

## **Transcription ICANN Beijing Meeting**

### **Registries meeting**

**Tuesday 9 April 2013 at 14:15 local time**

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Cherie.

So we are now - welcome back everyone. The beginning - this is the afternoon session following our meeting with the ICANN Board in Beijing. Welcome back everyone.

And I'd like at this point to welcome our colleagues from the Nom-Com and ask them to maybe introduce themselves for the group and then we'll get right down to business, and thank you for joining us.

Yrjo Lansipuro: Thank you. Yrjo Lansipuro, the Chair of the Nom-Com.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm Chair-elect for 2013. And providing I survive this year, I'm expected to be the Chair for 2014.

Adam Peake: Adam Peake. I'm the Associate-Chair, so I try and help Yrjo out best I can, occasionally.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mostly help.

Keith Drazek: Thank you all very much, and welcome. We look forward to the presentation. Apologies if we're running a little bit late, but let's go ahead and get right down to it. Thank you.

Yrjo Lansipuro: Thank you very much.

Yes. Thank you for letting us in. We have basically three messages for you, and to everybody we talk to. One is that we need good candidates - we need a good candidate pool. We are still quite low. Lower than the historical average for this time when it comes to the number of candidates. And, we really ask for your help first of all to get in good applications either yours or - you know, (unintelligible) you think what we would for these jobs that are open.

We have - as you probably know, we are going to have three directors on the Board. Two for GNSO Council, one for ccNSO Council, and three for ALAC. And that - and then one is from Africa, one is from Asia - Asia-Pacific Islands, and from - one from Latin America/Caribbean.

The second message is that we want to convince you that Nom-Com is not a black box. It is not a bunch of Cardinals that you know assemble and then you know go in a closed room and then you know white smoke comes out, poof, and you have a Pope. The - at least from now on, we try to change that, even if we have these red tags.

The what is necessary is strict confidentiality about names. Without that, we would not have any candidates for sure. So that's going to remain as it is. But it is not an excuse for making you know, secret mythical of everything else.

And at our meeting - kick off - kick start meeting in Toronto, we decided that we want to keep the process open - as open as possible, but the data is confidential - secret.

We have implemented this already in two ways. That is to say as you probably have noticed, Nom-Com has used monthly reporting calls for the community. And how it works is that the - a report is produced immediately after each call - each meeting. It's circulated.

And when there's (unintelligible), it will be sent to the communities - to the constituencies and stakeholder groups by their representatives on the Nom-Com. And I hope that this system has worked well with you too.

The other way is that we have a couple of open meetings in Beijing. I believe that they are historical firsts. There was an outreach SAC Committee meeting yesterday chaired by Cheryl, and there will be a full meeting - a meeting of the full Nom-Com later today at 5:00 in Room 5 (BC), and you're very much welcomed to attend.

A third thing is that we would like to hear your ideas and your advice for what type of people we would look for when we start our work of selecting and eventually finding the selected few. Not only concerning you know GNSO candidates for both houses, but also for the Board at ccNSO and ALAC, and if you have viewpoints on that.

I think I stop here, and perhaps Cheryl could continue?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Assuming there's a transcript recorded, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record.

I'm not sitting in all of today's meetings. It's very important that you don't just think of people who may be appropriate both from the ranks of those that are considered as ICANN (unintelligible), but specifically and particularly from those who you may find in your normal daily business lives.

We do need to get what should be thought of as more the independent-thinking but appropriately qualified to take up these roles, and that goes for not just the Board positions.

It's easy to think of Nom-Com appointment as independent Director in (unintelligible), and that's not a bad mindset to have. But it also skills that we need in all of the (unintelligible) appointments that we do as well.

So to that end, (Joe), it has a couple - I think left out some of the bookmarks we had. There's been a desire - perhaps in the second-hand market even. We definitely thought about that (Joe). That's possible.

There was a pile of very nice, easy to carry business cards we had which has the URL of that, and we'll be talking to you in a moment on them. So if you spotted some piece of talent that you thought you might be worthwhile tracking, if you give them this card and they could follow the URL. We still have those, but they've somehow disappeared into a black hole or secondhand market, or whatever, and they're unable to be found.

We do have some bookmarks however, and (Joe) can leave some hear (unintelligible) to pick up and use if you want. It's the sort of thing - you know, you may find someone at your next cocktail party. But, we do only have until the 1st of May.

We personally also would like to - as Yrjo (unintelligible), he informed you about the skill sets you believe we should looking to because - and this is important to let people know as well. Each year is in fact different. It's not just a fresh Nom-Com with a fresh mandate. The skill sets and the filters that we are asked to apply are different each year.

So someone who may have applied for a given role or leadership position and have - to date they're unsuccessful, should not feel that it is an unrewarding task to do another statement of interest. It's all about being the right fit in the right year.

We can only appoint from the puddle we've got. And if you have, as we have heard from time-to-time from some of the support organization people, some of the material we may have sent you in the past may not have come up to scratch. It's certainly a matter in the ALAC that some of the appointments that

they made have not actually worked out as well as the Nom-Com had thought they might.

The only way we can avoid that is by having a very robust and broad puddle of people to choose from. And so don't just think about what you want ccNSO appointments - sorry, for your GNSO appointments - I'll use that you know later - to your GNSO appointments, but do think of the - about that reaching out activity.

Now I wanted to say just one other thing, and that's got to do with the people you send to us. And this is me putting on my next year's hat. There will be a possible churn on the appointments you make to Nom-Com - made annually, and they're usually term-limited and you can work out whether you've got churn or not opportunity.

But, please be warned. With the increasing criteria, particularly for the ICANN Board positions, we really need people who are already operating in the C-Suite. We need people who have ready access in their rolodexes to the right level of talent to tap into.

So have a look at who's already there and staying. And if you've got someone who can come and join us in the Nom-Com who has a particular industry or business set of experiences, think seriously about that. Thank you very much.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you very much Cheryl.

Jeff, did you want to get in the queue real quick before we move to Adam?

Jeff Neuman: No. (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Okay. Go ahead Adam.

Adam Peake: Oh, thank you very much. Adam Peake.

Could we bring up the Nominating Committee...

Woman: No, we can't.

Adam Peake: Oh, we can't. Okay.

So we followed - the Nominating Committee's Web site follows the usual ICANN formula of committee name ICANN.org, so Nom-Com - noncom.icann.org. And two things you can - well, three things.

The first of all is that we've spoken a bit about the characteristics and skill sets that we're looking for in candidates, and you'll find that there's various documents on there which have come from - the Board have given us some descriptions of the types of skills that they think should be present in Directors. We've had community feedback. The ccNSO has provided some thoughts on the type of person that they need on their Council.

And, this is something that we will discuss further in a workshop tomorrow, Wednesday lunch time. I think it's 14:30. And we're always looking for community inputs on the type of skills that are needed in all of these positions. But an ATRT requirement is to do it specifically for the Board.

So, that's something that you'd find on the Web site.

The second thing is noncom.icann.org/apply will -- the word apply -- will bring up the statement of interest form, which is the application form. So if you wish to apply it's very simple. It will come up with that.

One thing to note about that form which is a little bit irritating is that it doesn't save, so you have to - you know, you might be inputting stuff - if you leave

that page, you'll lose it. So if you're going to apply, please make sure you've prepared your form offline.

Something again that we would like you to think about very much is that you can suggest candidates, and it's okay for friends to suggest that they contribute to ICANN. It's good fun. So if you use the app, [icann.org/suggest](http://icann.org/suggest), you'll go to a form which means you can recommend people.

And you can either do that anonymously or you can do it with your name attached. And we think that this is very useful to actually be encouraged by someone you know to say we think you are you know the right type of person to join the GNSO, or the right type of person to join the Board is good encouragement.

So please, as Cheryl was mentioning, if you do know people who you think should be coming in from outside our community into this process, then please use that suggest form. That would be very helpful.

And I'll leave it there. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks very much, Adam. I appreciate it.

Let's open up the floor. Questions? Comments?

I know Jeff wanted to get in the queue. I just saw Chuck then (Ken).

So Jeff, Chuck, (Ken).

Jeff Neuman: Hello. Hi guys.

