Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

Registrars / Registries Meeting

Tuesday 16 July 2013 at 16:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Man:	For the record this is registries, registrars stakeholder group scheduled from 1600 to 1700 local time.
(Michela):	(Chris Gift) I believe is in the room here somewhere or he was, he left, he's always here you can see arm has been waved. Berry is he in the room or is he gone?
Berry Cobb:	(Unintelligible).
(Michela):	Okay so much for that move onto plan B.
Krista Papac:	Hey (Michela) it's Krista Papac with ICANN staff. I think he was under the impression he was last on the agenda. I can go find him real quick if you guys want him now though.
(Michela):	Yes if you wouldn't mind getting him we'll talk with the council over the interim because unfortunately people moved our agenda around it wasn't updated.
Krista Papac:	(Unintelligible) when that happens, I'll be right back.

(Michela):   Thanks, okay so I want to talk about council motions first so I'll let you lead that.

Keith Drazek: All right well I am actually going to defer to Jonathan Robinson and Jeff Newman who are here our council reps. Ching Chiao couldn't make this trip so he'll - he's planning on dialing in for the council meeting but Jonathan and Jeff are here so I'll defer to Jonathan, please let's discuss the council motions.

Jonathan Robinson: Jeff tells me - it's Jonathan Robinson. Jeff tells me I should remind you that you need to come to our room next time because we're going to have more members than this so this is your last time when we're coming to you.

Man: That's what you think, you haven't seen our membership growth plan so move on quickly.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so we have three motions I'm not sure if the - I assume you've discussed them all and I expect that there's really one that we should focus on in terms of any discussion but and that is on the proposed by law amendment.

                      So let me just take a pause and hear from you, have you discussed the others? The other two seem non-controversial and I'm expecting that you will support them, which is the policy and implementation charter and the domain and (locking) subject to UDRP.

                      So question have you discussed them and are you in support of those two motions before we go onto the one, which we should have a little discussion on?

Michele Neylon::   Okay, well to name main subject to (locking) yada, yada, yada UDRP lock as we prefer to call it. I chaired the damn thing so I'm a bit biased and there several other members of our stakeholder group were on that.

As far as I know nobody had any opposition to it, anybody have any opposition to it? No, okay so you can take that as a given that we're support on that one.

Jonathan Robinson: And then the next one is the charter for the policy and implementation working group.

Keith Drazek: Again I don't think there was any opposition to it. I think the only one where there was some discussion I think was the third one, third motion or maybe the second (unintelligible).

Man: Jeff on your by law motion could you just provide for the registrars in the room some background on how that came about it would be useful?

Jeff Neuman: Sure, the background is - dates back to there was a non-commercial stakeholder group reconsideration required on the trademark (plus 50) the (strawman) proposal.

The non-commercial stakeholder group claimed that it didn't follow process and that ICANN violated its by laws by not pushing the issue back to GNSO and GNSO said that that was policy.

Putting the substance aside like this is not to talk about trademark (plus 50) the board of governance committee rejected the non-commercial stakeholder group petition for reconsideration, which is fine but in its rationale it was fairly aggressive.

And it stated that it doesn't matter that the GNSP thought this issue was policy, we the staff thought it was implementation and that's what really matters and the fact that the GNSO said it was policy doesn't matter and

therefore there's no review necessary because there's no requirement for the board to consult with the GNSO even if it disagrees with what the GNSO does.

And it was pretty harshly worded just like that. I raised an issue and then the council agreed to raise the issue to the board of governance committee that this rationale wasn't exactly fair, it wasn't - it was a little harshly worded and he should go back and rewrite the rationale.

And ultimately that's what the board of governance committee actually did was rewrite the rationale to something where even if you don't agree with trademark (plus 50) put that aside, the rationale basically came out as something that was much more fair and in line with the by laws.

Put that - putting that aside and the rationale said that there is no by law requirement that the board come back to the GNSO if they disagree with what the GNSO does and that's true.

So what I did was write up a - by a proposed, a recommendation from the council to the board that the board adopt a by law, which basically nuts and bolts boils down to look if - two things.

Number one, the GNSO is also responsible for providing advice on implementation issues with respect to gTLD issues or sorry generic domain issues, generic gTLD issues.

The second thing was that look if you disagree with something that actually comes out of the GNSO we know how rare that is but if you disagree with it or are going to disagree hey just come back to us, let us try to work it out and if we can't work it out great do what you were going to do anyway.

So that's the kind of the background of the by law. I will tell you that and the reason I draft it as a by law amendment was to really get the attention from the right people and I think we accomplished that goal.

If I had drafted it just as a motion to just say hey, I don't like this nobody would have paid attention to it but as it turns out the board paid attention to it, the other council members have paid attention to it, the other stakeholders have paid attention to it and spent a considerable amount of time discussing it.

I can tell you right now the commercial stakeholder group would likely vote it down. I think that - and the board doesn't like it very much either because they don't like to tinker with their by laws except when they want to tinker with the by laws.

And so ultimately in the end I think we've got what we wanted to get out of it. My recommendation right now is I'd still like some sort of commitment or affirmation or something loose where the board and the staff would agree to come back to the GNSO if it's going to take an action that it agrees with.

