen
- Failure sensors are vital
- Reflective Science™ !
  - o Abandon "we are invincible" mentality
  - o Work back from the assumption that you failed
  - o Identify vulnerability
  - o Some external markers of breeches
    - Cache poisoning of recursive DNS servers
    - Hijacking of network route announcements
    - Darknets or honeypots
    - Appearance of your credentials in underground economy
  - o Monitor outside, not just inside

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-security-systems-fail-last-line-defense-joffe-16mar11-en.pdf

The 10 best ways to hack a registry, Simon McCalla, .uk
- Excellent self-explaining presentation about social engineering
    - Bluffing your way in through the front/backdoor
    - beg until customer rep resets password
    - Leave usb sticks around
    - Pretend to be an employee
    - Usb keystroke recorder
    - Login to wifi
    - Stolen equipment

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-ways-to-hack-registry-mccalla-15mar11-en.pdf

ccTLD News session

Rebranding .US - Judy Song-Marshall
- Reinvesting profits in branding campaign
- From patriotic message to social "us" back to "America's address"
- New logo, integration with .US facebook page, name generator, .us video

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-us-branding-refresh-song-marshall-16mar11-en.pdf

.SE quality management – Danny Aerts
- Company of the year 2010 quality award
- Why?
    - We live on trust "we are the trustees for the delegated domain (RFC1591)
    - Good basis to handle strong growth
- Financial surplus to reinvest in local community (internet development)
- How?
    - Internal trainers to train other employees – so few external consultants
    - Due diligence of peers through benchmarking trips
    - Divide plan in sizeable bites
        - Employees learn key messages
        - Identify the customer
        - 2/3k per year per employee
        - Plan for the time and allocate resources
- Why did .SE win?
    - Great growth rate
    - Satisfied customers
    - Price per name drops
- Message:
    - All registries have this possibility, but don't always do a good job in showing this off.
    - Small investment could create enormous amount of goodwill in own market.

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-se-quality-award-16mar11-en.pdf

.TR – Atilla Özgit
- .TR exists for 20 years
- 250k domain names allocated
- Only third level registrations

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-drd-tr-16mar11-en.pdf

Delegation and redelegation of .so, Mohamed Ibrahim, .SO
http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-so-cctld-briefer-history-ibrahim-16mar11-en.pdf

SIDN celebrates 25 Years of .NL – Sieger Springer, SIDN
http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-sidn-16mar11-en.pdf

.EU Multiyear registrations, Giovanni Seppia, EURid
http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-eu-multiyear-registrations-seppia-16mar11-en.pdf

Whois Policy team review – interaction with ccNSO, Emily Taylor

- Informational session for ccTLDs
- Looking to what extent ICANN's whois policies meet legitimate needs of law enforcement and meets consumers needs and expectations

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-whois-policy-rt-16mar11-en.pdf

DNSSEC Panel

Bart Boswinkel – ICANN – overview of current situation:
- Low penetration in signed zones with one exception: 15% in .CZ

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-dnssec-status-boswinkel-16mar11-en.pdf

Chris AusRegistry:
- Difficult message, high risk
- Provide registrars with toolkits and documentation
- Provide registrants with a simple tick-box, build it in the browser by default
- Top-down push or bottom-up? Latter seems the most efficient.
- View dnssec as an enabler – make dnssec a requirement to get other more funky tools

Ondrej Filip:
- Informing possible stakeholders is essential
- Very active marketing on DNSSEC
- .CZ demonstrates that DNSSEC can be deployed on a large scale

Jeff Bruegmann, AT&T
- Low demand
- Government procurement behavior is changing
- Federal Government main customer
- Ultimately we need to create user demand – consumers are not willing to pay for security

Michele Neylon, Blacknight
- Doesn't see a business case
- Technology is interesting but fails to understand why registries think that this will solve all the problems
- The interactions are important – they provide new ideas

Philip Du Bois
- DNSSEC launch in December
- Just over 1k names signed in a 1000k zone
- Wonders if DNSSEC is money well spend as there is no market demand
- DNSSEC needs to be simplified, otherwise it will not be successful

What would overall success look like?

