Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting

Registrars meeting

Tuesday 9 April 2013 at 10:45 local time

Marika Konings: Hi, thank you very much, hello everyone. For those of you that don't know me my name is Marika Konings, I'm a senior policy director and a GNSO team leader within the policy staff of ICANN, here together with Brian Pack, a colleague on the GNSO team.

And there a lot of colleagues around that are actually covering some of the other meetings. And so we are just providing you a policy update, so giving you the main development from a GNSO perspective, what projects are currently ongoing which may interest you.

(Nikida) did tell me don't bring too many slides which of course I didn't listen to and I've brought you many slides. But the idea is that if you can maybe go to the next slide, I've basically listed some of the topics that are currently on the discussion where there are immediate opportunities for either input or participation or decisions.

And actually wanted to hear from you if there are any others you want to hear about. So this is - you know if it would be up to me I would probably just cover the first four items and the other ones just leave them in the slide deck for you to review at your leisure.

But if you tell me you really want to hear about you know RTP part D since you already heard about B and C this morning, I'm happy to talk about that as well or any of the other topics here.

Or if there are any other items that you know the GNSO is working on or discussing let me know.

I'm looking around, okay, we can cover D.

Adam Eisner: Adam Eisner, PDP D great, love it.

Marika Konings: Do you want me to start or...

Man: One second, slow down. Did Adam Eisner just volunteer for a PDP?

Adam Eisner: No, he volunteered to have a discussion on the PDP. He did not volunteer to participate.

Man: Because if he volunteered to participate I'd want to kind of go capture this moment.

Marika Konings: So let me maybe first briefly uncover the first four items and then we just go to IRT part D as well. Everyone happy with that? Can we go to the next slide please, and the next one.

                 So looking over the main subject to UDRP proceedings I think I've already been speaking to you before about this topic, as I think you're all aware there's currently no requirement under the UDRP to actually lock the domain name.

                 But it is a practice to fulfill the requirement to maintain status quo, but there's no standard procedure around it, we did a survey amongst registrars in which many of you participated or the working group on that survey.

                 And actually found indeed that there are many different approaches and practices around that. Go to the next slide, so there's actually a PDP that

came out of an initial report on the - or an issue report on the review of the UDRP.

And council actually decided to only look at this specific narrow issue as it's a real concern to many. And actually leave the other items off the UDRP to a later date.

So working group has been working really hard on this topic, we have participants from many registrars are participating in this working group.

But also UDRP providers, members from the IPC, ALAC, business constituencies so there's a broad group of participants that have been discussing this issue.

That said we got input at the start from registrars as well as UDRP providers about their experiences and issues Dave encountered with this issue.

We held a public comment forum, we also reached out to the different stakeholder groups and constituencies for input and our action at the states that the working group has published an initial report.

The report itself lists a number of preliminary recommendations, most of them basically codify existing practices that are in line with the UDRP. And we hope that these will actually clarify and make it really clear to all the parties involved what the requirements are and which different steps need to be followed in the process.

As I move through the (march) just clarifications, however there are few items that may require changes to the rules, if they would be adopted so we just want to point that out as well, or may require changes to UDRP provider supplemental rules.

So we can go to the next slide please, so just a brief snapshot and I really want to point out that we're actually having a more detailed session on this on Thursday, so if you're interested in this topic and really want to get more detail on all the recommendations that are in there please come to the session which I believe is from 9:00 to 10:30 on Thursday.

Looking to Michele, chair of the working group if you have any complaints about it, just talk to him, not to me. So basically very brief the report contains 11 preliminary recommendations so specifically saying preliminary because the working group is looking for input and feedback on these before they want to - will finalize that report.

Man: Constructive feedback preferably.

Marika Konings: Constructive feedback so don't say you don't like it, just tell us you know why you don't like it and what you would like to see changed.

Man: Exactly, I got attacked by about three people in the bar last night.

Marika Konings: Oh really, okay. And then they actually read the report, that's good news, look at it from the bright side.

So 11 preliminary recommendations, first of all a definition of what lucky means, it's sad there currently is no definition of what that means.

One of the main elements there that I think will you know affect registrars and basically requiring registrars to apply this lock within two business days following a request for verification from the UDRP provider.

And to mention like locking these basically preventing any changes of registrant and registrar.

One of the changes I mentioned that maybe would require a change to the UDRP rules would be removing the obligation for a complainant to notify the respondent at the time of filing as it has been identified as one of the main reasons for cyber flight.

And so basically it's complainant can still do so but it's no longer a requirement as it currently would be. In addition like the recommendations themselves aim to provide like a step by step clarification of what is required of all the different parties at every step of the way.

And also once we have agreement on the recommendations and the process, that is a recommendation there to make sure that there's a development of educational informational materials to all the affected parties.

So really can make sure that people understand and know what is required of them and as well include some of the best practices that are being discussed by the working group.

I think that's mainly on the recommendations itself, if you go to the next slide, we do have a workshop that goes into more detail on these recommendations on Thursday.

The initial report is posted for public comments so if you can attend a session but you do have specific views on this please submit your comments either through the stakeholder group or individual comments.

Once the working group has a chance to review all the comments received as well based on what we heard, what the working group heard here and the comments submitted, we will work on finalizing reports which would then be submitted to the GNSO council hopefully for a fourth option.

So I think that's where that stands if anyone has any questions on this effort or any comments.

Man: My you left people speechless Marika, that's great.

Marika Konings: Okay, then moving on to the next topic. So the purpose of gTLD registration data PDP I think you already probably heard quite a lot about this effort over the last couple of days.

Go to the next slide please, so this is the - I don't think I have to talk about this one so if you can move on to the next slide.

As you know this is part of a board initiated PDP on this topic which basically is trying to start the whole discussion afresh on WHOIS or as we're now calling it the purpose of gTLD registration data.