But frankly I mean it's not important to me whether it's a by law or whether it's just some resolution or some other commitment or whatever. I've let members of the CSG, we've let members of the CSG know that because what they said to us is, hey guys we support your principle we just don't agree with the by law change.

They kind of called their bluff, they're great you support the principle why don't you come back and rewrite it and, you know, let's sign it off as some sort of resolution or something else.

They've now bluffed and said well, I'm not sure we can write a resolution, I'm not sure we can do it. You know, it's calling their bluff and, you know, I know

it's being recorded and everything my - I believe there's more things behind the scenes as to why the CSG doesn't want this type of thing in there.

I don't think they necessarily want things to come back to the GNSO. I think they like their direct avenue to the board and not wanting certain things that they lobby for to come back to the GNSO until in the end tomorrow if it comes up as a by law and then if it comes off I'm hoping that the CSG proposes a friendly amendment, which I would actually accept as long as the principle is intact is my view.

If it still is a vote on a by law amendment my fear is that the council, it may not get past the council and so if I have that feeling I may choose to withdraw it or if I don't withdraw it but to change and then defer it.

So basically I want to see how it plays out its really the principle that we kind of care about as opposed to their by law.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff for this explanation, thanks.

Man: Okay just to close up the thinking on that I think we've discussed it at the (X Com) level and we're leaning in favor of voting for it if you keep it on the table in its current form or in an amended form.

So if there's a sense in the room that that's not the action that counselors for the registrars to take then, you know, we should hear about that sooner rather than later.

Keith Drazek: Anybody else have anything on this? Registrars speak now or forever hold thy peace, Volker and then Matt.

Volker Greimann: Yes I just wanted to add my support to what Jeff said, second - I second the motion I think it's a very good idea to - it was a very good idea to get the ball rolling and we have done that.

And by offering to amend it in a way that all groups can agree to it I think we are keeping that ball rolling as it is so I would be very supportive of keeping that motion in - let the ball in the game and try to make the best of the motion that we can. So I would also suggest that we were for it if it came to the table as a vote.

Keith Drazek: Okay Matt and then (James).

Matt: Sorry, so Jeff you said the CSG is all likely to vote against it?

Jeff Neuman: I mean that's what I'm hearing from the back channel I believe so. But my goal is to get the discussion going at a council level and if I see that's the way of going.

What I'll say to start with is my fear is that they don't say anything and just intend to vote it down so my statement would be that I expect that since you're not saying anything you're going to vote for it.

And hopefully that will start some discussion and then if the discussion leans the way I believe it will lean then I'll offer some other wording that I've worked out with some other people, which basically takes it and makes it not a by law change but just a - just a commitment to adhere to the principle.

Matt Serlin: Okay, thanks.

Keith Drazek: (James).

(James): Hey Jeff I need to - over here, how's it going. I need to first ask, apologize because although I read the motion when it was sent around by Mason to our list for review I haven't been following it over the weekend.

So I'm not really sure what the status is but the only question I had was relative to your last bit of language down there under the further resolved. I'm looking for it now just a second here, do you have that language handy?

Jeff Neuman: I don't have the exact language but it basically says that this should apply regardless of whether it's a formal PDP or not.

(James): Thanks that's it and it was something to do with what kind of scenarios do you imagine where the GNSO would want the board to treat something that came out of other than a PDP as formal policy advice and to consult with the GNSO if they were to go against it? I'm having trouble with that last bit, that's all.

Jeff Neuman: Sure and that's a good question as you know because you were on the PDP work team with me there are a number of outcomes of - from PDP that may not be a formal consensus policy or anything like that or there's a lot of other ways to develop policy other than going through a PDP.

So or even advice without going through a PDP an example is the whole thing that gave rise to the situation with the (strawman) was that we as a GNSO and ultimately the council sent a letter to Claudia after she asked us whether we thought trademark (plus 50) was policy or implementation.

We as a council said hey we think this is policy and it's come back to us for work on it. Staff basically said, no we disagree with you and then the board voted in favor of it and they never came back to us and said, hey guys we actually disagree with you and here's the reasons why and talk it through with us.

That's the type of thing I think that the staff should come back and the boards come back to us before just saying, yes implementation and therefore we don't have to listen to the GNSO, that's one example.

There are others or there are other things that haven't necessarily gone through a form PDP where it just results in a working group that comes out with some sort of statement or advice whether it's something that may come out out of this working group for comply - I forgot what it's called.

It's uniformity in reporting may not be a PDP or but it may be a working group that talks about it and comes up with just some things that the staff should do or, you know, some other recommendations if that happens and something comes out of the GNSO.

If the board disagrees with it that's fine they can do that and they cannot adopt it but it would be nice if they came back to the GNSO and gave us another crack at it or gave us a chance to work on it. It's more just convenience or consideration not convenience sorry, consideration.

If your chief policy making body for gTLD comes to you and says something, which is as we know extremely difficult to even get a letter out of the GNSO if that happens then they should just be considerate and come back if you're going to scream and say why and let us work on it.