PDB: DNSSEC needs to become simple to implement

OF: Success would be implementation by key customers such as banks and ISPs

Chris: If no end-users would use DNSSEC, that wouldn't be an issue for AusRegistry

Michele: There is no real benefit for the end-user. The Plug-in is not being used by the average user

JB: IPv6 is much more of a priority now, only public procurement could give the much needed push

What is the market?

Why is government pushing?

OF: There is a market (governments), financial institutions, registrars

Audience: There is a market (like there is one for https) but users don't know it.

How do the marketing?

PDB: Share info and promote DNSSEC to selected parties. Only providing basic technology explanation.

GAC Report

The GAC, the Board, the Community and the new gTLDs

The 40th ICANN meeting ended up being one big consultation round on new gTLDs. The normal schedule of Board, GAC and as a result of many of the Supporting Organisations was shacked up. Unfortunately this also meant that many of the meetings of the Board and the GAC with supporting organisations were cancelled.

After the Cartagena meeting where the ICANN Board and the GAC agreed to '*an inter-sessional meeting to address the GAC's concerns with the new gTLD process*'[1] many expected San Francisco to be the place where finally the ICANN Board would agree on the definitive Applicant Guidebook for new gTLDs.

However, already early February, before the inter-sessional Board-GAC meeting, it was that there would be no decision in San Francisco and that a new final version of the DAG would only be published in April.

The discussions on the new gTLDs in San Francisco cannot be separated from the GAC/Board meeting in Brussels since the scorecard on outstanding issues compiled by the GAC for this meeting, clearly helped to structure the discussion also in San Francisco.

(1) ICANN Board - GAC Consultation in Brussels, 28 February – 2 March 201
The Board and the GAC met in Brussels, Belgium, two weeks before the ICANN meeting.
In preparation of the meeting, the GAC published a clear scorecard on new gTLD outstanding issues. The Scorecard reassembles the advice the GAC has given at different moments in time. On the second day of the Brussels meeting and after some pressure coming from the GAC and indirectly also from the audience, the Board agreed to publicly inform about its position on the different issues on the scorecard.
At the Brussels meeting Board and GAC started to use the term *'our current best thinking',* which gives them the possibility to indicate what their current position is on a certain issue without this being considered as an official Board of GAC position. It definitely helped the discussion.
The scorecard would also be the basis for the discussions in San Francisco between the Board and the GAC and with the Community.

The GAC scorecard can be found at
http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/gac-scorecard-23feb11-en.pdf .
The Board's notes on the GAC scorecard can be found at
http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/board-notes-gac-scorecard-04mar11-en.pdf .
A CENTR report on the Brussels consultation can be found at
https://www.centr.org/main/6167-CTR.html .

(2) Public Discussion on the issues identified by the GAC, SF, Monday 14 March
(3) Public Discussion on the issues identified by the GAC, SF, Wednesday 16 March

The different constituencies were invited to give their opinion on the topics on the GAC scorecard and other issues regarding the DAG.
Peter Dengate Thrush (ICANN Chair) made clear that during these public discussions the Board wanted to check community support on the issues identified by the GAC scorecard.

Kurt Pritz (ICANN) gave an overview of the current position of the Board on the different issues in the DAG scoreboard which could be divided into 80 different sub issues. On 25 issues the Board was in full agreement with the GAC. On 28 issues the Board agreed in principle but needed to sort out the details. And on 23 issues the Board signalled that it was in disagreement with the GAC advice. On the remaining issues there was not yet a position defined.

---

[1]See ICANN Board resolution (2010.12.10.21.1) Cartagena

Board vs GAC scorecard on new gTLD outstanding issues at start of SF meeting	
25 issues	Board in full agreement with GAC
28 issues	Board agrees in principle, details to be sorted out
23 issues	Board disagrees with GAC
4 issues	No position yet

The first session focused on the points where there was disagreement between the Board and GAC Advice. The second, shortened session, discussed the other issues on the scorecard.