So basically it's a two pronged approach, where on the one hand the board has already initiated a PDP by requesting an issue report which staff has published in the mean time and are the preliminary version which is open for public comment.

And on the other hand has also launched the expert group which will feed its findings into the PDP. So the idea is that once the working group concludes its work those recommendations will feed into the final issue report which then will be submitted to the GNSO council and then feed into the PDP working group as the next step of that.

So where we are with that, as I said the preliminary issue report has now been published for public comments, so fi you go to the next slide, the report itself at this stage contains more of a background on what has gone on, WHOIS, all the different efforts that have been undertaken.

I really hoped to provide an effort on where - a background on where we are now and how we've come here and help as well inform further discussions on this.

We'll welcome public comments at the initial public comment period is open until the 19 of April and will be followed by a reply period if there's substantive comments.

And then we'll publish a final report following the conclusion of the expert working group and taking into account the public comments received.

Any comments on either expert group? I think most of you have actually attended the working group yesterday.

You know it's sad, they really are expected to start from scratch, really look at this issue with fresh eyes and really look at a model for a replacement system.

Again I'll point to Michele as a member of the expert group if you have questions to ask him about this.

Man: Yeah I was just going maybe put him on the spot and just ask him real quick just to give his kind of perspective on the work so far and the outlook for going forward.

Michele Neylon: Yeah no problem. I mean the way this is working, I mean we're working on the basis of let's bring together a bunch of people from totally different backgrounds, totally different perspectives, totally different experiences, etcetera.

And work it back, start with the building blocks. What do you need, what's the absolutely minimum, build it up from there, looking at use cases, all this kind of thing.

So that's what we've been doing over the last few meetings that we've had. We met on Sunday all day, we had the public session yesterday where we got some interesting input and feedback from various community members.

We're having another meeting tomorrow to try and make sense of what all that input was, and we'll be continuing our meetings and discussions, I think we're having another face to face meeting in New York in a couple of weeks or something.

The idea is we'd have some kind of blueprint ready hopefully by (Dervim). The - one of the things that I think has caused a bit of confusion, well there are a couple of things.

First off in terms of timeline expectations it took longer to get the group together than had originally been expected, I think some of the language around the timeline might have lead people to believe that we'd have been done a lot faster than is realistically possible.

Because I think what the kind of view from the ICANN CO and board downwards is let's do this properly as opposed to let's do this quickly.

At least that's my understanding, I think we're also meeting tomorrow with ICANN compliance as well to get some input into some of the problems they have around WHOIS and other things.

If anybody has any concerns or any issues or any questions about what's going on with EWG I'm not really that hard to find and anybody who has difficulty contacting me I would wonder what you're doing wrong.

Marika Konings: Can we move to the next slide?

Michele Neylon: Before we go on to a slide does anybody have any queries or questions for Marika on anything she's covered so far? Apart from Adam who has volunteered to ask questions or do something.

Man: Let's try to encourage more participation, not scold those that dare speak.

Michele Neylon: No, let's get them to actually interact or something, you know. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah so just on the next slide I said this slide as well as the background information where you can find additional information so I'll link to the public comment forum as well the working - the expert working group meeting on Monday where you can actually find further information about the expert group because they have their own wiki where they're posting meeting reports and any additional information that they wish to.

Go to the next topic, so just very briefly want to mention uniformity of reporting and can go to the next slide, it's actually a final issue report that's now in front of the GNSO council to decide whether or not to initiate a PDP on.

For those of you that have a long ICANN memory you may remember the registration abuse policies working group which was a pre-PDP working group delivered I think its final report in 2010 looking at some abuse related issues and related recommendations to that.

And this recommendation specifically asks for a need for more uniformity, the mechanisms to initiate track and analyze policy violation reports.

And as many came back to the idea of having informed and fact based policy development so how can we actually get more data and information that will help inform policy development discussions.

So one of the main focal points at that time was what information can we actually get from ICANN compliance and they initially were requesting feedback on the systems that they had put in place or were planning to put in place.

And gaps that they had identified, and based on that feedback it became clear that they had actually the arrival of Maggie put in place like I think a three year plan to improve some of the functions and I think from our perspective is something we outlined as well in the issue reports that I think they probably met a lot of the requirements or the questions that were outlined by the rep working group.

But still a little bit of the council did request the issue report to further look into this issue and determine whether there will be any other areas that we need further work.

So you can go to the next slide, so we published the initial report on the preliminary issue a while back for public comment. We didn't actually receive any input so we've now issued the final report.

So as I said the report outlines the efforts that the compliance team has made and is making to gather data and provide metrics that will also help inform policy development activities.

We did know that currently there is a lack if you want to say that way in the PDP and the working group guidelines on how metrics should factor in to policy development.

So we've noted that as one of the areas for our improvements may need to be made or whether council may want to consider doing - undertaking some additional work.

So this would be measuring on how effective our policy recommendations weren't implemented, how to assess their success or lack of success that will then help as well inform discussions in the future or possible changes to policies.

So we can go to the next one please. So as is an issue where we believe there are consensus policies that require that at this stage from a staff perspective we don't recommend initiating at PDP at this moment in time.

We do recognize that we're basically noting that there's a lot of work being undertaken from - by the compliance department so we're suggesting as well that the council await the completion of that and then makes an assessment whether additional work is needed or there are additional requirements that they would like to see in place.

And we do suggest that it may be helpful to actually form a drafting team that will look at some of the other questions we identified and one of those is that - and that may interest you if there is a mechanism for example to get additional data from contracted parties.

Because of course the complaints are information that compliance received is only a small fraction of actual complaints out there.