Keith Drazek: Yes Jonathan go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, we probably need to wrap this up so I'll try and be brief. For me there's two concerns. There's an issue about what is likely to happen and I mean first of all there's a matter of what's good for us in our stakeholder groups. I think it's good for us to establish this principle.

The second thing is what's good for the GNSO I think it's good for the GNSO if we can get this through in some form or another. We have I think a pretty good sense from the board and he staff that they will accept this principle yet they're going to find it very difficult to accept the proposed remedy at the moment, which is to change the by laws.

So I would hope that we'll get the mandate at the council to support this principle and I expect that we will try and achieve that by a moderated version of what Jeff has proposed and so there will need to be some discretion given to the council to try and get that situation.

The worst outcome would be it either fails at the council level and potentially fail at the board level as well but at the moment the (unintelligible) unlikely to even pass at the council level, which leaves us somewhat it's just not a very strong position from a GNSO and council perspective.

So hopefully we can get something through and then get something that the board finds passable as well.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jonathan, Yoav.

Yoav Keren: Yes I want to (unintelligible) just what you said this is - I totally agree this is important and good for both our constituencies and stakeholders and for the GNSO.

It was very frustrating to see the bypass of the GNSO several times in the past year and I think that hopefully we'll find a way and Jeff this is maybe I think for us and try to do some work before tomorrow maybe try to find a way with the other groups to have - to get it back on the (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Thanks Yoav, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Keith, a suggestion and I think it's good to just have some discussion on the motion that's on the table unless somebody submits an amendment in advance but it seems like it would be very helpful if there was an amendment ready to go to be submitted, a friendly amendment to the motion and would the registrars be willing to submit a friendly amendment?

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Chuck, any response?

Man: I would like to do that yes.

Jaime Wagner: I'm sorry what were the friendly amendments stated I missed that Chuck.

Jonathan Robinson: I can give you an indication Jaime, it would essential encompass the principles, which is that we would expect reference back to the GNSO in the event that all the staff seek to take action that is not consistent with the advice we have provided and to engage in substantive dialogue over that or that without requiring a by law change.
So that's the essence of it I don't have the exact wording in front of me but that's the essence.

(James):   I'm sorry there's probably a queue I'm jumping but if something like that could be clarified to indicate that it wouldn't necessarily be - it would have to require something explicit on the part of the council saying do this or don't do this and not necessarily require the board to check it or board or staff to check actions with you every time. I think everybody's probably thinks that's a sensible idea.

Jeff Neuman: That's what it is (James) even the by laws change is not - doesn't have the expectation that the board checks with us on everything. If council actually does something, which is a big if then they should come back.

It's not even the council's if the GNSO does something then the board should come back to the GNSO.

Keith Drazek: Great, okay thanks Jeff, sorry it sounds like next steps for Jeff you to draft up a potential friendly amendment that could be used and submitted by the registrars provided everybody agrees to the language if necessary, correct next steps?

Jeff Neuman: Yes sir.

Keith Drazek: So next steps you're going to draft the friendly amendment, socialize it with the registrars and have it ready if necessary.

Jeff Neuman: Yes sir.

Man: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you, once your models have been given moving on next item on the agenda, well next item we've decided to put on the agenda is registrar onboarding implementation and we have (Chris Gift) from ICANN is here and is in the room for several of other people have been involved in this, somebody give me a word for this.

Man: Effort.

Michele Neylon: Initiative, okay thank you, initiative that's been ongoing on and off for the last two years or something, over to you (Chris).

(Chris Gift):   Thank you very much this is (Chris Gift) with ICANN staff. Yes please for those who have been involved for the past years don't' be shy and chime in as well.

                  So those of you who are new to AROS if we can go to the first - the next slide please. It stands for automated registrar onboarding system and it is a system that is to simply and unify how registrars are onboarded across the spectrum of registries.

                  So it would be a centralized system, optional for everybody to use so we're not - ICANN is certainly not mandating that people use this system but it is an optional system for registries and registrars to move through accreditation and contracting process amongst each other and then move through to reselling the domain name.

It's goal is really to replace some of the systems that are out there in terms of manual systems that may be out there. It's certainly to automate as much as we can, provide a better user experience but most importantly to provide some scalability within the industry and sector and to ease some of that burden for onboarding for people.

And now this is not just the onboarding and I'll talk to that in just a second but it's also about the contact information that's in the system because we do know that that contact information changes and so if people use AROS if they go in and change then they've onboarded to all the registries using AROS, they only have to change it once and it will automatically populate to all the registries.

So that should greatly simplify contact management going both ways for both entities, all right thank you. So what has gone on before again this is a recap for everyone, there was sort of a - in 2011, which asked whether we should be doing this activity and the overwhelming response was yes I should wonder what the total numbers were.

The survey - another survey was done about whether it should be automated onboarding should be included not just accreditation and that was another yes. We moved forward, included a working group consultative working group some members that are in this room and I'll share the list with members.

And we've been working with them to draft requirements for this system and then we hired some advisors to work on that and (David Conrad) was the representative from JAS to help us with the requirements and we've been moving forward.