The transcript and recording can be found at http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22097 (14 March consultation) and http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22169 (16 March).

(4) ICANN Board - GAC Consultation on new gTLD outstanding issues, SF, Tuesday 15 March
(5) ICANN Board – GAC Consultation on new gTLD outstanding issues, SF, Thursday 18 March

The GAC – Board consultations in San Francisco, just like the Brussels meeting, walked through all the open issues on the scorecard. On some points progress was made while at other moments GAC members were surprised to hear Peter Dengate Thrush (ICANN) asking if the GAC had changed its position. This usually triggered the reaction that the GAC gave the Board its 'current best thinking' and was waiting on a reaction from Board rather than planning to change its position.

In the mean time the GAC, behind closed doors, continued to prepare its written response on 'the Board's response to the GAC's scorecard'. This written response will only be finalised and posted after the San Francisco meeting.

At the beginning of the consultation GAC Chair, Header Dryden (Canada), indicated clearly the GAC's priorities:
- GAC's Law enforcement recommendations
- Objections and sensitive strings
- Early warning
- Community strings

Law enforcement recommendations – The GAC wants amongst other things that applicants are screened for convictions for the illegal sale, manufacture, or distribution of illicit or pharmaceutical drugs, acts of terrorism, arms trafficking, human trafficking, money laundering, smuggling, including weapons, intellectual property crime and cybercrime (including spam, hacking, or the deployment of botnets).
Applicants that offer higher levels of security should be given a higher weight in the application procedure.

Early warning, objections and sensitive strings – The GAC wants to introduce an early warning opportunity for governments for sensitive strings. At the moment of the early warning an applicant would still have the opportunity to review or withdraw its application and so avoid facing an objection later on in the process.
The early warning is only a part of the requests from the GAC regarding objection mechanisms for strings that are potentially sensitive to governments (geographic, religious, linguistic, cultural).

The ICANN Board seemed to work in the direction of a solution by introducing including a 45 day public comment period, early warning and 4 possible ways for governments to object a sensitive string:
1. During the public comment period an individual government can submit an advice (this will be taken into account by the initial evaluators)
2. The GAC as a whole can issue an early warning to the Board (Board will send this to the applicants, so that applicant could review his application)
3. The GAC can submit a formal GAC Advice to the Board

4. An individual government, if it doesn't want to go via the GAC, can file a formal objection to the ICANN Board.

Some of the other questions discussed:

- Why do applicants that withdraw their application and recover a part of their application fee, in the end still pay more to ICANN than the full fee during the previous round?
- What is the rationale behind the 180° turn of the Board's position regarding the registry-registrar separation?
- The GAC and Board are still struggling with geographic names that are not on any official list and 'commonly used abbreviations'.

Next steps:

- March 25th: written GAC feedback to the Board
- April 15th : changes to the Applicant Guidebook posted for public comment (30 days)
- May 20th : consultation ICANN Board / GAC (conference call)
- May 30th : Applicant guidebook posted
- June 20th : Special Board meeting to approve the Applicant guidebook

Note: The GAC communiqué clearly asks the Board for revised version of the Applicant Guidebook in which track-changes clearly indicate how the GAC's advice has been taken into account.

Official bylaws consultation on .xxx

The GAC and the ICANN board met for a so-called bylaws consultation on the ICM registry application (.xxx).
The ICANN Bylaws prescribe that in the event that the ICANN Board takes an action that is not consistent with the GAC advice the Board has to inform the GAC why it decided not to follow the advice and try, in good faith and in a timely manner, to find a mutual acceptable solution. (Bylaws article XI, 2.1, j).