So what we're wondering as well if there would be kind of mechanism or system that could be explored to benefit from all the information that you probably have within your companies of course recognizing that it would need to be a way, you know respecting confidentiality and calling out some registrars by the way of trying to get further data and information that will help policy development activities.

And so that working group can really focus on those issues that are problems instead of focusing on issues that people believe may be problems where there's no actually hard data there.

You go to the next slide please, I think you already heard from compliance on the improvements they have made on their previous sessions so we can move to the next one.

So basically this is now operating, these are councils for a decision. I think there's no motion on the table for this meeting but they're likely to take a decision on it at the next meeting.

So on Wednesday they'll just review the report and we're not recommending an initiation of a PDP at this stage. But the formation of a working group to look at some of these questions.

So if you have any ideas or suggestions on how we can do that more effectively speak to your councilors as they will be voting on that eventually.

Comments or questions on that topic, or we just move along? So the next issue that's also up for decision by the GNSO council related to the translation and transliteration of contact information.

Another subject relating to existing WHOIS, there's also a final issue report where the council now needs to decide whether or not to go ahead with a policy development process.

Go to the next slide please, again I think this mission has been discussed quite extensively over the weekend, and I believe that many of you are probably familiar with this.

So basically we had an initial or preliminary issue report again asked for public comment and we're now going to update it to the final report reflecting the comments that were received.

Again here is also a possible link with expert working group because of course if the WHOIS system changes substantively it might also change how contact data is factored in.

So we're a bit wondering at least from the staff that is about how to make sure we don't cross each other but at the same time we want to recognize as well that this is really important topic, especially with IDNs becoming more prevalent.

And you know the issue of contact data and contacting others in other places of the world. If we go to the next slide, so I think at this stage this is just an example and you know the translation and transliteration, go to the next slide please.

So basically staff has put forward a motion, a suggested motion to the council for its consideration. It hasn't been made yet so it's again where probably a decision will be taken at the next meeting.

There will be a discussion on Wednesday, we're actually suggesting to go ahead with the initiation of the PDP which will allow staff to already start some investigations or some studies on this topic, especially with the information the commercial feasibility of any requirements or changes to the system could of course, there would be a cost involved if there would be requirements where translation and transliteration in this regard.

So that would allow some pre work already to start but at the same time watch closely the deliberations and possible outcome of the expert working group and see how that would factor in to the policy development process.

So we need to see as well with members of the council that are interested in this area how they would like to see this issue moving forward because I know you all already are diving for the mic because I know for some of you it's a real high profile and important issue.

So would really be interested to hear as well what your perspective is on how to move forward on this and what the next steps should be.

Man: Well personally I think we should move forward on a PDP. What? Oh sorry. I said personally I think we should move forward on the PDP but I just wanted to ask a small question.

What do you mean about cost where the cost for translation transliteration?

Marika Konings: I believe - I mean I'm not an expert on this topic but I believe that one of the questions of course if you put in a requirement for translation transliteration someone would have to bear the cost of that.

So would that be a registrar cost, a registrant cost, are there other sides, talking about the commercial feasibility of putting a system in place that would require transliteration and translation.

Man: I feel it should probably be the registrant, not rar.

Marika Konings: Right, so again it's on the agenda for tomorrow and the real experts on this topic are Steve Sheng and Julie Hedlund so these - you know ask them your questions as well because they'll probably give a better detailed answer on this one than I can.

Are you waving at me Michele? Okay, any other questions on this topic? If not maybe then we can jump ahead to the IRTP part D which is a couple of slides further.

Man: Marika just one quick comment, your slides seem light in the photo category this meeting, any - they're light in the photo category. Usually you have very good graphics and good use of stock photography.

But you seem to have dialed it back a little bit.

Marika Konings: They're not all mine, so maybe that's it. I'll encourage my team to use more funny pictures for you. So into registrar transfer policy these as (James) says I think it's the D in done, it's hopefully last one at least this series of PDPs on the transfer policy.

Because I'm - I hate to say it but I'm sure there will be others in the future because transfer policies is still there I believe.

Man: If there is ever another transfer policy or series first of all find somebody else. No, secondly I mean I think when we get done with this and realizing it took us four years, right, since we started, IRTP A?

Paul Diaz, network solutions, Paul Diaz of network solutions kicked us off, but anyway you know maybe it's time to step back and take a holistic view of whether we even need this any more and whether we can just revamp it completely differently.

But I'll let you continue but this is the end of the - this is the caboose on the train here, this is it, no more IRT policies after this.

Marika Konings: And I hate to depress you even more because I think this was already underway when I joined ICANN in 2008 so I think it's already on its fifth year.

Well it comes back to the broader question of course because as you have policies like in ICANN we like to review everything. So we may want to think at some point as well, I mean it's a broader question on how we go about reviewing policies that are in place.

I mean we have ERP I think it is now, but it's one of those things where we may want to have a discussion at some point about how go about reviewing

policies that are in place so that we can make adjustments if needed or bring issues to the table.

Anyway focusing on IRTP part D, we can go to the next slide. So this working group kicked off recently and is actually looking at I think we have six charter questions if you go to the next slide.

Four of them are actually looking at the transfer dispute resolution policy so looking at questions as should there be requirements for registries and dispute resolution provider to provide feedback on you know what disputes they see and how are they being resolved which currently doesn't exist.

Asks whether there should be possibility for registrants to use TDRP and one of the things I think we discussed over the weekend actually is that there is a very low incidence of TDRPs.

So one of the conclusions may be okay there are no disputes, but that's why there are none being filed but at the same time from the ICANN compliance point of view it's the highest number of consumer complaints we received.

So there is somewhere a disconnect with a very high number of complaints but a very low number of disputes. So is there a disconnect, it is because it can only be initiated by a registrar who may not want to do or doesn't believe a dispute should be initiated.