So if we can go to the next slide this is the members of the working group. I think we can just - thank you and just move onto the next slide. So some of the requirement highlights against to educate everybody.

Obviously a browser based system, administrative user interface for registries and registrars. There will be an ICANN administrator user interface because we need to populate the system.

Contact information, some click through accreditation for contract acceptance as well as a multi-step process for moving through on the accreditation. Integration with the ICANN CRM or sales force and this is important because the system will be automatically populated.

So we are migrating radar as well as obviously (EGTOB's) are currently on the CRM but we're going to be migrating all of our contact management and relationship management to sales force.

So when somebody an accredited registrar logs into begin the onboarding process with registry a lot of their information will already be there and pre-populated and ready for them to move forward.

Obviously, that's quite all right, document and form we are trying to standardize all the forms so we are working on that right now. We have - we've downloaded as many forms as we can.

I mean there's a great deal of similarity between all the registries and we're trying to come up with a form, which encompasses everything that's out there currently so we'll be showing that to the working group if we haven't already.

And then lastly we will be in the second version we will have API's, (restful) API's so that people can integrate their own relationship management system or whatever operational systems they have into this into AROS.

So they just for instance just want to do the contact management within AROS but not the contracting that can be part of it as well but we still need to have further work on that but that is the intent.

So take the - yes. We did select a vendor to help us implement this system. The vendor selection process is what we did, we did go up on RP however we selected, we pre-selected four vendors.

And some of the reason we did this is we really wanted to be sure we covered three implementation methodologies right, when we were looking at this. One was we looked at whether we should build and design a stand alone system all right, not on sales force but just a completely stand alone system.

That was one option we wanted to pursue. The other was build on top of sales force using one of the vendors that, you know, or one on sales force CRM implementation vendor.

And the last thing is we wanted to investigate whether there was an outfit that had already created similar solution to this and so we investigated. We wanted to see if we could purchase some IT and then create that system and then develop it ourselves.

ICANN develop it from that point on and develop it on our sales force instance and we want to do that for the reasons I had already mentioned previously about having the same data set and so on.

We elected to pursue after looking at the really four RP's we elected to pursue the last option, the third option and those for three very concrete reasons. One was that it offered us the minimum of feature and date risk.

Obviously since they had already done this before they knew and they know the industry, they know the problems and how the onboarding process occurs and the contracting process and accreditation.

So they're very familiar with the problem and so we felt that it really minimized their feature and date risk. Lastly on that second entrust it from an

operational perspective and for you guys as well in terms of using the system having it fully integrated with the CRM was beneficial and lastly it was in the mid-range of cost.

So we thought really all the way around it was a big win for us to go down that path. So where are we know, the last slide thank you. We did sign the contract it was - the contract was approved by the board just last month.

We are rapidly progressing through wire frames, the working group that reviewed the first wire frames on July 2. I think that was a good meeting there were some questions around, you know, some of the data elements and then authorization and then having deal to have sub, you know, subset of TLD's managed by one sub-operator versus another.

I think we're resolving those, we are going to a second review of the wire frames next week July 24. Right now the delivery timeframes are September for phase one and October for phase two and the API and the rest will be in phase two.

Just a quick (unintelligible) between the two phases obviously the first phase is going to be a simpler feature set than the following phase. But the primary distinction aside from having the API is that in phase one we're really moving through with one workflow, all right.

So it may not fit everybody obviously with just one accreditation and contracting workflow. And phase two in the follow on will allow you to manipulate that workflow and have something - well and have alternative workflows for accreditation so we will support that in phase two.

And I think that's the update for AROS and I'm more than happy to answer any questions.

Keith Drazek: Hey (Chris) thanks very much, very helpful. Just a quick question from me and then let's open it up. When you talk about the delivery timelines in phase one and phase two what's the timeline for sort of the initial testing for registrars and registries and the various interaction with the phases?

(Chris Gift):   Well that's a great question a full-fledged system for testing will be in late August, early September. I think how you said that we're developing this very iteratively and I know we're finishing up our first sprint within a few weeks.

I'm hoping that we can actually if people are amenable to this is to have people start looking at the functionality early on. I mean they won't be able to obviously work through a whole accreditation process but you can certainly see subsets of the functionality live.

So my hope is to get that actually even earlier and have people start commenting on that. But the full-fledged system for initial beta testing will be early September.

Keith Drazek: Okay (Chris) thanks very much, Jeff I saw your hand, Jeff I saw your hand, (Roy).

Jeff Neuman: So can I ask also that because you're progressing with wire frames so that's what the working group - that's what the working group is working on so that's shared with everyone.

Just to get some expectations with ICANN and when we raised this it was a voluntary thing for registries and registrars to participate. Is that still the understanding of ICANN that this is all voluntary that it's not going to be mandatory that every registry has to submit everything to ICANN to put into this system and that every registrar, you know, after that?

It's just I want to make sure that its still contemplated that this is all voluntary to make things easier but not mandatory.

(Chris Gift):   Absolutely it is entirely voluntary, there is no discussion or no intent or anything to make it mandatory in any way, shape or form.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks.