So I'm going to say this and I'm not - I don't want you take this the wrong way. So...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So it's - to me it's not a surprise you're not getting too many candidates this year because of the positions you have to fill, right.

And so if you look at the Board right now, the three members that are up are Cherine, Erika, and Bertrand. All three of those are I believe first term, and all three of those are I believe first term, and all three of those are seen as good quality Board members and - at least I think so.

And - (unintelligible) - so I understand. I'm not - but all three of them are - like I said, they're well respected, they're good Board members, they're all first-termers, and - you know, I've talked to some people about whether they should apply because they're interested in that role, and frankly I told them no. Not this year. Because, I think this year is a difficult year for that.

Even for the GNSO I'll say the same thing. So the two GNSO reps that are up are I think Osvaldo and - not Osvaldo - Lanre and...

Keith Drazek: Thomas.

Jeff Neuman: And Thomas. Sorry, Thomas.

And both of those are first-timers, quality members of the Council. And you know, for me, I would think it will be a mistake for the Nominating Committee to remove them because then we're not encouraging people - two years is a real short amount of time on a Council. You're just getting your feet wet you know your first year. Maybe you start (unintelligible) the second year. Thomas has actually been great because he jumped right in. I think he's a great appointment.

So again, when people - when I talk to people, I've actually said now is not a good year to apply. Not because there's anything wrong with the Nominating

Committee, but just the quality of people that have been previously put on. It's almost - it's actually a testament to what we've done in previous years really.

And so I just wanted to relay that as kind of some feedback. And maybe it shouldn't necessarily be seen as a bad thing that we don't have many people. But it could just be like I said, a testament of the good job you did in the past two years.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much, Jeff.

Chuck and then (Ken).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Keith. Chuck Gomes.

Thanks again for the presentations. And Cheryl, it's good to see you're following me around again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Sorry. That's a personal joke.

Okay, the - what's the status of the appointment of NCA's to houses in the GNSO?

Yrjo Lansipuro: My understanding is that the - this year, the NCA's who's term is up are - in the two houses, they are somewhat homeless - NCA was appointed last year.

So what we do is to appoint followers to those two who are leaving to those houses which they are leaving.

Chuck Gomes: I don't understand what you just said.

So you - there are two people leaving, okay. They're both in houses now. So am I correct in understanding that you will - okay. You're going to have - in the end, you're going to have three candidates. One carryover that's a non-voting right now, and two new ones. Maybe repeat candidates. And is it solely up to the ALAC to appoint where those...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I'd love it to be up to the ALAC. In the old days, darling. But I think you mean the Nom-Com.

Chuck Gomes: ALAC. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

The - (unintelligible).

So - it's your fault probably. So the Nom-Com will decide those three?

And where I'm coming from - I'm on the - taking a lot of different position on this than a lot of people because it's so important that people with the right skill sets are in the two houses, because if you have to bring somebody up to speed, you're probably taking six months or more to get them functional and so forth. And, it really can be disruptive to the process of the house.

And so that's where I'm coming from, and I don't know what guidelines the Nom-Com uses for appointing those. Whether there's any interaction with the houses or whatever. But if you can talk about that a little bit.

And before I jump off and let you respond, one other question. Will there - now Jeff kind of already shared some comments, and I - by the way, I concur with his comments. I don't know if you wanted those in this meeting with regard to the candidates that are there now.

But will you be coming to us - to those of us that have worked with those NCA appointees, if they're applying again to get our feedback in terms of the effectiveness and the added values of a - I know I have been approached in

the past in that regard, and I think that's helpful. I don't know, hopefully it's helpful for you. And, I'll stop there.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck.

Yes, I just wanted to see if there was a response. Go ahead (Ken).

(Ken): Yes, Chuck, let me respond on a couple of things.

First of all, there's been a lot of controversy over the last two years as to who should be placing the appointees and who - in other words, the question becomes is it the Nom-Com's responsibility to select appointees to the Council? And then the Council's responsibility to decide where they feel those appointees should be most effective?

And from a practical standpoint, and I'm looking at my perspective - and Adam, or Yrjo, or Cheryl will slap me down if I'm wrong. The Nom-Com's principle responsibility is to select what they feel is the best person for the specific job slot that they're appointing to. So let's assume this year we have two appointments. Those appointments are two slots that are currently being occupied by people who by the way need to re-propose themselves.

So right off the bat, it's not an automatic. These guys have got to decide they want to do it again. And not only do they have to re-propose themselves; in many cases, they will indicate the preference where they feel they could be most effective.

In other words, if Thomas wants to jump over to the other side and feels he can make the case to the Nom-Com - and the Nom-Com will get into discussions about that.

One of the problems you run into is confidentiality, Chuck. So I have to be perfectly frank with you, having been on Nom-Com, I can't come to you and

say to you, "Well, you know, Thomas is - tell me, what did you - did Thomas do a good job last year," because technically, Thomas' decision to resubmit himself or re-propose himself to the Nom-Com puts on - us under a confidentiality that we really can't break.

So it's very difficult for the Nom-Com members as they move in the community to get information about people without specifically eluding to that. Because you could imagine, if you propose - if someone proposes themselves to the Board and the Nom-Com then is walking around saying, "Oh, tell me what you think about (Charlie Jones)? Would he make a good Board member?" You know, this is where you start running into the problems there.

So...

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Ken).

And Chuck, does that answer your question? And let's make sure we get...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Cheryl jumping in here as she does.

Just let me also clarify this really, really carefully. That's not limited to the work that the appointees to the GNSO does. That goes across all of the appointees. And this detail we've managed it with the Board, right.

We are receiving from the Board of Governance Committee a report - a 360 review report on all of the appointees from last - you know, that's coming up for term now. But we will get a review that we will be happy to get similar from any other. But it's got to be for all of them.

Now should any of them choose to apply, that's fine right. How you (unintelligible) (Ken) is what's important, okay. So if you would like to give us

valid feedback, it would be greatly appreciated. But, you have to send it, we will gratefully receive it, and it has to be on everyone. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So - and Chuck again. In follow-up then - yes. And I am much more comfortable with that than with you can't get any review, because it would be crazy to appoint new candidates that maybe were ineffective, so you need a review.

But - okay. So I respect the confidentiality issue, so I think it's incumbent upon us then, either GNSO broadly or even the registry stakeholder group individually, to provide some feedback in the candidates so that they have that data in terms of the evaluation of the two candidates, in case they do reply, and I will be asking them.

Keith Drazek: Okay, great. Thank you very much Chuck, and thanks Cheryl for that clarification.

Go ahead.

Yrjo Lansipuro: Yes. Just that. The evaluation from the Board, that will be sent to me as a Chair, and I'm responsible for sharing it by secure means to the - to all the members, and to say this is sensitive information and we just have to be sure that that sort of stuff is not circulating around.

I think the other thing you took up, I think that (Ken) answered that very well. (Unintelligible) - why it is important that Nom-Com makes those decisions (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you very much.

In light of the time, (Jonathan), okay. Go ahead.

(Jonathan): It's a very brief point.

I mean, I was talking casually to Lanre last night, and I got the impression that he thought he was leaving the Council no matter what. So I'm not sure whose responsibility it should be, but someone should at least communicate with him, and I guess I will do so. But ideally - I'll make sure that talk to those two Councilors and make sure that they realize that - either - that they need to actively choose to reapply or to not put themselves in the frame again.

So that's important I think.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks.

So in light of the time, and I know we've got Maguy here from compliance waiting patiently, are there any final questions or comments for our Nom-Com colleagues?

Adam Peake: I've got one brief thing.

Keith Drazek: Oh, okay. So Krista go ahead, and then Adam.

Krista Papac: Thanks, Keith. Krista Papac.

I just wanted to say thank you for the Nom-Com report cards. I think that those are very helpful and something I know that previous Nom-Com's talked about doing something similar (unintelligible) - it was light on execution. So I think that that's a great add and I think it's very helpful to the community, so thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Krista.

Adam?

Adam Peake: Very briefly, I think just - so it's made clear that we do have to make appointments to the houses, understanding what the skill sets are you think to join the contracted house as opposed to non-contracted house would be very helpful.