It looks as well at you know what are the current mechanisms in place, we have had comments already because as you may be aware there's a two tiered approach so you can file the dispute either with the registry provider or with a pointed dispute resolution provider.

Registries have already suggested or asked whether they can be taken out of the equation from their point of view with many new registries coming on board and may not be saleable for them to continue providing this service.

And it may be better suited to actually have that done at a district resolution level. What are the other questions? There's also a question how to handle disputes and multiple transfers have occurred.

So if there are any guidelines I think that's when we comment you know to registrar hopping, how do you deal with a dispute that has actually multiple registrars involved.

And then the two other questions that relate to - well I think one question actually (unintelligible) but I think one question has probably already been taken over by events as it was developed such a long time ago because it actually asks whether there should be penalties for IRTP violations.

So those actually predate the 2009 REA where there are graduated sanctions in place so that may be - I don't want to presume, maybe a simple answer but nothing is ever simple when it comes to a PDP I believe.

And then there's a last question that deals with whether the ETP auth info codes have actually overtaken the need for FOAs. That's another question that actually came from the previous working group where this working group will be looking at.

So this working group has actually only formed recently so if any of you are interested in this topic or any of the other ones that haven't been talking about like thick WHOIS, we have an INGO PDP.

All these working groups are open always to anyone interested to participate so if you're interested just you know come and find me or write the GNSO secretariat or talk to any of your councilors and they'll be able to get you on the mailing list.

So the working group is really at it's starting phase, it has reached out to the different stakeholder groups and constituencies so you should have seen a request as well I think coming through on your mailing list with the request for input.

And as these issues are really close to registrars we really welcome any information you may have that will help inform the working group's deliberations.

The working group is having a face to face meeting on Thursday morning, no, is it Wednesday (James)? Wednesday morning right, tomorrow morning.

Yes, tomorrow morning from 7:30 to 9:00, it's on the schedule, so if you want to see the working group in action or have a look at see whether it's something you would like to get involved in just come over.

We may even have some coffee and croissants for you there as an incentive to come so early.

Man: Don't say that, then people come and they drink the coffee and they eat the croissants and they sit in the wi-fi and they don't - we welcome everyone. We don't want to bribe.

Marika Konings: It is at 7:30.

Man: Well that might not be the best time to encourage more participation but that's cool. I will just echo what Marika said and give a shout out to (James) who has been active in these for a long time.

But also try to recruit some new blood into the working group because again you can see very clearly here that these - I don't think there's an issue that affects registrars more than transfers frankly.

So if you are interested in participating, do we have other registrars that are...?

Marika Konings: You have to go to the next slide, I think we have the membership.

Man: I think with the membership breakdown, there it is.

Marika Konings: We do already have quite a number of registrars on that.

Man: I was quite happy to leave that working group, quite happily.

Marika Konings: And if you go to the next slide, I think I already mentioned that so we have asked for your input and the working group has started looking at the charter questions basically trying to determine what needs to be undertaken to - what information needs to be gathered in order to be able to answer these charter questions.

Go to the next slide, (James) has set a very aggressive - (James) is the chair of this working group.

Man: May I walk through this slide, do you mind?

Marika Konings: Yeah, no, go for it.

Man: So one of the things that you hear, okay I'm going to take a holistic view, people have been subverting ICANN processes, trying to get stuff into contracts, going to the board and everything.

Why, because they say the PDP doesn't work and it takes too long and there's just a general lack of confidence in that as a viable mechanism to make changes.

So one of the things we tried to do with these PDPs, these transfer PDPs is we've got the experts, we've got the data, or the people who can get the data.

We've got commitments to meet frequently and to drive these things through, there's no reason why they can't be aggressive and short exercises. They shouldn't - we're challenging the ICANN culture I think a little bit.

We're registrars, we're businesses, we like to keep things moving in commercial time frame, not ICANN time frames so that we resist this idea that these things have to take 14, 18, 24 months.

And we're trying to push them through in - this one in particular by November, by the meeting in Buenos Aires. And as Marika said that's pretty aggressive.

And I've actually had folks pull me aside before and say oh, you're cutting corners, you know nine months to do a PDP, slow down tiger.

But really we think that we have everything we need, why drag this out, let's get it going, let's get these questions on the table and let's get some results.

So that's my cheerleading. So, if you like that kind of PDP, come join the IRTP.

Woman: Any hands for joining? What's that?

Man: You can also join...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...volunteering if you want - we're happy to do that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Oh, I see a hand. Who is (unintelligible)?

Man: I don't know.

Man: Okay. Excellent, wonderful...

((Crosstalk))

Man: If you can email us up...

((Crosstalk))

Man: You don't actually have to raise your hand. That's probably not the most
                effective way to do it, but just send (Makalia James) and myself an email.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Makalia's) out.

Man: I'm leaving that PDP.

Man: So, I'll run it by Marika to try and get (Makalia) off the ground.

Woman: So, I think this is everything I have for you today, so I don't know if there are
                any other questions or other topics you want to hear about - I mean, there are
                quite a few issues that, you know, may come up over the next couple of
                months and we'll need new volunteers, et cetera to issue that - will come up
                by decision by the council whether or not to initiate a policy development
                process. One of the questions I have - need to discuss with the attorneys -
                with the completion now or near completion of the RA negotiations.

                There is as well the RAPDP that was started that basically identified that if
                there will be any remaining open items on the list that we need to go into

PDP's, that would kick off as well and looking there - I don't know if there are any or - I think one of the questions probably is proxy privacy accreditation.

Man: Yes, I'd probably say privacy proxy is one of the - the only one that comes to mind anyway. If there is anything else that would go into a PDP that wasn't addressed in IRA - (James), (Jeff) - anything from you guys?