Man: We've got a couple of questions from (Romota) I think we should take those first.

Keith Drazek: All right.

(Romota):   (Chris) question, I wonder does the ongoing system take into account hundreds of custom tailored RA's?

(Chris Gift):   That's another great question. The initial version does not contemplate customer version RA's, the phase two does.

(Romota):   How come there was no public RSP for this contract as far as I understand it's worth about $650,000 dollars?

(Chris Gift):   Six hundred fifty and four hundred fifty, well the reason one reason is we really wanted to like I said pursue the three different options in terms of - so we put it out to bid to the four specific vendors.

And the second thing was they had specific knowledge so certainly none of the vendors in particular had a very particular knowledge in terms of IP and intellectual property around this space.

So we were very interested in pursuing them and getting an option from them, which we did and they ended up being the selected vendor. And that's the primary why we went with the selecting the vendors directly.

Keith Drazek: Jordyn Buchanan I think was one, whoever is first though.

Man: Yes just (Chris) just wanted to remind me I'm pretty sure that it in phase one there's no requirement to use the electronic contracting piece right?

(Chris Gift):   That's correct there's no requirement to use electronic contracting in phase one.

Man: Wanted to make sure everybody understood that.

(Chris Gift):   Yes, yes.

Jordyn Buchanan: Hey, Jordyn Buchanan for the record. So I understand this is intended to be voluntary but what I don't understand is how contracting works if you don't use the system.

In particular I don't know anything about like as a registry operator I don't know who my customers are and I don't know whether they're accredit by ICANN.

You have a big list of registrars that have no way to associate identify between that big list and people that are contacting. I guess they could just assert they are registrar X and I could trust them.

You know, especially since a lot of accreditations are to and if presumably they don't use like the email address or anything like that in their day-to-day business.

(Chris Gift):   This is (Chris Gift), so if they're coming through the AROS system...

Mike Zupke: Thanks Jordyn, Mike Zupke so I think basically the question is what's the existing process and will you be able to continue to do that.

Jordyn Buchanan: Well yes I don't think we're using the existing process for the new (utilities) right?

Mike Zupke: Well so the existing process is ICANN would announce when a new registrar is accredited to all registries, we can periodically provide a list of all registrars to registries with their primary contact person.

So it's a pretty manual thing and I think the sales force will probably automate how we make those announcements but, you know, from what we heard from registrars many of them said we would love for this to actually be mandatory.

I think that, you know it's intended to make things easier than this current system, which is pretty labor intensive I think.

Jordyn Buchanan: So that list is what we're using to figure out if a registrar exists or is the people are dealing with I guess is the real question?

((Crosstalk))

Jordyn Buchanan: Pardon?

Man::   You announced ICANN directly.

Jordyn Buchanan: Okay, fair enough if that's the response then thank you.

Mike Zupke: Right and so but we would encourage you to deal with the primary contact person and that's the identity that we will identify to you in the list.

Jordyn Buchanan: Okay great.

Michele Neylon: We have another remote question.

Woman: The question is what does IP have to do with it?

(Chris Gift):   The reason we were interested in intellectual property that again that firm, that vendor had worked in this space and resolved this particular problem in terms of registrar onboarding.

And so we were interested in getting that knowledge but that knowledge had been paid for by another organization so we were very interested though in getting that intellectual property and using that to create a new system for AROS and then moving forward.

Woman: I have a question from the connect. I guess the question would be how the vendors were selected when they're with often a number of consultants being - sorry it's running away from me.

Man::   It's helping registrars with accreditations.

Woman: Thanks.

Man::   Anyways no need to - okay sorry yes, your connect dropped sorry. The question is, the question that's being asked remote is from (Frank Mitchlik) I lost it now as well.

They're asking how the vendors were selected when there were also a number of consultants helping registrars with accreditations?

(Chris Gift):   Consultants helping registrars with - so these are software developers. They're not helping with any accreditation process I'm sorry if I mis-communicated along those lines.

They're, you know, they are software developers who implement software solutions on top of sales force. The vendor that selected and happened to work in this phase previously so they had knowledge about, you know, developing software for solving these kinds of solutions but they don't work with registries or registrars to do any kind of accreditation.

The other vendors were very much the same thing they were consultants that do software development. I hope I understood the question properly.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Matt.

Matt Serlin: Do - sorry this is Matt Serlin, are you going to identify who the vendor is and publish the contract that you executed with them?

(Chris Gift):   Sure if they haven't already been identified and the contract published it should have been done - I'm not sure anyway Solution Street is the vendor.

Matt Serlin: Okay thanks.

Keith Drazek: Go head (Chris).

(Chris Gift):   If there is any interested we could - we can also schedule a Webinar. I know the working group is involved with us but if there is some interest we can schedule a Webinar within a few weeks or in a month and again show progress, demonstrate some of the screens or do anything like that.

                   If there is an interest let me know or let (Karla Velente) know in the registry team.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you, we're running a little bit behind schedule it tends to happen at these wonderful meetings. Officially this meeting was meant to end at 5:00 it is now seven minutes to 5:00 so unless the trademark clearinghouse can do everything they need to do about trademark clearinghouses in five minutes or less and you all field all your questions in minus five minutes or less.