So if we - if you can share with us who can (unintelligible) the registry appointee to the Nominating Committee, then that would be helpful. Because then once we know what's needed to join you effectively, we can look through the pool and of course allocate sensibly. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you very much.

Any final questions? Comments?

Thank you very much to our Nom-Com colleagues. We really appreciate you being here with us. Thanks.

Okay. So let's now welcome up Maguy and the Compliance team and report. Hello Maguy). Welcome.

Maguy Serad: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Thank you. You too.

Maguy Serad: So we're scheduled for 20 minutes. Does that like start from now or is it subtracted from our time?

Keith Drazek: I thought it was 15.

Maguy Serad: Oh, I've got 20 on my calendar. (Unintelligible). 15's cool.

Thank you for this opportunity. My Maguy Serad and with me from the Compliance team I have Jacks Khawaja. He's the Risk and Audit Manager. In

the audience I also have Carlos Alvarez. He's Senior Manager for Operations.

So what we wanted to do - I had to beg to come out to this meeting, which is unusual. Usually, people are fighting over us, so Keith I don't know what to think of that.

But anyway, we wanted to reach out to you. It's not every meeting guys. It's really important that that we connect at least every other meeting. We've got a lot of activities going on. It's really important to keep the dialog. There's no divorce in our discussions. We have to keep communicating and talking.

Today's slides, we're going to provide you a high level update - what happened?

Next page please.

Next page.

Keith Drazek: Probably, we need to minimize the...

Maguy Serad: Yes.

Keith Drazek: We have the...

Maguy Serad: So something that we started doing more proactively, we've left the registry stakeholder - registry contracted parties alone for months. Now with staff and - are structured and building more processes and tools, we're able to start focusing on all contracted parties. So, we wanted to provide you an update because some of you have also been reached to.

We're looking now into the different area of contractual compliance that relates to you guys. And I just want to remind everyone, please, please, if you ever have a question, don't hesitate to call us or reach out.

The reason for that reminder is we do have the informal resolution process that was communicated and we worked through it. So we started looking at monthly reports and discovered some discrepancies in the reporting. And we received a few calls saying, you know, "What's going on? We've been reporting the same way for 12 years or 10 years. What's happening?"

What's happening is we have the resources now and the tools to be able to do our work properly. So, we will be working with you.

And what we bring to your attention is between you and us only. Nothing's being published. We're here to make sure we align.

And guys, it's not just to make sure we're aligned. It's basically level-setting on the baseline of where we are today so that we are preparing for new gTLD's and the bigger picture that's coming our way.

So next slide please.

I'm not going to go into the bullets, but if you have questions let us know.

The consolidated complaint system today doesn't touch you. But guess what? By ICANN 48 it will. We're going to start building a compliant ties specifically to registries where applicable, but also in the new gTLD space.

So this slide here, which I'm not going to take it a bullet at a time, we - you guys have known we have fragmented tools. We're consolidating them into one. It's rolled out - rolled up phasing approach, which means that we just rolled up the Whois. (Inaccuracy), we're going to continue roll up and sunsetting the old tools.

I'm happy to report, out of the God knows how many tools we have, we sunset one. So now we've cut down.

Next slide please.

Part of the improved consolidating system, we're getting away from (unintelligible). We're making it more user friendly, more navigation. The FAQ's are now - will be available in the six (unintelligible) languages.

Next slide please.

Okay. These are some of the timelines that we'll report on. Again with the ICANN community, it's hard sometimes to miss on expectations. (Unintelligible) was always put a plan and to communicate and report on the plan so expectations are met.

So by ICANN 47, we hope to complete the consolidation of all the tools in the current state, and start building towards ICANN 48.

Next slide please.

(We leave) time for Jacks. I'm running.

We've increased our transparency and reporting. And these (unintelligible), please go at your leisure. If you get bored during the ICANN meeting, just click on our reports and look what they - look at them. Provide us your feedback.

And elements on the bottom that might be of interest to you guys, Monday morning at the kickoff ceremony Fadi clicked to it. It's on myicann.org. There's a compliance tab. The (dots) are there. It's (unintelligible). Until we consolidate our tools, which hopefully by ICANN 47, at the latest 48, it will

become real time. The data there is at a gTLD level. It's at a complaint type level at a regional level.

We will never publish a direct report about a specific contracted party. It is just between you guys and us, unless of course there's a breach notice. Then, we are obligated to publish it.

Next slide, okay.

Jacks Khawaja: Hello everyone. Jacks Khawaja.

So I don't know if many of you have seen this slide. It's been published for several months now. But basically, it's an overview of the various phases that we went through in the audit this year for Year 1.

I'm not going to go through every single point, but basically it follows the same methodology that would be used in a publicly traded company versus a non-publicly traded company. Profit or non-profit. It doesn't matter. It's the same phases, same methodology, and same approach.

At this point - and I'll go through individual ones at a later slide, but basically to bring you guys to I guess current status, we've gone through planning, assigning resources, creating timelines, project planning; all that stuff leading up to this point, which is reporting.

Next slide please. Thanks.

Okay. So just to give you guys a flavor of what we've looked at overall. The registries, we looked at four US TLD's, one Asian TLD, and one UK TLD. And in addition, from the registrar side -- this shows you how global this audit was -- there were 35 different countries where registrars were represented.

Over 56%, granted, were from the US, but the remaining you know 44% were from the remainder of the world basically. Different sectors across the globe.

On the right side, there's a chart that shows languages. We've had to translate over 21 different languages based on the documents we've collected from the audit. That's significant. And we did it within a matter of three months, which is critical. You'll understand why that's so critical when you see the amount of documents we collected from the audit.

Next slide please.

So just specifically for the registries, these are some of the observations we provided to the registries that were audited this year. Again, these are observations.

Some of the things that we noted were that certain elements per the registry escrow requirements were missing or didn't match within their escrow files. One of the things that we noted is information between (unintelligible) versus the actual elements for the domain didn't synch up.

Another thing that we noticed is missing data in the host, the registrar and domain elements per the data escrow specifications (unintelligible) requirements for the registries. Values for the domain element within the escrow (unintelligible) not present. And I gave you a couple of examples. The registrant's state, the administrative tech state, and things of that nature.

And then finally, named servers didn't match between the zone file and the escrow file.

Again, these are observations. Each individual registrar - registry received their own report and will answer any direct and detailed questions with them as they approach us and ask us for the evidence and the validation.

The next step in this is to actually collaborate with them and work with them. If they ask for our assistance, we'll work with them and show them the evidence in which we found this. Again this is observations. We're not going to go through the 1 2 3 process. This is basically an individual report that's been submitted to the registries. It's upon them to look at it, if they want to take action and revise the remediation plan that would be good, otherwise we'll provide them any evidence they need to corroborate the results that they've seen within their audit report.

Next slide please.

What we will report on to the public is the list of the registrars and registries that were audited in year one and statistical reports. The statistical reports were mainly be around the registrars. What we won't provide are the actual individual reports for the contracted parties. The registry and the registrar audit reports will be not published anywhere; they will not be shared. The only the occurrence in which that would happen is when a registry or registrar was breached for any reason. The breaches obviously have always been public. And so I just wanted to make that clear with everyone here.

Next slide please.

So tomorrow there's going to be an outreach session. It's going to be an hour and half, please attend if you can. And what we'll do is we'll go through all the statistics, all the data that we've collected in terms of the batches that we've issued in terms of audit reports. Again we won't call out anyone specifically but we will get into the details of what we've done for that audit. Okay? Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much Jacks, (Maggie). Let me open it up and see if there's any questions or comments. Krista I see your hand. Anyone else? Krista go ahead.

Krista Papac: Thanks. This is Krista Papac for the transcript.

I have three questions actually. In the Amsterdam regional meeting registries and registrars often spoke about the system that's being built has got these different pillars and functionalities in it. It's basically a backend CRM plus that ICANN's developing to marry these things. When you guys are talking about putting this all in a platform, that's part of that system correct?

(Maggie): It will eventually be. But as you know the CRM and the strategy ICANN shared is a very recent strategy that got put together. We got on the bus a year ago so we couldn't wait for an enterprise strategy because of the challenges that compliance is faced with. Eventually we will have migrated to the CRM into the full picture yes.