Man: I don't think there was.

Man: No, I think we kept wanting to punt to PDP as opposed to getting them into - it's possible that it might end up there specifically - well, I mean, one draft of the PDP had us agreeing to the output of the expert working group...

Man: Yes, right.

Man: ...in advance. So we did, you know...

Man: That one got knocked on the head first very quickly.

Man: Well, I don't think the expert working group was driving down - I think that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: But, we talked about perhaps some of the validation verification and not making specifications out - you know, into there because they change, right? So that's what a PFP is for and the privacy practice aspect.

Marika Konings: So, a lot of interesting work will be coming our way - so, please keep an eye out and of course the call for volunteers always go up on the ICANN Web Site, the (Genius) Web Site and I presume they also go out through the registrar's state groups. So, keep an eye there - (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, I just wanted to know - you said there were some complaints - a lot of complaints about transfers. Do you have any graphs like the percentage of complaints versus the number of (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) processes - (ABCD) is it decreasing? Is it helping to solve problems?

Marika Konings: I don't have graphics. I did provide a report to the working group on complaints specifically related to this issue and I think that on the ICANN compliance side of the ICANN Web Site, I think they do provide a breakdown of our complaints compared to other complaints. I don't think there's a breakdown related to domain names. It's something I can ask. I don't know if they have that or if it's easy to provide but - and to your other question - (unintelligible) - the thing is I think a lot of IHRPA actually didn't produce any consensus policy recommendations. I think there were some - I think we had an advisory and the ones for BMC are still in the process of being implemented.

                  So I think it's basically too early to actually draw that conclusion or (unintelligible) to improve or to not, but it's a very good question. It comes back as well to the metrics question on what point do we assess whether indeed those recommendations had an affect, and reduce the level of complaints.

Man: Yes, because also you could even compare this (figure) together (unintelligible) just to - you don't really know if it's a huge problem or not...

Marika Konings: Right.

Man: ...so you should compare it to other (unintelligible). You have the graph and see where (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Right - no, it's a very good point and I'll definitely take that back.

Man: Any other comments, questions for Marika and policy staff?

Marika Konings: I think maybe we can thank all the hard working registrar volunteers and all the PDP working groups. It's really great -- all the effort you're really putting in -- and the leadership is showing in many of these groups and the input that is being provided as well by the stakeholder groups as a whole and many of these efforts - so, I just want to thank you for that. And I just want to let you know...

(Ron):   Sorry - I just want to point out that this is like grand irony -- Marika thanking us, you know. Her and her colleagues really do a lot of the heavy lifting in these groups. And I think those of you who have been in the groups have seen like - we have a meeting for an hour where we discuss nine things and then it turns into a whole new document - well, I didn't write that document, you know, that came from Marika and her team - so, thank you. And, you know, we're - we work very well together, I think the volunteers and the policy staff and I think that's one - there's certainly no shortage of things to complain about in ICANN and that's not one of them.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

Man: Agreed.

Man: Thanks Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you (Ron).

Man: Okay, we've got a quick slot on the schedule to talk about registrar on-boarding and then our colleagues at ARI have a presentation before they are bringing in lunch, so big shout out to them for that and I think (Mike) you're going to talk to the registrar on-boarding piece.

(Mike):   So, I just found out a few seconds ago that I'm talking to this. I'm sorry that I don't have the most up-to-date information for you but I can give you a little

bit of background on this. There's been an initiative that registrars and registries began - the idea was that this world of new TLD's that registrars wanted to be able to sign up to new TLD's in a very efficient way. Registries wanted to be able to enter into RRA's with registrars in a fairly efficient way and it seemed the most logical way to do that would be perhaps to extend the database that ICANN has right now which we call radar. You know, to use that in a way that would allow registrars and registries to come together into their agreements. And basically have one central point where that would happen so that every registry or registrar is not tracking or track down the other - you know, engage each other.

So, there's been a project that's been under way. We've retained (David Conrad) at - I forget the name of his consulting firm - I think it was JS - who's been doing - who's been kind of doing the technical heavy lifting here and we've got a requirements document that's come about through work among registrars and registries and several who are in the room are on the online chat. So, if they want to add anything that would be fine.

Generally, you know, this has been a little slow going at times but I think the message that I would just like to share with you today is that, you know, staff is very supportive, management is supportive of this. I think, you know, we see value in it too. So, you know, the ideas we want to make this happen in a time that would be useful for registrars and registries and new (unintelligible). So, I would offer to answer questions but I probably don't know the answer but - otherwise, I can see the (unintelligible) or whoever - whatever your (unintelligible).

(Jeff):   So Mike, I'm not going to put you on the spot since you don't have the answers but I think it's something that is critical to this group and if you can send an update to the registrar's stakeholders group because I can see it as a huge problem going forward and I'd love to know where ICANN is in the process and what we can do - if there are others that are not aware of it - to help out, to expedite the accreditation process and how that will work and

how we interact with registries because we are - you know, hopefully, a month or two away - and I don't think we have a defined process in place yet, so - if you could send us the updates, that would be great and we could start working on it because I'm just concerned there might be additional work or other things to - for registrars to do to actually make it easier but we still have to pass that technical hurdle to make that happen, so I think...

Man: I'll just take (Mike) quickly off the hook on that because (Karla) - and I shared some information and I have spoken briefly to (David Conrad) as well. Okay, (David)'s worked with (Karla) and those of us who have worked in that group to put together a technical specification and the feedback and everything else. And (Karla) and - I think she's in with the registries today. Is that right (Mike)? So when we go to the registries later on, she might be able to address some of those questions. We've also pushed back, I think, on some of the contractual issues. And one of the things that several of us had problems with either it was obligatory for all registries to use some parts of this or it was kind of pointless. So I think (Jeff) if we can take Mike off the chopping board for...