The GAC informed the Board that it didn't change its position it already stated at the Wellington meeting (March 2006). A statement was read out to inform the Board that there was no active support of the GAC for the introduction of .xxx. The GAC expressed its concern for the stability and universal solvability of the Internet since some governments might try to block access to the .xxx domain.
 The GAC asked for further clarification on ICANN's decision in December 2010 on .xxx (the Board's intention to enter into a registry agreement with ICM) and expressed concerns regarding the sponsorship criteria and registry agreement between ICANN and ICM.

It was clear that the board and GAC could not come to an agreement and on Friday the ICANN Board approved the ICM application for .xxx .
Conform bylaws Article XI, 2.1, k, the Board provided a 20 pages long rationale for its decision to approve the registry agreement with ICM for a .xxx sponsored TLD (http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/draft-icm-rationale-18mar11-en.pdf).

Other GAC Business and the GAC communiqué

The GAC Communiqué of the San Francisco meeting can be found at
http://gac.icann.org/system/files/GAC-communique-SFO.pdf .

The new GAC secretariat was presented in San Francisco. The Secretariat is financed by the by the Brazilian, Dutch and Norwegian governments and will be based in Delft, the Netherlands. Currently it has two staff members Jeremy Beale (United Kingdom) and Ruth Puente (Uruguay).

ICANN Open Forum Open forum

The open forum on Thursday dealt with everything except new gTLDs since the community had already more than

* FY12 Operating Plan and Budget Framework
The FY12 foresees in the recovering of the historical costs of the introduction of new gTLDs. GNSO's Chuck Homes proposed to partially delay or delete this recovery operation and spend the money on support for new gTLD applicants and language community in developing countries in addition to report JAS working group.
He also asked for additional ICANN support for the GNSO (staff, policy support), since over 94% ICANN revenue comes from gTLD registrants.

Questions on the staffing
- business constituency remains concerned that that the ICANN staffing needs to be brought up to the FY10 budget levels of 15 staff in registry/registrar compliance

- Former ICANN staff member and now member of the ICANN nominating committee Maria Farrell, introduced herself as 'being the first of many mass exodus of staff from the ICANN organisation in a series of forced departures which continue to this day' warned for the vast los of expertise, relationships and institutional memories and its effects on the effectiveness and international profile of the organisation. She mentioned that there was a climate of fear among staff and that members staff members were afraid to speak out loud.
The staff is no managing expectations instead of serving the community and internal communication is non-existant
Loud and long applause from the audience.
PDT: asked ceo to brief on staff members
Rod Beckstrom (ICANN) compared ICANN's 15% total staff turnover for 2010, with the 20%-30% turnover for US non-profit organisations in the US and a similar rate for high-tech companies. For privacy reasons he could not give details on the number of voluntary and involuntary departures.
He further mentioned that ICANN did a survey on staff satisfaction and was very proud of its results.

- questions on the VP for organisational effectiveness (role, how it fits in in FYI10)
Rod:

Roelof: (chair of SOP working group)
There was a total staff expenditure for personnel costs of 25.9 million USD for 135 Full time equivalents, which would come up to a fairly high average of 192,000 USD.
Rod this is a normal figure for a High Tech company based where the ICANN offices are based.
Roelof: we got the indication from ICANN staff members that 'too much lower qualified work was done by overqualified ICANN staff'
PDT referred to the work of the compensation policy WG and said that the board was planning a review of the 2006 study.

Lesley
In cartage I was expressing some concern about staff retention and the loss off expertise and knowledge and roughly calculated a turnover of 78% of senior staff. Lesley supports Maria's comments that the community
The concern is that even with the compensation policy, experience seems to walk away from ICANN.
Applause from the room

IANA contract

Nigel
In art 4 of

Asks Board to confirm whether or not 'relevant international law' as mentioned in ICANN's article of incorporation art 4, 'includes the universal declaration of human rights (1949) and/or the European Convention of Human Rights of 1950'

David Maher
What impact would a significant delay of failure to comply with the ATRT recommendations have on the IANA contract?

ATRT review
-> comment on appointment of ombudsmand appointmeny
Kieren McCarthy: suggests

.xxx
A series of representatives of the adult industry read statements against the introduction of .xxx .