Krista Papac: Okay so you guys will actually start off having - you'll have this independent system, they're developing this independent strategy and at some point down the road, probably still to be determined, it will get migrated across?

(Maggie): Yes we are part of that team.

Krista Papac: Okay and then my second question with respect to the system that you're going to have where everything's integrated by ICANN 48, is that I assume it's being developed, that's kind of silly question I guess, but to be scalable? But as we launch new gTLDs and we have potentially different DRPs that we're trying to figure out that might have compliance impact, those would be things that you could built into that system as well.

(Maggie): Yes.

Krista Papac: Okay thanks. And then my third question and then I'll be quiet, the audit results that you just shared that was an audit like a full compliance audit of the registry and the only results were related to data escrow or was it a data escrow audit?

Jacks Khawaja: It wasn't just a data escrow audit. Data escrow files were provided as far as the audit. It was its own file that was provided. There was a full and an incremental that was provided. So those are just some of the observations we made based on the results we looked at.

(Maggie): What I'd like to add is that a year ago we also communicated when we brought Jacks on board we built that strategy for a true contractual compliance audit and the program is over a three-year plan. Because of the volume not necessarily in the gTLD space but more in the registrar space, we could not do audits for everybody in year one so we built it over three years, random selection. And after the completion of that we will do more of a selective audit going forward.

There's a lot of information on our Web site.

Keith Drazek: Excellent. Thank you (Maggie) and Jacks. Krista good questions thank you. Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: If I may just a quick question, is it your department that's going to be viewing the SLA monitoring or is that done out of...? Because I know you retained a vendor AVIKS or something, AVIKS SIA. Is it you guys that are doing that, if so what is your plan for doing that kind of monitoring and how does that relate?

Jacks Khawaja: This is Jacks for the record. So the monitoring tool is actually managed by another department but we will have access to it and we will validate the SLA requirement as part of the compliance program.

Jeff Neuman: So and I asked this question, I think if we can get a call in the next few weeks -- we have a call every two weeks -- with that department and maybe you guys as well and actually the vendor because the SLA monitoring system that makes us a little uncomfortable just to - it's very different than what we're

used to, most definitely the monitoring internally from the moment something comes in to the moment it comes out of our system. So frankly none of us really trust the way any vendor that's going to come in and monitor us. We'd like some way to become comfortable with how they're going to do it and maybe even have them do some tests to see what the issues are.

- (Maggie): So (Karla) and (Wendy) this is an action item for you guys to take back to (Gustavo). We'd love to be part of the cause and we understand the concerns because we depend on that SLA again monitoring tool to measure for contractual compliance obligations.
- Keith Drazek: Great thank you. Thanks Jeff. Anyone else, go ahead and identify yourself.
- Man: My name is (unintelligible) with (South Hill) Construction. How is this going to apply for RSPs? So if we're a registry and we have an RSP, who gets the results of the audit?
- Keith Drazek: So the question is for a registry service provider, for an applicant who has a registry service provider, who is the one interacting and who is the one getting the reports from compliance right?
- Jeff Neuman: I can help out sort of this one I think. You guys can jump - because the audits have already happened with registries that use a backend provider so what happens is ICANN goes to their contact which is the registry, the front end and they'll ask the front end all the questions and then the front end will call us let's say if we're backend and we'll give them what they need. So the front end registry is responsible for the interaction with ICANN staff.
- (Maggie): Sorry it was a new abbreviation I haven't heard yet. I can't believe that, three years later. Thanks Jeff.

Keith Drazek: Great, okay, thank you. Any other questions? I don't see any. Thank you very much for coming and spending the time with us. (Maggie) do you have any wrap-up comments?

(Maggie): Yes. We are a phone call away. I know because we answer them and if we don't answer them immediately we promise and commit to answering by end of the day. Okay? Yes and Jacks?

Jacks Khawaja: Yes I just want to say one thing. For those registries that participated this year, we greatly appreciate the effort. Thank you for collaborating with us. It was definitely worth it and hopefully it helped you as a registry understand the things that we've located and we're willing to work with you anyway we can. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much. (Ray) I saw your hand. Go ahead.

(Ray): So real quick, I don't mind saying Dot jobs was one of the ones that was selected, I hope that's okay. You said June that's all right. But I want to attest it absolutely was collaborative, it was two way, it was very - we've had our issues with ICANN compliance in the past. This was different and I support your approach, I support how when we called you did pick up, if we you didn't pick up you called right back. There wasn't like in the past guarded communications or what do they mean by that question, nothing like that. It's all different now and I just wanted to - I don't mind saying that to the group.

(Maggie): Thank you very much, we appreciate the feedback. And guys constructive feedback, we are in continuous improvement; we're not perfect. Thank you very much for adding us to the agenda. We appreciate your time.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much (Maggie) and Jacks. I need to say that was a very efficient presentation, excellent engagement and thank you very much. And again congratulations on your progress. Thank you.

Yes so okay thanks everyone. We have a few items that we skipped over the agenda and we need to get to the GNSO council discussion specifically I don't believe we've talked about the IDN updates. We did not talk about as I said the GNSO council issues and motions. There's something else I believe we skipped over. But let's focus on those two right now.

Ching would you like to provide...Not here. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: I can probably, it would be faster. So the two main things were the IP work, the variants work. The IDN variant TLD project is set out into four phases and I guess two reports came out that supposedly completes the third phase. I guess I'll highlight a few things.

One is that it looks - both of the documents actually look very well. It addresses a lot of the issues that they the community is concerned about. There is one particular item that I might flag back to us and also the broader community. There is one particular point in the user experience study recommendations that might run counter to some of the policies that are being implemented in the community for IDN variants especially for Chinese and the Chinese CDNC and some of the implementations that are currently in different new gTLDs. So barring that if that actually does conflict, the documents are looking good and we're moving ahead on that front.

But I do want to raise another item is that in terms of timing it is becoming imminent that the delegation of the new gTLDs the IDN and new gTLDs will be ahead of the completion of the variant issues, variant project and where we will see IDN TLDs that ought to have IDN variant TLDs not have them in the root when the names are being delegated later this year -- maybe as soon as later this year.

So there is going to be a concern because the user experience study does identify the importance of IDN variant TLDs and why it needs to be in the root and there's a lot of discussion there. And so one of the questions that the

community probably needs to ask itself and probably the board needs to ask itself is whether the delegation of just the primary and not the variant actually introduces another type of risk for users or in terms of the stability and consumer trust of the DNS. So that might be another item that we brought up.

But at this particular time I think both documents seem to be in good shape. Both Ching and I and I guess others will continue to look at that. So that's on the VIP stuff.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Edmon. Questions, comments? Okay.

Edmon Chung: And then there's the IRD. So that's the internationalized registration data. Again that's I think staff came back with the issues report recommending a PDP to be started but deferred until the Whois work is complete so that the internationalization part would go forward except for starting to study the feasibility of translation and transliteration. I think in my view actually I'm supportive of that. I think it makes sense, it makes sense to start to the work.

As staff has mentioned the translations of and transliteration is important. We need to know the economic impact on registries and registrars actually before we even do the PDP to decide what the policies need to be. So again there is nothing much to be flagged. I think it is in good order.

Keith Drazek: Excellent thanks very much Edmon. I guess a direct question from me and then we'll open it up if there's anyone else. Are there any action items facing the registry stakeholder group at this time on either the variant program or the IRD? Is there anything you need from us or need us to focus on?

Edmon Chung: There is if that item comes up. As I mentioned the user experience study report had a few recommendations, one of which might be incompatible with the implementations right now and also most of the gTLD applications that went in. If that is the case then I'm seeking for clarification on that and there

is a public session on the variant project I think either tomorrow or Thursday. If that comes up and it is in conflict then I would flag it for immediate attention.

Otherwise there is also the joint IDN working group between the ccNSO and the GNSO and it's putting out a final report on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs and that's going out for public comments and once it does I think I would like the group to take a look at it.

Keith Drazek: Excellent thank you very much. Any questions or comments for Edmon? Okay great thank you.

All right so let's move on then. Working our way down the list of the things that we skipped, I know we've got the GNSO council issues. Do we want to wait for Ching to come back or are you guys prepared to move forward with that now?