(Jeff): Yes, I said - I'm not asking him but I think it's something that we should address today when we're all together. Either if she can come in here today or when we're together because I'm sure the registries are just as anxious to know the details.

(Mike): You know we've heard that statement (Makali), you know, that registrars and registries both seem to have an interest in making this into something everybody must use and I think that, you know, we're aware of it on staff. I think, you know, whether or not it's possible it doesn't matter but I think we're supportive of that.

Man: (James) did you want to go on the queue?

James Bladel: Yes, and I don't know if this is directly related to Mike's comment or even to the topic that we're discussing, so I'll just wing it. But, you know, we were talking about our AA's and RA's at this meeting but, you know, it's probably the time to have a discussion about RA's as well and how registries can use ICANN and probably this system you're building to automate those because I think that we need to talk about how we're going to harmonize those as well. That's a whole different animal that hasn't even been tackled yet.

Man: So, I think there's maybe kind of two points to what you're saying. One is the substance - making those sort of consistent that they're a little bit easier for registrars to deal with on an operational and sort of legal basis. The other is the actual processing of them. This system is intended to facilitate the processing of them. You know, it's very easy to enter into RAA's with registries and you know, registrars.

James Bladel: Yes, and I think there's - we haven't even started those conversations is what I was getting at. Thanks.

Man: Okay, next mic. Let us move on. I see (Adrian) rearing and ready to go. You can roll if you want - just a hand held mic - I said you can stand on there and roll - okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes, it's your show man. Hold on to your style. You can even jump off the stage - get up and go - I'm blocking the doorways. What are you doing? Where are you going? I want to get these guys on the way out with the...

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: We're going to hand out these documents whether you like it or not. Okay, now this side - get this door going. Okay, guys - the old cliché - I understand I'm standing between you and lunch. I'm also standing between you and bed.

But I just want to go through this slide really quickly. We were more than happy to sponsor lunch- (why are you getting up?) - that's good, thank you - just checking. I assume that you guys should be asking a lot more of opinions - lunch is going forward. This was relatively cheap for me to do. Next meeting there is going to be a lot of registries fighting for this spot, wanting to get in front of you to get this - so make sure you guys charge appropriately but please remember the fact that we've been long term supporters.

Let's keep going. So this is to all the registrars out there, there's lunch waiting for you in boxes that we're paying for but we really want you to listen for a couple of minutes here to get a feel for - I guess what you're in for in signing up to our registry provider - just kind of a hub the way we're connected to all our registries, okay. So, I've got a bit of a slide deck to go through. That's me - that's my CTO who is somewhere in the audience. Where are you? He's standing over there. He's the (Brian). I'm the good looks, clearly. There's my Twitter account too - now you can see what I do every morning - thanks. Next slide please.

Am I doing it? I guess that's what I'm doing. So, why do you want to come and connect to ARI? Fairly simply, we got a bucket load of streams. They're good. I think you'll see when we get into some of the detail. We've been working with registrars for a long time and we've been a registry for about ten years -- just over. And so we think we understand the needs of registrars and we try to hone our on-boarding process - difference of on-boarding process of ICANN. But ramp-up process - try to hone that and try to make it as easy as possible. And we also think we will be supporting the very first TLD to be launched. There will be some more information about that. Next slide please.

So, we went out, the last couple of meetings - and we've asked registrars what do you expect of our registry service provider? How do you want your billing? We lead a group on that. We called into some of the other registries because we wanted to make a uniform experience. There's a gentlemen sleeping in the audience. Oh, he's awake - hi - it's good to see you. Do you

want me to get back to the start? No, I won't do that. So, we - yes, we got other registries involved because we wanted to try and get a uniformed experience for registrar's and one thing you don't want to be doing as a registrar is having to go through completely different registries and different systems every time of engagement -- billing and everything.

So we try to be consistent. We try to involve the community - somewhat unsuccessfully but at least we made an effort and I think that effort is going to be - you'll see that when you sign up to us - where there reward will be. So, you spoke, we listened. Next slide please.

Okay, so what were the three things that came out of it that you wanted from your registry provided? The first one was simplified integration. We've done that. Okay, we believe that we created a nice efficient method for you to get on board. Secondly you wanted good products on your shelves, right. You guys are like a supermarket and now you're going to have people fighting over your shelf space. We want to make sure that in coming to join us you'll see the shelf space is worthwhile -- filling with our products. And lastly you wanted to be able to work with registry operators who are going to invest in marketing, okay. And I think for those of you who don't know my company, I think that one thing we are good at - probably not much else - but, no - one thing we are good at is marketing. And so we will be working with the registries to make sure that they are pushing their TLD's into our way that's beneficial to you to make sure that you are able to sell many of the products. Next.

Okay, so this simplified integration - we're going to go through each one of these. We've gunned it down as easy as possible. We realize that there's an international audience for this as well. In this book that I have in my hand that we're going to hand out to you guys has basically a couple of things - a nice letter from me but then has a registry implementation guide that takes you through some of the steps. And so, you'll see that. You'll need to sign a contract about getting access to us - that's the standard. It might be a little

different. You might not be used to doing that. A lot of times you guys would have been familiar with the fact that you signed a contract with a registry operator who is also the technical provider, okay - conventions like (unintelligible).com. This is different now.

Now you're going to have to technically sign an agreement with me that talks about your access and that you're going to behave yourself and then you're going to want to sign a contract for registry provider - I'm sorry, the registry itself. So we're talking about the backend here. We want you to integrate with our technical environment and we'll try to do that and then you turn on the TLD's and you activate, okay - but that's all detailed in this document that I have. Next slide, please.

Man: (Adrian), we have a remote question for you. Are we taking questions?

