CONTENT OF CHATROOM – NBO Meeting –
GNSO Vertical Integration Working Group Meeting

Date:
Wednesday, 10 March 2010 - 12:30 – 13:30

Room:
Impala

Meeting Leaders:
Margie Milam
Senior Policy Counselor

http://nbo.icann.org/node/8918

[12:28]   Jeff: Good thing the Council approved the Charter, otherwise this would have been a short meeting

[12:32]   Jeff: You will all need mikes

[12:33] Rick_Wilhel: Is there going to be audio from the Adobe meeting room?

[12:33]   Jeff: Chuck will read the names from Reston

[12:34]   Jeff: What about remote participants

[12:35] Jothan_Frak: Jothan here in Reson in Lobby

[12:35] Jeffrey_Eck: Jothan - See if the Registries will let you in the room

[12:36]   Jeff: Actually Jothan was the only one to leave because of the fire alarm

[12:37] Robert_Hogg: the whistling wind is stephan blowing into the mike.... power issues here

[12:37]   Jeff: Jothan has enetered the room now

[12:38] Jothan_Frak: Was on 15th floor, just took me longer cuz no elevator

[12:39]   Jeff: We cannot limit the working group.

[12:40] Jothan_Frak: amen.

[12:41] MarkMonitor: is there audio for this session?

[12:41]   tlr: can somebody throw a link into the chatroom?

[12:41] Jeff_Schmid: http://stream.icann.org/impala-64-en.m3u

[12:41] * tlr meant to the charter, but thanks!

[12:46] Frederick_F: thanks for the link

[12:46]   wseltzer: the council has an unlimited supply of optimism

[12:53] Jothan_Frak: or well disguised cynicism

[12:53] Jeff_Schmid: "constitute a material deviation" vs "determine the possible effects"

[12:54] Kathy_Kleim: Good morning, good afternoon all!

[12:54] Jeff_Schmid: Seems like a fundamentally different tasking

[12:56] kevinsaimon: Hi Yumi-san

[12:58]   Greg_Aaron: Reston has lost phone contact

[13:00] Greg_Aaron: and we're back

[13:01] MarkMonitor: the 16-bit feed works ... but not two way

[13:01]   jeff: Everyone in the room should state their interests up front

[13:02]   jeff: Everyone speaking should as well too

[13:02]   MikeOC: testing...

[13:03] Steven_TECH: Two way audio is only available via the bridge call

[13:03]   wseltzer: +1 to likely

[13:04] Steven_TECH: Bridge call info is: 866 692-5762, pass code VERTICAL

[13:05] MarkMonitor: J. Scott Evans: Let's not be to much of a wordsmith here. Likely is fine.

[13:06]   avc: testing

[13:07]   jeff: There are new options presented in latest economic report after DAV v3

[13:07]   jeff: So should that be revised

[13:07]   jeff: Sorry DAG v3

[13:08] Jeff_Schmid: Not just what effects, but what effects constitute material deviations from current and past restrictions...

[13:09]   jeff: But there are more than 4 options now, with the new economic report

[13:10]   avc: This just has to do with DAG3, correct? I would not like to see this re-opened from the beginning when DAG 4 comes out!

[13:10]   jeff: No, ICANN staff lierally just posted new options

[13:10]   jeff: this week

[13:11] Steve_Holst: add "whether" the effects...

[13:12] Jeff_Schmid: I personally think the whole first option is lacking clarity and crispness. I even think we're all reading it slightly differently...

[13:13] Jothan_Frak: Jeff, what's your affiliation

[13:13] *** Signoff: Faisal_Shah (Connection closed)

[13:13]   avc: I think that's correct. According to recent report released by ICANN, VI may have a *negative* effect on competitors, but a *positive* effect for consumers

[13:15]   avri: @avc so that would explain some of the shift in position i think i am perceiving.

[13:15]   avc: Absent monopoly position, VI will almost always help consumers by providing lower prices

[13:16]   wseltzer: avc: unless the market is differentiated in more ways than price

[13:16]   avc: (since I used my initials, for disclosure "avc" is Antony Van Couvering, CEO M+M)

[13:16] Jeff_Schmid: Jeff Schmidt = just an internet user interested in economic issues. No other relevant affiliations. ;-) Also, there are three "Jeffs" here I think?

[13:17] Jothan_Frak: thank you JS.

[13:20]   avc: The IPC version is definitely *not* a narrowing

[13:21]   Kristina: Going back to the "supplementary documents" issue, you could deal with it by saying "supplementary documents including, but not limited to [example]". That would allow you to avoid a footnote, but also provide clarity.

[13:21] Kathy_Kleim: I agree with Mary -- I thought the original intent of the drafting team was a narrow one.

[13:24] Kathy_Kleim: I thought Milton's rationale was to figure out what earlier contracts of ICANN say

about vertical integration -- and whether current proposals are a significant deviation.

[13:25] Jeffrey_Eck: Kathy is correct. That was the rationale

[13:25]   wseltzer: why set ourselves that baseline task?

[13:25]   jeff: BUT, we need to include the options presented by (1) the DAG, (2) the most recent economic report, and (3) options presented by the comments to DAG 3

[13:25]   avri: yes, and anything else is boiling the ocean and makes the task impossible.

[13:26]   jeff: Avri -notderstand your point

[13:26]   avc: completely agree with Kathy

[13:26]   avri: i was agreeing with Kathy's version of Milton and associating with what I said about Milton's comments.

[13:27] Kathy_Kleim: exactly - a very specific mandate - and one that is very doable

[13:27]   jeff: What is the rush with this group since ICANN staff have already stated that the output here will not affect this round of gTLDs?

[13:27]   avc: We should stick to what *deviation* there is, not what *possible effects* there might be

[13:27]   jeff: Or perhaps we should ask staff what their intent is

[13:28] Kathy_Kleim: can someone post the points being read?

[13:28]   wseltzer: but the point of this exercise it to determine whether those deviations have an effect on the market

[13:29]   jeff: Everyone needs to do a statement of interest

[13:29] Michele_Ney: SVG - maybe

[13:29] Jothan_Frak: Yes, but SoI is likely the right approach

[13:30]   MikeOC: glenn@icann.org

[13:30]   MikeOC: glen@icann.org -- sorry this is the right one

[13:31]   avc: Cut it off where? There is emended language up there that hasn't been discussed

[13:32] Jothan_Frak: Jeff Schmidt aren't you an independant evaluator?

[13:34] Jeff_Schmid: @JF: My company responded to the RFP, but no selection has been made. So, no, but we might be at some future point. Or we might not. It's all on the ICANN public site.

[13:35] Jothan_Frak: ok cool

[13:36] Jothan_Frak: just didn't know if that was the same Jeff Schmidt

[13:57]   MikeOC: impressive!