Okay so I will hand this then over to (Jonathan). Have at it.

(Jonathan): Just instructions, I'm going to be very brief and I'll take questions. But as you might expect we've had two days of weekend sessions. A lot of that was regular reports on the council and the activities of the working group so I'm not going to run through those specific points.

I've got two motions on the agenda and we had some key sessions with as I think I said earlier with the board and CEO. We spent in total two hours with them -- an hour and a half with the board and CEO and the follow up with Fadi. We met with the GAC and we had an initial sort of intro session where we really substantially focused on the policy and implementation issues.

One of the issues that came up is there was some discussion in and around the review of the GNSO but that hasn't really been substantive at this stage so what really what I think the key issues are, the two motions on the plate as far as this group's concerned so we'll get right onto those.

Jeff are you willing to say something about those two motions?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

(Jonathan): I've got a slight IT problem in actually viewing them at this stage.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I'm trying to pull them up too. So there's two motions on the table. Here we go. I'll go with the shorter one first. Both of them were from the noncommercial stakeholder group. Both of them I actually don't think are good paths for the reasons I'll explain.

The first motion is a motion from Wendy Seltzer and I think it's basically it says resolve the council -- it's on the registrar accreditation agreement -- and it basically says resolve - the council recommends that ICANN permit registrars to extend the rights and obligations in the current RAA and its renewals to new gTLDs until such time as a GNSO adopts a consensus supporting the policy changes in any proposed new RAA.

So there's two parts to this resolution. The first part is basically saying, which is okay and some of us do agree with, but it's basically saying don't rush the registrars into signing a new agreement, if some of them are on the old agreements still allow them to participate in the new gTLD process. That's okay. The second part of it though it says until such time a GNSO adopts a consensus supporting the policy changes in any proposed new RAA.

What this essentially means and is what some of you fundamentally disagree with is that the GNSO still believes it's still got role in approving the contracts. And this is very, very controversial point. The registries and registrars according to past actions and things that we've done do not believe the GNSO has any role in the contracts themselves.

The noncommercial and the commercial stakeholder group obviously do not agree with that but we have maintained that. And in fact the new version of the registrar accreditation agreement seems to minimize the role of the council and those agreements and certainly the registry agreement's kind of the same way. So for those reasons we oppose -- at least the registry reps that have discussed it -- oppose the motion.

Now I will say that there's been some talk of amending the motion and there's been some alternative language provided which is much more benign than the registrars have drafted. I honestly don't know the status of that language and whether it's being proposed but I would just ask that if there's something that's more agreeable to the registrars and doesn't implicate the GNSO and the policy roles, which this new alternate language will, I just don't have it in front of me, then just give us discretion to if the registrars approve it to approve it as well.

I'm not expecting that though given that the registrars have made significant progress on the RAA since this weekend and so I don't expect an alternate text. So my recommendation for this motion is to not vote in favor.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff. Why don't we open that up for comments or questions?  
Chuck I see your hand.

Chuck Gomes: Yes in the weekend -- Chuck Gomes -- in the weekend session I think I saw at least early versions of the amendment suggested by the registrars. That seemed okay to me. Now Jeff are you saying if those amendments remain you're suggesting opposing the motion?

Jeff Neuman: No I'm saying if those amendments are made and the registrars are in favor of this then we would. So this is one item we ask the registrars in an hour - sorry, this is one of the things I think we should the registrars in an hour if they support it or if first they're going to provide the alternate language and second if they support it.

I think that because the RAA is coming to a conclusion with the negotiations that it's really kind of not really relevant. There you go, superseded, so yes.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff, thanks Chuck. Any other questions or comments on that issue? All right I think you have your guidance. Let's move on.

Jeff Neuman: So the second motion is a motion regarding the straw man, also proposed by the noncommercial stakeholder group and it really is chastising amendment or motion I should say. I'll read sort of the excerpts of this one.

It says, "The GNSO council registered its disappointment and concern at the recent of adoption in significant parts of ICANN staff of the trademark clearinghouse straw man solution despite the proposal's broad genesis and the strong opposition to it voiced by both the GNSO council and a significant portion of the public comments."

It goes on to say the council strongly regrets the decision to circumvent the established transparent and rules-based policy development process and a top-down decision-making process to the detriment of the GNSO council bylaw-defined role and then requests the board reconsider basically the TMCH process to basically increase the claims from 60 to 90 days and to reconsider the decision to include 50 additional terms and then the claims process, I'm kind of summarizing.

So this motion even if you agree with some of the sentiment it's highly insight -- not insightful because that would be wrong -- incendiary, thank you, sorry it's a long day, and it's just very negative. Obviously the IPC is going to vote against this so even if the council passed this motion it would never have the meaningful effect because it's not like a very strong statement where you can't get everyone on the council.

I think we've had enough discussions with the board talking about our views on this and it's like poking your eye in it. They have talked I know with (Jonathan). They have talked about changing this into a letter but (Jonathan)?

(Jonathan): Yes I've had a few conversations with people over the weekend on this and I think as it stands it's perhaps inflammatory, provocative and my primary concern from a council point of view is that it in some ways contradicts the letter that we wrote to the chief executive. So from my point of view as chair of the council I do not want to be sending one letter that says one thing and shortly thereafter sending a motion that says something else. So notwithstanding the substance there's an issue for me with that that needs ironing out no matter what.

I think Jeff is right to some extent both particularly in this context, the council discussions but equally our stakeholder groups, the discussions with the board, we've made that point in many ways very firmly. I am expecting that this motion should come back in a revised form to take - and/or be withdrawn or to take cognizance of those kind of issues. If it continues to be made in the exact form of words that it is now, I strongly recommend that we don't support it as a registry rep.

However if it is modified in a way such that it provides a constructive reinforcement of the counterpoints we've been making over the past couple of days then I can see that it may well...In other words for example if the motion directs the council to write a letter to the CEO saying if in the event that he is given policy advice by the council in the future and to the extent that he sees fit to do something that goes against it, we would expect him to come back to council. So something like that could be a constructive reframing of it but as it stands I recommend we certainly don't support it.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Jonathan). Jeff you wanted to comment and then I saw Jon's hand.

Jeff Neuman: Yes on that last point I think that's the important one that we stress the same point we made in front of the board just before which is in the event, as (Jonathan) said, in the event that we say something's policy and we provide advice, to the extent they contradict that that the GNSO be offered an opportunity to at the very least respond to that.

And this whole notion - I think they still - see I'm not as comfortable or confident I should say that the noncommercials are going to come back with anything that's even that constructive. I think they still want at the heart of it a reconsideration of the decision. I'm afraid that any indication by the council that they want a reconsideration of decisions that are made is just going to delay the new gTLD process so that's another reason I was not in favor of this.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff. Jhn?

Jon Nevett: Thanks Keith, Jon Nevitt. I'm thinking about one thing in relation to this issue and it stems from the fact that you mentioned before about not poking other folks in the eye and I'm wondering if we want to mention somewhere, I don't know if it's a letter or it's a statement or something, that we're kind of getting poked in the eye in that as part of this straw man proposal the trademark claims period went from 60 to 90 days, right, so a 50% increase.

And now that we know the pricing for the trademark clearinghouse we know that there's a transactional element to that that we have to pay 30 cents per successful transaction only during that trademark claims period so they just added a 50% cost to registries for something that we actually asked not to happen, we don't want, we didn't support and now we're paying for it. And I'm wondering if there's a way on the council level you could tie that somehow and register some concern.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I think that's a good point and we can say it and if we don't say it strong enough the council's an open meeting, you can certainly jump in there at this point in the discussion. I'll try to attend the meeting also and I'll make sure to actually say it.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff. Are there other motions that we're considering? Any other...? Yes (Jonathan) go ahead.

(Jonathan Robinson): A very brief comment. And I think John that's a point very well made and well taken. It's a new point. I haven't got to that point so that's great thank you. I still think that no matter what, no matter how we might feel about for example the 30 to 60 days the critical thing for me is that it must be new information should make us contradict ourselves in such a short timeframe. You've provided new information; that's a basis on which to provide new content so I'm more than happy with that.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Jonathan). Any other questions or comments on the GNSO council motion before us? Seeing none I think I'll take this brief opportunity to thank our councilors for all their service on our behalf. I know it's a lot of extra work particularly over the weekend so thank you guys for being out there on the front lines with us.