Does anybody have any issue with us extending this meeting slightly to cover this? I don't see people running to the door so I assume they don't have an issue. Okay so...

Keith Drazek: Yes so I guess so (Chris) thank you very much for your time and presenting this to us today, appreciate it. I'm sure that if there are any follow-up questions we know where to reach you so thanks again.

So let's now move to invite our friends from Deloitte and IBM to the table to join us and let's get into the conversation around trademark clearinghouse implementation.

And thank you all for bearing with us as we're running a little bit late, we appreciate it. So I guess an initial question is whether you all have a presentation or whether we're just going to have a dialogue I thought the idea was a dialogue that's perfectly fine with us, thank you.

Man: We have the presentation tomorrow with an update on all of the details so.

Keith Drazek: Excellent, thank you. I think an opportunity for dialogue and Q&A is absolutely the most beneficial and efficient thing for everybody here. So obviously with regard to the new gTLD program trademark clearinghouse and in particular implementation questions both registries and registrars have questions and concerns I think in terms of timing, in terms of next steps.

Just in terms of general interaction around testing and OTNE as we move forward, you know, anticipating the first new gTLD delegations. According to ICANN staff yesterday they projected September 5 with a sunrise notification period for the following 30 days and then in effect the beginning of sunrise October 6.

Now that I understand was their best case scenario, you know, sort of an earliest path towards delegation but that sort of sets the stage for what's going to need to take place over the next two to three months.

So I really appreciate your, you know, coming to spend some time with us and maybe I'll hand it over to you to sort of maybe lay out your thoughts about the coming weeks and months.

Man: Okay so (unintelligible) for IBM, high-level planning is and I will present them tomorrow in detail with the exact dates. It is about we will have a system available for testing for the sunrise August 8, no, no - we'll...

Man: August 9 we...

Man: ...August 9 the system will be available and available for claims one month later being September 9 so in timing of ICANN's schedule or planned schedule.

Man: Sorry just so I got that so August is when you'll have the sunrise and September if when you'll have a claims system.

Man: Correct.

Man: That's a testing environment...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That is the production environment, which will be available at that time and in parallel we will provide (unintelligible) environments and the testing will be a little earlier available by the end of July.

Man: For both or just for sunrise?

Man: No, just for sunrise yes that will rollout consecutively.

Man: So if it's the end of July for testing that doesn't leave much room for (2A) kind of feedback or changes to your system. The reason I say that is, you know, if anyone's in the room on the pre-delegation testing from ICANN there was so many bugs found in that system.

And it was a good system it still is a good system, every good system has bugs and you don't find that out until you actually test with the registry, until you test with the users of that system.

And so my fear is not having it out until the end of July obviously we're almost there anyway but not having it out until the end of July but then planning production towards the beginning of August may - we'll have some challenges.

Man: Yes we'll still have close to two months to correct. I think one and again that's standard in the industry that we used to be in business in we will do a little testing and make sure it is as solid as possible when we release it.

So to avoid (unintelligible) we'll have no (unintelligible) or existing bugs in the system when we released it first time. So our view estimate that we'll have sufficient time it's already longer than what we need for planning.

Man: Okay and then just to confirm and then it used to be that you couldn't join the testing line and actually sign the contract with ICANN. I'm assuming that's no longer the case?

Man: We are in discussion with ICANN having to do with that right now and you need to have a (unintelligible) with ICANN obviously to access the production systems.

We will provide what we call a (unintelligible), which will be up and running by now and some preliminary testing already. For that you don't need ICANN

(unintelligible) but to access the production task and the production systems you obviously do need to have that and (unintelligible).

Man: For the production system, in order to go live you would need the contract but I'm talking about the other testing environment. This is critical because A, first of all registrars won't have any contract with ICANN, a registry agreement will only have terms and conditions and that's not final yet.

And registry operators or sorry back end registry service providers will not have any contract and we're going to be obviously the ones that need to test. You know, this is actually a critical issue and it would be great to after your session tomorrow to just have a discussion with anyone who wants to but with ICANN staff to get this solidified before we leave to make sure that we'll all have access to this testing environment and this is issue number one in terms of launch, this is all in the critical path.

Man: I realize this so I will speak with ICANN anyway on this, this evening. Still I'll see if we have a different position or a more firm position tomorrow we have a meeting at 11:00 and if not we can obviously speak afterwards.

(Adam Kenvokram): Just to make it absolutely clear what is your current understanding so how would it according to you be best organized?

Man: My current understanding from ICANN, which we intend to change is that we couldn't enter any testing environment or we couldn't start testing until we signed - until a front end operator signed a registry agreement, which none of new starts front end registry to sign that agreement but we have 300 plus back end deals.
So it's important that we get in there. Registrars obviously don't sign registry agreements and so they can't get in. My understanding is it's not a well thought out plan and that's why before we leave here we should come up with a definitive plan.

And then the second thing before you respond is that what I asked ICANN for is that we should have an operational document that is developed for registries on who we contact for different customer support issues, what your customer support hours are, what your response times are, what your escalation task is.