Adrian Kinderis: Already, wow, this would be good. Who from my office is dialing in -- my wife?

Woman: This is a question from (Frank Niclet) - sorry if I'm butchering your name. "Regarding simplified integration, does ARI do something beyond EPP's?

Adrian Kinderis: Okay, I'm looking at my technical guy. Maybe - we need to speak into the mic so they can hear you - but we might take that question at the end, if you don't mind. We'll circle back to that - give (Chris) a couple of seconds to get his thoughts together. And so, where do you go to? You go to (irservices.com/registrars) as we are onboard, new TLD's as they're ready to go. You'll get more information about it there and you'll also be able to contact our team, so go there. Next slide please.

Okay, let's talk about a few of our products we've got on the way -- your way. As I said, we believe we've got some good ones that aren't in contention and we'll be ready to go early, giving you some opportunity to earn revenue early,

okay - which is why we felt that at this meeting we'd come out of the gate pretty hard and get in your face. Next slide, please.

So, what's coming soon? Next slide. Okay, dot (unintelligible) which means dot web in Arabic. It's prioritize number three in the draw. Now before it is dot catholic in Chinese and dot - Amazon's dot in Japanese or something, maybe. Anyway, we think that the guys from (unintelligible) are prepared to sign the base agreement and moving fairly quickly. And based on that we think that will be the first TLD to go live, okay. It will be the first cross boarder --Arabic TLD, of course. We've only had (unintelligible) TLD's before that's been Arabic. And so, you see there provides an emotional connection between Arabic culture and online communication. We think it's a ripper. We've received frontline news when it had the (unintelligible) - sorry that's a ripper. It's really good. It made all the news across the Arabic nations when the initially variation results were announced - front page in some circumstances so we were pretty excited about that - so that's a good one. Next slide please.

The next one we have is dot menu. Dot menu is a 132. You know that all the IDN's went beforehand so it's a bit early for the asking and we think potentially may be one of the first ascii's launched and in fact guys from dot menu in the audience today and they've also assisted in providing lunch. Stand up for me gentlemen please. It's these guys here. Make sure you track them down. I'll tell you more about this TLD. We're excited about it too - early in the draw - great TLD for getting out to the masses and add a decent premium. We think it will do really well in the market, not contended obviously. So, therefore, (unintelligible) with some predictability get out to market but that's a good reason to connect to ARI. Next slide please.

Lastly marketing. We're heavy on it. We believe in it. We're certainly working with our registry partners, evident here with the dot menu guys - what you're about to see when you go and get your lunch. So we will be working - trying to create innovative ways to promote our streams but also ways to work with

you -- the registrar channel -- and we think we've done that successfully in the main spaces we currently manage. So we'd like to certainly take ideas from you on how to best do that and work with and act as a nice conduit between the registries themselves and the -- you guys the registrars. Thank you.

So, one other thing I should talk about - when we have these swatches which is a list of every string we have. You're familiar with this if you've ever done any home decorating. I know my wife is familiar with it. And we've listed all of our streams and highlighted ones that are coming out soon. I have two of my staff -- (Melanie) and (Chloe) are at the back -- so you're going to get bombarded as you walk out. You're going to get one of these and one of the booklets. So I urge you to read through the booklet that has registry implementation details in there. If you are that well inclined, my CTO is here to talk through some of those issues for you but outside of that guys is a box at the back for lunch.

So, is it working lunch (Matt) or are they coming back in or are you going to take it out? At 1:00 - so it is now ten past roughly. So, guys you have 50 minutes - grab the box on the way out. Please read the information that we have. I appreciate your time. I get that it's tough and you're getting lunch and the energy level is low but please consider connecting to ARI. Get in early - we're going to get busy. We've got a lot of streams. We will have registrars. We certainly want to make sure that you guys are at the - ready to start revenues soon as very possible. We've been waiting long enough. So, please take the time, read the information, come and contact any of us, reach out - there's some contact information in the booklets if you need anything further and I'm happy to take that question and any others now. Thanks.

Man: Thanks (Adrian). Just want to thank (Adrian) and their ARI team for stepping up and providing lunch.

Adrian Kinderis: And there's some goodies coming in the afternoon as well. A little dot menu special coming this afternoon if you're here - a little bit of incentive - a little sweet for you. (Chris), do you want to answer the questions - you want to grab this mic so I can...

(Chris):   So what I - what I believe the question was trying to get at was what other interfaces does (unintelligible) offer beyond the EPP specification or the EPP interface. I think that's what they were getting at. So, from that perspective, of course, EPP being the protocol mandated by ICANN and every registrar having experienced it at the moment - is the primary interface that we offer. We do have a fully functional web interface that goes far above and beyond the web interfaces of almost all the other industries that enables you to create varying levels of accounts and users within those accounts - signed permission to those users - control what they can and can not do within the systems.

As well as for those of you that have multiple registrar accreditation, it actually allows you to group all those accreditations together into one account within the system so that you can interact all those accreditations from the one log-on and so forth so you don't need to go out and create - or have to deal with having user names and passwords for those different accreditations and so forth.

So, we put a lot of thought into those different interfaces. We did talk earlier with registrars about building some restful based interface. There were a few registrars that for some reason don't like EPP and wanted to do it in a non-standard way. But the general consent that we got from all the discussions we were having is that you guys are too invested into EPP and you don't want to switch to any other sort of protocol and so, we didn't explore that any further but if there is renewed interest in that, we will certainly talk to people about it.

Man: Are there any other questions that we want to cover - (Adam)?

Man: Yes, (unintelligible) grab the mic.

Man: I've got it.

Man: Thank you. Hey guys. (Unintelligible) - first time (unintelligible). Is your - is the platform basically based on (unintelligible) or is it something that you guys separated as something new?