Okay moving on we have right now just over 30 minutes left before we go meet with the registrars and there's several issues that we still haven't quite gotten to. First is an update on the IRTP Part D PDP working group. Is there anybody who would like to give an update IRTP Part D? There's probably not much to do. All right well that was easy.

Next item on the list...

(Cherie): Barbara was looking for possible volunteers. I think an e-mail went out to the list and I thought somebody was going to talk on that today but we can follow-up on e-mail I'm sure.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Cherie), thanks for that reminder.

Jeff Neuman: So on that one there was a discussion. It seemed like the PDP is mostly now irrelevant so it's a PDP on a bunch of issues with the -- and let me ask the question -- it's on the transfer dispute resolution policy and aside from VeriSign with com and net who may have had maybe like 50 over the entire life of this policy, is there any registry here that's ever had a transfer dispute filed and if so you don't have to answer it now but I can say on behalf of Neustar that this has been in place since 2005 or 6, maybe even 4, we've had zero and it imposes costs on us because every year we have to train our support on the process. So if anyone has and if you can ask Ken if ask your guys and David.

Because if the answer is none the entire PDP's on a process like (unintelligible) and zero or close to zero -- one? One since 2003 so yes. One of the things that we need to provide feedback is let's just shut it down because its just not worth spending so much time on.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jeff, appreciate that. I see (Ruben)'s at the mic and then Chuck.

(Ruben): (Unintelligible) question but from a ccTLD perspective we had (unintelligible), like a few every year. Some of them were forged documents, fraudulent paperwork being transferred and there was also transfer listed where our research said hey this registrant said he hasn't registered that domain to that other registry so how do you prove to me that you have cancelled quickly? In the ccTLD space we have like a few areas so a one hand area. Not zero but not 10,000, not 100.

Jeff Neuman: And thank you (Ruben) that's good, although interestingly enough the subject you mentioned wouldn't be the subject, it would be ICANN transferred the resolution policy.

(Ruben): We had both, both (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So you had very few.

(Ruben): But a few -- very few.

Jeff Neuman: And then the last item in that PDP is whether EPP itself has obviated the need for FOAs -- help me with the abbreviation -- yes form of authorization. So I think that may be an issue worth talking about.

Interestingly enough when the whole transfer process was going on in '04, '05 I actually made a case on behalf of the ones that had a EPP at the time and comment that did not have it at the time but (Scott Hollenbeck) was actually the author of the EPP and he and I had a long discussion and it was still his view and it carried a lot of weight that even the EPP registries may still need a FOA. But I think now having eight years under our belt of that I would think even he and others that have run the EPP believe that it's not really FOAs are really just for non-EPP registries.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jeff. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes. Jeff clarify for me what part of it you wanted to kill?

Jeff Neuman: Both but at least the part that talks about some issues that have come up with the transfer dispute resolution policy. I urge you to look at. There's a long discussion about it. And even -- who was it that was presenting the fact report? -- Marika I think, was saying it was such nonissue that it was thought to be when we started this whole transfer PDP in 2008, it was thought to be that it could be an issue but it's turned out that it hasn't really been an issue.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. I talked to Barbara and it's Barbara's team -- Barbara Knight -- Barbara's team that manages our dispute resolution process. They'd love to see it go away so we don't have that responsibility and based on what we're

hearing I'm wondering if that's an issue that maybe should be considered when - from the data that I'm hearing. So I just throw that out.

Jeff Neuman: And I may have misspoke. It's not really to kill the PDP. It's to kill the transfer dispute resolution policy and make it a compliance function within ICANN.

Keith Drazek: Chuck again.

Chuck Gomes: I would be fully supportive of that.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks guys.

Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: It would seem to be relatively easy statistically to make that case when you consider the number of names under management, the number of domain years that - and the number of cases that have been filed. Is the end - even worse; the cost to ICANN and to the community to manage the policy around a process that's literally not being used. It just would see that this would be the perfect time to bring this in.

So maybe what we can do is talk to Marika and ask to get some statistical information from the various registries.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Ken. I mean, maybe this is something we take as an action item within the stakeholder group and put together a small working group that can sort of tackle that.

Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: One more thing. (Barbara) would really appreciate some feedback from people in the group with some of the things you're saying today. So if you

could put that in an email and - that would be really - you can put it on the list and just address it to (Barbara)'s attention.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks, Chuck.

Are there any other comments or questions on IRTP?

No? I see a microphone on over there. I think it was Ken.

Okay, thanks. Then let's move on. The next item on the agenda is the ICANN Fiscal Year '14 Security, Stability, and Resiliency Framework. Anyone want to touch on this? Any thoughts? Comments? Questions?

No. Okay, moving on.

Next item on our agenda is to discuss probably the open public comment period's issues reports. (Cherie), I think we - yes. Okay. Terrific. Thank you.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Okay.

And again, we don't have a tremendous amount of time, but I think it's important that we go through these. And then once we get through - just for planning. Once we get through the discussion around the public comments, then the final set of bullets is around registry stakeholder group business. There's three items under that talking about planning for the growth of the stakeholder group, the task teams, financial reporting.

So is Mike here still?

Ken's back. We'll talk about the financial reports, toolkit of services, and then we'll get ready to rock and roll over to the registrar's meeting.

All right. Yes, we're not going to be able to see that are we? Not very well.

Okay, just give us a second here.

All right. So I'm just going to run down the list here and sort of open it up for any comments, questions, thoughts? And (Sherry), I know that you've been following this closely in terms of where we are and where we potentially owe stuff, so feel free to jump in as well, okay?

All right, thanks.

So the first item on the list is the preliminary issue report on uniformity of reporting. The public comment period closed on the 22nd of March and there is a reply period that's open until the 12th. So coming up pretty fast.

Chuck drafted comments. We need to make a decision about whether to file during the reply period. Chuck, is there anything you want to talk about with regard to this one?

Chuck Gomes: Trying to get my mind in gear on that.

Keith Drazek: On the uniformity of reporting.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. No, I know the topic. I'm - I reviewed a lot of these things and did some things.

So did we submit comments?

Keith Drazek: We did not. That's the issue. We did not submit the comments. You did the draft. I don't think we acted on the - on your draft. So now the question is do we submit those comments during the reply period?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I guess that's left - you know, if there's no interest in submitting the comments that I drafted.

I don't know even know that there is a reply period. There's only a reply period if there were initially comments. But a lot of - and I'm not sure there were comments (unintelligible) on it, so we're actually getting an update tomorrow during the Council meeting. We did not get an update on the weekend, but I thought I saw on the agenda this topic.

(Cherie): This is (Cherie). Just so people know, the reply period closing dates were listed from the ICANN Web site. So...

Chuck Gomes: Then that probably means there were no comments during - there's only a reply period if there were comments during the comment period.

Keith Drazek: But what (Cherie) is saying is that there is a reply period listed as April 12th.

Chuck Gomes: So you said it was listed from the Web site?

(Sherry): No, lifted. I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, lifted.

(Sherry): I'm sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Thank you. Berry.

Barry Cobb: Hi. Berry Cobb, ICANN staff.

So yes, the comment period did close. There were no comments so the reply doesn't necessarily apply. We will be briefing the Council tomorrow on the

report. We didn't get a motion filed in time, so it won't be considered for the Council until the May session.

Keith Drazek: All right, excellent. Thanks Barry. Really appreciate that.

Okay, yes. We can cross that one off.

All right, next item. Revised proposal of the ACDR to serve as a UDRP dispute resolution service provider. Again, there was an initial comment period closed on March 22nd. There's a reply period April 13th. Does anybody have something to discuss around this?

No. All right, let's move on.

Chuck Gomes: Keith?

Keith Drazek: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Just one thing. Sorry, (Paul).

Shouldn't we just make it - if we're not going to submit comments, why don't we - instead of - why don't we change the status to not submitting comments?

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Chuck. Agreed.

(Paul), did you want to say something?

(Paul) Diaz: Same comment.