All those types of things because what we want to avoid is we need that direction connection with you guys or the person to go through ICANN because it will never work.

And I saw that the statement of work was posted and that gives us some indication of your commitment to ICANN but it doesn't give us the operational stuff that we need and the 24 hour assistance of who do we call for anything?

(Adam Kenvokram): All right, thank you and first of all I'd like to introduce myself. My name is (Adam Kenvokram) I'm the program manager IBM. Just to come back on your last question particular on the service and support hours and how to escalate.

Part of the meeting tomorrow is we are going to explain it to you and we're working closely with ICANN to get on board and have it for all people where all this information will be provided and so you know where to call, how to call, what you can expect from one and each other.

And hopefully you (unintelligible) popping up either ICANN and IBM and (unintelligible) Deloitte in this case. And so who do you call for what purpose and so we're working there right now and we will provide that information to you.

Man: Okay, thank you very much. I'm going to make a suggestion and certainly open it up to, you know, other comments and other thoughts but I'm thinking that it might make sense for the registries and the registrars to form sort of a

joint working group that would then potentially interface directly with IBM in terms of dealing with operational and technical and sort of interface concerns.

Particularly as we get into this testing phase and sort of, you know, you get into getting people signed up and integrated. So I'm just going to throw that out there as an idea and maybe it's even a regular meeting that takes place once a week or more often if necessary, Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes that's actually a - and thank you for mentioning it. The group that was set up, this right protection group from the registry in discussions with ICANN staff that is one thing we specifically requested is that there is a weekly or a bi-weekly call for, you know, basically any registry, registrar to discuss issues with you, issues on the testing, issues with production.

And to just get an update directly with the provider, obviously ICANN could be on, you know, but the direction communication is vital for us and, you know.

(Steve):   Yes so this is (Steve) let me just jump in. I think one of the benefits to you as the provider is that if we on the, you know, the customer side if you will have the opportunity to share our own experiences and concerns and questions we can consolidate lists of questions and concerns instead of you having to do one off conversations it's more of a coordinated effort.

So I'm hoping that that's something that we can pull together.

(Adam Kenvokram):   Yes, no I full agree at this stage I can only see benefits and I hope I won't live to regret it later but so that's the way that we're looking at it right now it's something I would welcome and gladly facilitate.

Man: Well do we have to set this up for the front end too for the API interface I don't know if you're aware of it I hope you're aware of it. Quite a number of the - I mean we have a lot of participants during the weeks if you can give

some feedback on whether or not that works then we can settle up in the same way, so.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Man: From what I - sorry from what I understand about it we should pursue the Webinars right?

(Adam Kenvokram):   No people are able to pose their questions in the (unintelligible) of those Webinars and well Webinars they were actually conference calls. And so during those conference calls we have left all of those questions for the parties that want to participate.

And we always have foreseen some extra time for that interaction and I think additional questions. But I mean that's just an example of how it could work if you want to see it differently I think what I suggest is that you do a suggestion on how you see this happening practically.

Man: Yes I see more kind of an interative bi-weekly call not anything formal, not like a formal presentation. There may be questions in advance but there may not be. It's just kind of a let's get together and talk about what happened the last couple of days in the testing environment or things like that.

Not anything that formal in structure is my idea.

(Adam Kenvokram):   No it's good and I'm sure it will find a way to accommodate we have Webinar (unintelligible) but I can also understand and see the value of having something that's more open, free format in a bi-directional direction so we'll pursue it.

Keith Drazek: Okay, excellent thank you very much, thank you we look forward to that. Jonathan I think I saw your hand up.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Keith I sense a very receptive approach from you, which is great. I just want to make 100% sure that the point Jeff made earlier was clear. You've got three parties, right the operator, the registries, the technical back end providers of registry services and the registrars.

There's latitude while they may ultimately have contracts but maybe they weren't. The registry back end providers will not have contracts with you and so both of them and the registrars (unintelligible) terms and conditions will not have contracts with you but both will reasonably need access to a test environment.

So that's the discussion you could have with ICANN is opening up that test environment to those parties without a contract because they need to get access to that to development work, thanks.

Man: Okay, understood.

Keith Drazek: Okay I don't see any other hands so let's ask for questions, comments and while we're doing that I should also just note - thank Jonathan for helping to coordinate this session with you all, appreciate, you know, his efforts to bring us all together in this setting and again certainly appreciate your participation.

Any other questions or comments? Yes Matt go ahead.

Matt Serlin: Sorry I didn't know maybe I missed it did we talk about the (plus 50) the status of the timing on that?

Man: I don't think we brought it up I don't remember it either so I will bring it up then.

Matt Serlin: And I wonder if you could just give us an update on where that is in the process that's obviously critical for us to know?

(Adam Kenvokram):   We actually have a meeting with ICANN to discuss that after this meeting and so it's still not final at this moment. We're still trying to find out how much forward we can IBM can push this on our behalf.

Matt Serlin: Okay so sorry I'm not going to let you off the hook that easily. Do we think we're going to have some resolution on that while we're here next week, next month I mean any kind of sense?

Man: Sorry (Vicki) thanks though.