ICANN Board meeting, 18 March 2011

The Board approved the .xxx application, approved the 2011-2014 strategic plan, adopted a timeline for the completion of the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook and the launch of the new gTLD process.

The Board ratified the decision to move the venue of the upcoming ICANN meeting (18-24 June 2011) to Singapore and approved Toronto as venue for the ICANN meeting 14-19 October 2012.
There is no decision yet on the venue of the Africa meeting at the end of October this year. Rumours are that Dakar (Senegal) would be in the lead but ICANN staff is still watching the local political stability.

Overview of the approved Board resolutions:

1.1. Approval of Minutes of 25 January 2011 ICANN Special Board Meeting
1.2. Approval of Changes to SSAC Membership
    → David Conrad (former IANA GM and ICANN VP for IT) appointed as SSAC member.
1.3. ccNSO Review – Receipt of Board WG Final Report and Dissolution of the WG
    → The Structural Improvements Committee now has to propose action by the Singapore meeting.
1.4. Approval of Revision of Bylaws re: Implementation of SSAC Review Working Group Report
1.5. Approval of Membership of IDN Variants Working Group
    → Members of the Board IDN Variant Working Group: Ram Mohan (Chair), Thomas Narten, Suzanne Woolf and Kuo-Wei
1.6. Approval of Location of ICANN Public Meeting in North America – October 2012
    → Venue an dates: Toronto, Canada from 14-19 October 2012
    Budget: US$2.01 million.
1.7. ICANN Meeting in Singapore – June 2011
    → Change of venue ratified: Singapore, 18-24 June 2011
1.8. Approval of ICANN Public Meeting Dates for 2014-2016
1.9. Thanks to Departing ccNSO Council Volunteers
1.10. Thanks to Sponsors
1.11. Thanks to Scribes, Interpreters, Staff, Event and Hotel Teams
1.12. Thanks to Speakers
1.13. Thanks to Meeting Participants
2. Approval of the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan
3. Process for Completion of the Applicant Guidebook for New gTLDs
    → 15 April 2011: publication of DAG extracts with 'track changes'
    → 30 May 2011: Final Applicant Guidebook posted
    → 20 June 2011: extraordinary board meeting on the final Applicant Guidebook
    Timeline at http://icann.org/en/minutes/draft-timeline-new-gtlds-18mar11-en.pdf
4. AOC Reviews, Including ATRT Recommendations
    → staff to post plans for the implementation of the ATRT recommendations
    → GAC and NomCom requested to implement the recommendations
    → staff to develop metrics to benchmark ICANN's accountability and transparency with international entities' best practices
5. Approval of ICM Registry Application for .XXX
    → .xxx Registry Agreement with ICM approved
    → publication of rationale for not following the GAC's advice
6. Approval of Expenses Related to Board-Directed Activities
    → approval of budget for AOC Reviews, 3rd Board Retreat, GAC meeting, IDN Variant panel, ATRT ecommendations
7. Technical Liaison Group (TLG) Review – Actions Based on Independent Reviewer's Final Report
    → establishment of a Board Technical Relations Working Group to consider measures to enhance the coordination and cooperation between ICANN and other members of the   Internet technical community

8. IDN ccTLD Fast Track Review
→ approval of the "ICANN Recommendations of Public Comment Received on the Review of the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process"

9. Approval of VeriSign RSEP Request for Release of Numeric-Only Strings for .NAME
→ approval of numeric-only and numbers-and-hyphens domain names in .NAME

10. Appointment of Interim Ombudsman
→ Herb Waye appointed as interim Ombudsman while the search for an Ombudsman continues

11. Engagement of Independent Auditor
→Moss Adams LLP

12. ALAC-Related Bylaws Amendments: Posting for Public Comment

13. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group Charter: Posting for Public Comment

14. Proposed Process for Recognition of New Constituencies in GNSO: Extension of Public Comment