Keith Drazek: Same comment. All right. Great minds think alike.

All right, proposed 2013 RAA posted for comments. This may have been overtaken by events.

No?

(Becky)?

(Becky Burr): Just it is going to be - a new version is going to be posted on Sunday, so there will be the most current version still available for comment for another week.

Keith Drazek: Thank you.

So if there's going to be - (Becky), if there's going to be a new version posted, presumably there will be a new public comment period opened?

And I guess the follow-up question is do we - is there something that we want to comment on, on the existing comment period? Or, do we just defer until the next one?

(Becky Burr): The view of the registrars group and ICANN is that the changes are not material or they were both text was presented because all of the - the gaps in agreement were presented in comparison text.

So I believe no - they don't believe that there's another comment period necessary.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks.

So presumably, this is something we'll discuss with the registrars this afternoon. I expect we ought to ask for their thoughts as to whether comments from the registry stakeholder group would be helpful. If so, what would those comments be?

Anything else that you think we ought to consider, (Becky)?

(Becky Burr): No. I think that's - I think that would be a useful discussion. I believe that there's some pushback from the IPC on some of these issues.

Keith Drazek: Okay, great. Thank you.

Okay, so action item in the short-term is to discuss that with the registrars and take direction at that point.

Okay. Our next item is the (PIC) (DRP). A public comment period was open until the 5th. There will be a reply period - there is a reply period until the 27th of April. We need to decide whether we submit comments - reply comments on that.

Jeff Neuman: Well I think we should focus our attention on the "negotiation" going on now as opposed to worrying about drafting comments. Because hopefully by the time that period ends, we've got a new version that's better and the comments will be outdated.

Keith Drazek: Okay, I agree Jeff.

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: (Validaus) submitted some pretty good comments on it, so - I mean we don't need to reply, but we could reply endorsing their comments. They were pretty good.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Chuck.

Okay, moving on. Next item is the proposed modification of GNSO PDP manual to address the suspension of a PDP. Chuck drafted comments. Let's

see, I guess - well, the public comment period date closed on the 6th. There's a reply period open. I guess we did not vote on that, did we?

(Cherie): That's correct. There was no follow-on.

Keith Drazek: All right, thanks (Cherie).

Chuck, this is the second set of comments that you've drafted that did not get action, so I apologize for the extra work that you did where we didn't really follow through. Need to do a better job of all of that, and I'll take that to heart.

So we have a reply period though. Is there something that we ought to do here? Is there an action item in terms of submitting comments during the reply period?

Chuck Gomes: The - you know, Chuck again. The - I think if I remember correctly, I don't have those in front of me, but I think the comments were pretty straightforward on that. The - it was just supportive of the modifications, and they were very reasonable. So...

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I was going to say we need - I think we need to reiterate to the ICANN staff - the policy staff that we should not have a comment period that ends during or immediately before or after an ICANN week. I know that there's kind of a justification of, "Well, they got a reply period after. So if you look at the whole thing and it's (way after)."

But I - but then if no one comments, there is no reply period. So yes - so we need to I think send a message again to - and hopefully our ICANN colleagues will send that message. But having a comment period that ends on April 5th or April 6th when the meeting starts officially on the 7th but we're all here on the 5th and the 4th is probably not wise.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Jeff. I agree.

Specifically though on this topic, should we file comments during our reply period, assuming there is one open right now, assuming there was an initial comment filed on this; the proposed modification of GNSO PDP manual to address the suspension of a PDP. Do we want to submit Chuck's comments at this point?

Man: I mean, I remember Chuck's comments. They were - we just agreed they were basically pretty supportive and simple, but they may be - it may be that we - events have passed us by.

Keith Drazek: But I think there's a reply period now that we could submit those comments if wanted to.

Man: Right.

Keith Drazek: But the question...

((Crosstalk))

(Paul): (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Sorry?

(Paul): (Unintelligible).

Right. (Unintelligible)...

Were there comments (unintelligible)? If there was, (unintelligible).

My guess is that nobody responds (unintelligible).

Sorry Keith. This is (Paul).

I think the action item is we look at the thing on the ICANN site and see were any comments at all filed? And therefore, there will be a reply comment period. If it was merely supported as Chuck had originally done, and PIR affiliates both supported Chuck in there - but they were not substantive.

If that's the case across the community, then there's no extra work here. We'll just check and figure it out.

Keith Drazek: Yes, agreed. The extra work is to make a decision whether we're going to vote on it to submit.

So (Cherie), action item. Check to see - we will check to see if there more comments. If there were, if there was an action - sorry, a reply period open, then we will call for a vote on whether to submit those.

(Cherie): Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you.

Okay, next item. The preliminary issue report on gTLD registration data services. Fortunately, this comment period is still open and we have the opportunity to decide whether to file comments.

Any thoughts?

Jeff Neuman: So this is the one on the preliminary issue report?

Keith Drazek: Yes, exactly.

Jeff Neuman: This, we probably should; although it's - it's interesting, because the recommendation is that we wait for the expert working group to pretty much

finish its work and then we start a PDP based on what the expert working group comes out with.

So all this issue report is basically a history of Whois and the history of what's happened with Whois to date. So I'm not sure there's much in way of anything to file comments on.

Now remember, this is separate from the questions that the expert working group asked. This is just an issue report.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

So I guess the question then is, is there anything in that issues report that any of us in the stakeholder group would take issue with? And, whether we want to submit comments on it or not.

Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again.

I'm probably mixing this up, but is this one that (Don) was involved and said he'd draft something? I kind of vaguely remember that. But if we could check that.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Chuck. We'll check that. I think Cherie was thinking maybe not, but we'll double check that.

So the action item for this one, (Cherie), is to review the issue report and determine whether there's anything in there that warrants stakeholder group comments. And, we'll ask for a volunteer to take the lead on that.

Okay, next item. Consultation on the root zone and KSK rollover. Comment period on that closes in a few days on the 12th. Anyone want to - oh, Chuck. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: This is one that we can't - we at VeriSign can't comment on because we worked with (EPIA) and ICANN IANA people to develop this, okay. So they're just looking for feedback from the community. Is it okay?

So I'm just giving that to you for information, so...

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Chuck.

Any other thoughts? Any action item? (Sherry), we'll send around a note asking if anyone has any thoughts or cares enough about this issue, consultation on root zone KSK rollover, to file any comments.

Jeff Neuman: That will be due on Friday. It's another one that ends during ICANN week - or I mean, I wouldn't even send around a note.

I mean you could send around the note, but no way we can get it done here (unintelligible)...

Keith Drazek: All right, (Sherry), don't send around the note.

(Sherry): Yes. Because then I'll have the weekend to...

Keith Drazek: That's right.

All right, yes. Okay, next item. Let's keep plowing through this. The ICANN fiscal year '14 SSR framework. Deadline April 20th. Chuck has posted comments and we need to decide whether to submit those?

Let's - (Sherry), action items. Please send around again - or let's re-forward Chuck's comments - draft comments and call for, you know, a response or feedback whether anybody has any input.

Okay. Next item...

Jeff Neuman: Well, can I just recommend that if we get no comments by I don't know what day, maybe that (Sherry) should send around a vote.

Keith Drazek: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So...

Keith Drazek: Let's see. That one was - that one's due on the 20th, which is - what day is that?

Man: A week from Saturday.

Keith Drazek: A week from Saturday?

All right. So let's say if there's no response by Tuesday then we'll issue a vote for starting Tuesday night.

Okay, fiscal year '14 community travel support guidelines. Chuck, you've been doing a lot of drafting here. We owe you.

Deadline for this was the 21st, so that's a week from Sunday. Again, let's just - to help everybody out since we've all been busy and distracted, just re-forward that or recirculate that and same deal as the last one. Ask for...

Ken Stubbs: (Unintelligible)...

Keith Drazek: Yes, Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Yes. That'd be great. I welcome all input at this point in the day.

Ken Stubbs: Yes. We need more disclosure from ICANN on this. I think this program is really getting gamed. And I'm relieved that there were approximately 40 people that were subsidized out of the GNSO for travel to Beijing. And, I think we ended up being told that we only could have three out of that 40. I have trouble understanding that.