(Vicki):   All right, sorry. So tomorrow in the session trademark clearinghouse we're going to describe totally how it's going to work, what information you need to provide, ask for project plans and business model.

We hope to finalize that at the end of the week maybe tonight even that we can actually provide information tomorrow as well but we're definitely looking in days (unintelligible) and we expect to get all requirements in as a (unintelligible) business implementation there we need some time (unintelligible).

So I know it's not fully what you want to hear but we'll try to make it work tomorrow in the session.

Matt Serlin: Okay so then hypothetically let's say you get everything signed off on by ICANN on - by Friday. When will you be able to say that it's implemented on your end?

(Vicki):   So it will definitely need to be implemented before the first sun - before the first claims notification.

Matt Serlin: Yes we all know that.

(Vicki): I know Matt again we'll see if we can get more information but we just have one discussion that we need to do with ICANN later on this evening so...

Matt Serlin: Right but I'm saying once ICANN green lights you are you days, months, weeks, months what I mean give me some sense of other than before the first claims?

Man: It's going to be months.

Matt Serlin: I'm sorry would you - could...

((Crosstalk))

Matt Serlin: ...can you say that one more time because seriously the acoustics in this room are horrible did you say it is going to be months?

Man: Yes that's what my expectation is yes.

Man: It will be in probably be in advance of claims yes but it's not going to be somewhere in summertime so.

(Adam Kenvokram): So very concretely it's not going to be in August, it's going to be difficult to reach before the middle of September and we're trying to push as hard as we can to get in that timeframe.

We know that it cannot be a week before claim starts, we know it cannot be two weeks or three weeks before claim starts. The exact date we still need to (unintelligible).

With everything that has been pushed to us with how late the level of detail came that was required it was impossible for us to land this in August, that was just impossible.

Jonathan Robinson: Just out of curiosity who was the delay, where did this delay come from?

Man: I think we are all guilty as charged and everyone had a say in it.

(Vicki):   But if I could just add on the (unintelligible) labels it is important to note that it has to be a verified trademark before you can add any new (unintelligible) cases or any labels and we also need some time to adjust our API as well because it has an impact as well for our agents in working with the API. So there is some more stuff to do and it has an impact on the billing interface, it has an impact on the user interface, it has an impact on the validation interface, it has an impact on the database and it has an impact on the API.

                So it's just not something simple to do.

Matt Serlin: Yes, no sorry just to be clear I mean I fully appreciate that I'm just trying to illustrate that we've got parallel paths of things launching, you know, and people not really being clear that it's not fully launching, right.

                So it's - so I get that there's work to be done I get that it, you know, you've got to change systems and things like that but I'm just sensitive to the fact that everyone's, you know, announcing plans to launch their gTLD's when in reality the full implementation of the clearinghouse will not be part of that, that's all.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Matt, Jeff I saw your hand.

Jeff Neuman: Yes and we appreciate, you know, the work that they - on your side and I just this has been known since April, it's not your fault. It's been known since April that's when the decision was made to do this.

                We're at the end of July if I mean when IP owners find out that this functionality is not going to be in production until mid, you know, a week or two before or a few weeks before the first one goes into claims they're going to go ballistic.

Man: So Jeff, you know, and again I'll echo, you know, Jeff and Matt in saying, you know, we understand as, you know, businesses who operate systems we understand the implications for changes.

Particularly in, you know, mission critical. Systems but I think the frustration that you're hearing is that we, you know, even today there's been a or this week there's been a communication about particular dates that if the systems are going to be fully operational and in place puts those dates already at risk.

So I think the frustration that you're hearing is that there's maybe a lack of coordination of messaging and in other places. So, anyway we appreciate your candor.

Man: Yes I think it's not - you're going to be talking to a couple - I don't think necessarily (unintelligible) the other at risk at this stage but they're going to be talking (unintelligible).

Man: Okay Jonathan and then let's call for final questions and comments.

Jonathan Robinson: Super brief it's just a comment that (Vicki) made that I'm not sure if it was absorbed by everyone that regardless of the timing of this (unintelligible) it can only be built on a successfully validated trademark record, right?

So I hope everyone's got that we can't add those sub-records if you like for ICANN to sub records.

Man: Okay thanks Jonathan, any final questions, comments, any final comments from our guests?

(Adam Kenvokram):   I think the only thing I think I can add to the last point that is we understand his concern we are also annoyed with it. I mean I would have really wanted at this moment to tell you the exact date and we really are

doing our best to release that as soon as possible and yes we understand the reality of all of this so, okay.

Man: Well thank you very much for joining us we really appreciate your time we'll obviously participate in the session tomorrow and maybe if there are follow-up questions we can set up a follow-up session and then look forward to the ongoing, you know, dialogue through the working group teams, thank you.

Man: Okay are there any other matters that anybody wants to raise at this time or shall we adjourn this meeting? Okay I think we'll be adjourning, registrars there has been one nominee in one second for the NomCom if anybody else would like to throw their hat into the ring please do so.

If not we will look forward to having an interesting NomCom appointee for this year, thank you everybody.

Man: Thank you.

END