(Chris):   Yes, so we're - it's obviously based on the same technical infrastructure underneath but we've - (unintelligible) in (unintelligible) to what you're used to in the TDL environment and so forth. So, to make things easier for registrars we wanted to make sure that we sort of - we're more in line with the life cycle, and so forth, that you're used to having auto renew and those sorts of things. So the platform from that perspective is a newer one. It follows a similar life cycle to dot com. It has auto renew. It has all the things that registrars - the details registrars are used to operating with and the behavior you guys are used to dealing with.

We put a lot of effort into trying to have a system that is something that should be easy just to plug into and just works. And also get rid of all those barriers that you have with existing registries. So the documentation that you've got there, go through section by section - although you will have to - go through section by section - each part of the registry - and tells you about things that we've done after a (unintelligible) of registrars that supposedly make it easier for you guys. So, hopefully we've done well at that but if we haven't and there's something that's missing that you want or some behavior that the registry doesn't have that will make things easier for you, let us know and we'll get it into other developmental cycles and we'll get it out there.

Adrian Kinderis: Thanks (Chris).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Anything else?

Man: Anyone else would like to delay us from having lunch - state your name clearly.

Man: I should talk very slowly. (Unintelligible). (Adrian), question for you. You're obviously helping a lot of applicants and most of us will want to see some sort of uniformity which you're obviously trying to do. My question is that when you're talking to your applicants about their launch processes, what do you think is an acceptable time from delegation to pushing forward a TLD plan to registrars to start offering the TLD? Because I'm hearing, you know, the IDN is a great TLD. It should go live. Let's get cracking. But, I mean, how much time do you think registrars should have to get their systems in order, to have their frontends up and running in order to accept orders for all these TLD's?

Adrian Kinderis: (Unintelligible). Registries need to be conscious of the (unintelligible) registrars to technically get connected (unintelligible).

Man: The technical part for all of us is quite easy. You know, connecting to an EPP leverage is child's play - for some anyway - we won't name names. They're not here anyway. Yes, it's all the other stuff that we have to do to get our customers feel like they're involved and actually want to buy the TLD itself and we have to do a certain amount of work to publicize that fact.

Adrian Kinderis: I think we're working - we see (unintelligible). What we're trying to do is work with them to get much of an understanding of the (unintelligible) and we're (unintelligible) legal registrars. So I don't know if there's a set time but if they are certainly conscious of it and put you back to our point to say, (unintelligible) registrar's (unintelligible) as soon as possible otherwise it won't be there (unintelligible). And the other part after that is registrars don't need to (unintelligible).

Man: Oh, I'm sorry.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: ...you guys need to get out to your network to say, "Hey, this TLD is launching and this is the launch process as well." So all of that takes time. We understand that. I don't know that I can add much more to it as well unless you've got anything.

(Chris):   We're conscious of the exact issues that you're talking about and we're advising our registrar operators that we have all those things and at the end of the day, you know, we're - they're our customer. We have to do what they want. You know, in order to be successful and sell names, they need registrars. So if they're not paying attention to what the registrars need and the time that they need and so forth, then it's to their detriment. And that's a pretty powerful message to send to them so they tend to stand up and pay attention.

Man: I'd like to know exactly what it is that you're advising them because I want to...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Does anybody else want to get (John Berry) (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: No, just one question from me. Have you done anything about the finance or financial aspect of it?

Man: Yes.

Man: Because there's sort of - for some of us this is a major blocker.

Adrian Kinderis: I'll start on the billing conversation - it's a big one and I'll let (Chris) correct me. So, we certainly didn't want to - I think the norm is if you're going to go and put money into a registrar's - a registry's account - and then blah, blah, blah - different counties - we - when we went out to registrars, what we got told was, "I don't want to do that. Why do we have to?" And so, what we've been advising our registry operators is you pay for your phone monthly. You know, you get an invoice and that's how it works because there are so many ways in your business that you do it on invoice. So we're recommending to our registries that you do it on invoice and we think that's fair.

You know, you guys are going to have to outlay if all the registry operators want money in the accounts to get going from you, it's a lot of money - you're going to have to be very selective about who you go to because you only have limited funds to put into accounts. So from our point of view we're advocating do it on billing, work out, you know, limits as to what your spending is and whatever else that will occur over time - but certainly invoice billing. And if that's - if there's difference, as (Chris) said earlier, come and let us know. I'm seeing a lot of nodding of heads as to the preference - (unintelligible) - and thank you.

Man: Do you get a sense - is that message - what is your sense that the registries will actually do this?

Adrian Kinderis: So far good. Yes, we're getting a good response. We're certainly going and tapping them on the shoulders early, right - saying, "Have you thought about billing because otherwise you're going to have some headaches."

Man: Thanks (Adrian). It's one of the things for several of us is a major headache.

Adrian Kinderis: And that would be, you know, would be great if even the registrars could come out as a group and say something about some of the things that you want because it makes us - if we can communicate, we could forward to the registry operators or something and say, this is what they're expecting, you know, that sort of message. I think it would be easy because otherwise, it's just us arguing. So it's just an idea.

Man: No, it's the second time that we're communicating - that it came up today (unintelligible).

Adrian Kinderis: As long as that communication contains things that we can do.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: Anything else guys? Thanks very much for your time - appreciate it - enjoy your lunch. It's just a box lunch. It's not hot or anything but it's still nice and it's healthy too. And like I said, we'll give you the unhealthy stuff this afternoon if you're back in the room. Don't forget to see (Melanie) and (Chloe) on the way out. Grab an information booklet and one of the swatches that we've got. Thank you very much for your time.

Man: Yes, thanks (Adrian); thanks (Chris) - appreciate it. And guys, just as a reminder, we're back in here in 40 minutes -- 1:00 pm, thanks.

END