Also, if you take a look at what's happening on some of the other interest groups, it's turning into a very, very convoluted mess you know.

Also, there is very little clarity or consistency on this. One year we're being told one thing. Another year we're being told another. At one time, we were assured that we were going to be allowed to carry over these slots and we were told to get three a meeting. And if you don't use the three this time, you only use two, then we'll allow you to carry over the one. And it's working. It's being very badly abused by some people.

You know, I think take a look at the growth in our constituency, we're going to end up with probably 200 - I would easily guess that by the middle of next year, we'll - we may have close to 100 members and three slots is not fair. We have an awful lot of small registries that really need the opportunity to be able to put the people like Carolyn and newer ones that are going to be coming on board.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thanks Ken. Appreciate it.

I saw Chuck had his hand up and then (Wendy) wanted to comment. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: A couple things. First of all, the carryover was within the fiscal year, because they - I recall distinctly that they did not want to mess up the books. So that's just a clarification. It's not really too relevant to what we're talking about right now.

But what is relevant is there are two things going on here. There's the travel policy - travel support policy, and that is where the group were restricted as the policy states to three per - and it was up to the GNSO, and the GNSO allowed each stakeholder group to do their own thing.

Remember that for the fiscal year we're in right now, that groups were able to request additional support. And it wasn't just with travel. But, many of them did request more travel. We didn't. Okay, we're going to this next time, okay.

So I think that's - I don't know if it explains it all. It would be - Ken, your request for a total accounting from both sources is still very valid, okay. But, I think that's probably why there's a discrepancy between - some of the travel support's coming from this travel policy that that's about. And others are special requests from stakeholders and constituencies.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks.

(Jonathan): Chuck, thanks for - sorry.

Keith Drazek: It's all right. Go ahead.

Thanks, Chuck.

(Jonathan) then (Wendy), and then Ken.

(Jonathan): Thanks for putting your - it sounds like you have a very clear handle on what happened, Chuck.

Just to take that one minor step further. The net effect of all of that though is that I think perhaps all other groups, other than our own, within the GNSO ended up with six places as opposed to our three.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Because they requested more and it was - some of it was approved.

Ken Stubbs: Well, the only - a real quick response. That may have been the case, but I must have a real bad memory loss here because I don't recall us being given the opportunity to request more slots. So you know...

Chuck Gomes: We were. We were and we didn't last year. And the only reason I remember that, Ken, is because I was involved in the finance - the budget stuff, and that's where it came out of.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks guys.

Ken Stubbs: Start taking my meds more regularly.

Keith Drazek: All right, thanks.

(Wendy) over to you. Thank you.

(Wendy): Hi, this is (Wendy).

I was just going to say that I know that the global stakeholder engagement group as well as the finance group, which you're probably more intimately involved than I, are addressing that. I mean, we have recognized that the system isn't really working right and we're trying to find a way to make it more fair.

And you know to the even extent on having reports come back on people who do the travel - you know, under the ICANN budget - reporting on how effective that travel was so we can justify it again in the future. And that's being addressed and it's something that they know we have to do.

(Janet Dumalang) and (Fabier) and others are working on that (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much, (Wendy). Very helpful.

Okay. I think at this point we're getting very, very close to the end of the meeting where we need to move to the registrars. So let's not worry about the next few items on the list. We've got a little bit of extra time on the one - the three or four that are remaining.

I do want to move very quickly however to one of the items under stakeholder group business, specifically the financial report. And obviously, we've got Mike Palage as the Treasurer and Ken as the Assistant Treasurer.

(Cherie), do you want to mention - is there anything we ought to talk about as it relates to the financial report? Or maybe I'll just turn to Ken and ask for an update on financial reporting generally.

Ken Stubbs: Well you know for all intents and purposes, we're adequately funded. At this point in time, we have approximately \$46,000 in the bank. My biggest concern is budgeting for the future. And to be frank with you, (Ray) dropped a bomb on this here with this issue. So I'd like if at all possible in the next two months to set some goals for the constituency.

One of them is going to be we have to develop a methodology for dealing with dues in the future. When you're dealing with 16 registries, that's one thing. When you're dealing with you know well over 100 potential - and it could be 300 to 400, we need to develop a system that's equitable. At the same time, gives us the resources we need.

But you know until (Ray) dropped the bomb here, I was saying, you know, we don't need \$500,000 bucks in the bank. Now I'm beginning to wonder, based

on the experience that (jobs) had with their arbitration, we're looking at low seven figure numbers.

So you know, it's really scary, but you guys have got to keep this on the back - in the back of your heads. I need more input from NTAG. Naturally, we're going to be funding the NTAG effort on an ongoing basis because as the members (unintelligible), new members will be stepping into the breach and they may have some very good suggestions as to how to bring in - bring these people in.

We need equity all the way around. We haven't - we've got to be moving forward together and not in some sort of an adversarial way that creates rancor because of people feel like they're being taken advantage of there.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Ken. I think - you know, I guess the question that strikes - I'm struck by the question you know we probably need to have a more coordinated effort around forward-looking budgeting, right? And I don't know if that's an ExCom responsibility or if it's a working group responsibility, or something specifically focused on our stakeholder group budgets and finances?

And we probably ought to just put out a call for interested parties. But, I want to open that up. That's just my initial thinking.

Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Well I think ExCom - at this point in time, a good part of it belongs with the ExCom. But at the same point in time, we're transitioning - and I would like very much to have more input from the community. I'm hoping that (Tim) will step up and get involved.

But we need to acknowledge the fact that we're going to experience significant growth after the second half of the year in a number of active full memberships. So...

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Ken.

(Ruben), go ahead?

(Ruben): (Unintelligible).

(I'm curious). (Unintelligible) from a policy perspective what would happen if we had four interest groups?

(Unintelligible).

I'm not sure if policy (unintelligible) or having that (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Thanks, (Ruben). That's a good question, and I'll certainly turn to Jeff and anyone else who'd like to comment on this.

My understanding is that we have in the registry stakeholder group the ability for interest groups to form. It's a self-forming situation. If there's a group of like-minded registries - members that are you know contracted parties that want to self-form into an interest group, that's certainly welcome and allowable. And quite frankly I expect it.

As it relates to policy, voting, and finances - financial support, I need to take a step back and say I need to look into that and to get you - you know, get back to you with more specific answers.

Although, I think Jeff and others may be able to...

Jeff Neuman: Yes. That's what I was going to say. No matter how many interest groups or constituencies, right now, there's only one registry stakeholder group, and there will continue to be one registry stakeholder group.

There may be interest groups or constituencies in the future where maybe a generic registry group or brand, a community, a - whatever else, but there's only one registry stakeholder group.

(Ruben): Yes.

Jeff Neuman: It's like a commercial stakeholder group. There's one commercial stakeholder group, but you have the IP, ISP (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jeff.

Krista?

Krista Papac: Just to add to that.

So with respect to interest groups, the process for having interest groups within the registry stakeholder group is within the registry stakeholder group charter, and that's something that we do - you know, we do within the registry stakeholder group.

For the constituencies, there's a - you know, a whole ICANN process that you can - if someone wanted to go that route, would go out and identify and follow that through, which goes through the Board if I'm not mistaken - works its way through the Board.

Keith Drazek: Okay.

And so I just - just to wrap up this particular point, you know this is obviously going to be a big issue for the stakeholder group moving ahead, and we probably need to have some more detailed discussions around sort of the structure of our current charter, implications of looking ahead. So I think we plan on that for our next call. To tee that up for discussion.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Thank you.

Ken, I saw your hand very briefly. We're already late for the registrars.

Ken Stubbs: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks.

Jeff, you had a final comment?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think the next time - the next meeting, we'll have the registrars come to us because we'll be bigger. And actually within a month or two, our stakeholder group will have a lot more active members. So I just want to say that.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Okay, well thanks everybody.

I just want to before we break up just say thank you to Cherie for all of your hard work in getting us here and being an excellent Secretariat. I want to thank the ICANN staff for being here in support of us. (Wendy) and Karla, and everybody else that was here earlier. Thanks to our scribes and to the technicians and everybody else that supported us. Thanks so much everybody.

Woman: Thank you all. And (David), we can end recording. Thank you.

END