ICANN Transcription
GNSO Sunday Session
GDD Update
Sunday, 6 March 2016

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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/group-activities/calendar

James Bladel: Okay, good morning. If we could get some indication from the - thank you, Marika. Good morning. All right happy second day or third day or however long you've been here. So good morning. If we could get some indication from the staff that we are ready to go with the - there we go, thank you for the green light.

So our first agenda item for Sunday is an update from GDD staff. And our special guests are Akram and Cyrus.

Akram Atallah: And team.

James Bladel: And team. Sorry. And I know there were a couple of - I see Mike and Caitlin and some others. And Krista, fantastic. So you had some slides or we can just dive right in. One second according to Lars.

Akram Atallah: So while you queue that up just wanted to say good morning. Thank you as always for the opportunity to spend time with the Council today. We have a number of updates we wanted to provide you. I think the Council had asked

for an update on the status of the RDAP profile implementation so we'll go through that hopefully quickly.

There's a dedicated session on this tomorrow at 1:30 to which I invite all of you to come where we'll have more time to spend on discussing the details of what we think we should be doing and what feedback we need from the community.

Then to provide you an update on what's in the pipeline in terms of policy implementation, you see that on the screen, thick Whois, IGO INGO, IRTP-C and D and then translation and transliteration. Karen is going to provide you with a brief update on that new gTLD program reviews. And then we were hoping to actually have now been discussion, frank discussion on how we can keep improving the process and the communication going forward.

So if there are no questions I am going to hand it over to Francisco to walk you through what's going on in the world of RDAP. Thanks.

Francisco Arias: Hello everyone. This is Francisco Arias from ICANN staff. So this is a brief update on the status of RDAP. Can we go to the next slide please. So very quickly like he said, replacing the Whois protocol. And this started in 2011 with a report by SSAC recommending the board to replace the Whois protocol. And this was adopted by the board. Then the community work started within the IETF to develop this new protocol in 2012 and finalized in 2015 when the RFCs were published.

In the meantime we have to contract provisions in some of the legacy gTLDs, the new TLD agreement and the 2013 RAA. In order to implement the RDAP protocol we saw the need to have what we call a profile that will map the contractor and policy requirements related to Whois or RDDS, as the agreements call it, the registration data directory services.

And map that to RDAP features. So we create the first - draft the profile and shared with the community in September last year and then produce an updated draft in the input received that's currently in public comment that ends 18 March. So the week after Marrakesh.

Next slide please. It is sorry. My bad. So very quickly, the features that RDAP has - RDAP you can think of it as a menu. It has several features but you don't necessarily have to have them on, is up to the implementer, the registry, the registrar or whoever defines the policy for a given registry to set which things you turn on or turn off, that's one of the other reasons why we need the profile to tell the contracted parties which features they need to turn on.

This is the set of features, as you can see, you can have (unintelligible) query response (unintelligible) something you didn't have been Whois, secure access to data. You have a mechanics to find the servers. You don't need to know what server to query, you just put the name you want to know the information and it will give you that information. It has the mechanics to offer redirection of the data. This is for example, in the case of the (team) registrations you get information from the registry and the registry provides you a link they can be followed to get the information from the registrar.

And it has also support for internationalization so you can have for example contact data in Chinese or Arabic or other scripts. And it has also support for differentiated access. That has been one of the topics that have got the most attention from the community. And there are few others more that I'm not going to get into that you can see in the slide.

Next slide please. Now getting to the core of the issues, we have a couple of issues that we still have open in the discussion in the - from the public forum and the (unintelligible) tech mailing list. There has been a good number of comments from the community on this topic. The one that has got the most attention is differentiated access.

We have a number of parties that have requested that. The profile requires registries and registrars to do differentiated access from start. That is a must thing to do. Unfortunately only three gTLDs have that feature in their contract, that provision that allows them to offer differentiated access. Differentiated access in case it's not clear immediately means the ability to provide a different subset of the fields in the RDDS output depending on who is asking.

So for example the thing that most people seem to want is to have, excuse me, only a limited set of fields shown if you are querying and you are not authenticated. For example let's say (unintelligible) data, if you are unauthenticated. But if you are authenticated and you probably will get all of it. But, we have said that's likely a policy matter to decide who gets to see what.

So we are refraining from comment or we don't think we should include that in the profile. We should not define who should get access to what. And what we did in the profile is weaker language that says that a contracted party can do differentiated access if their contracts or a policy allows them to do so. Like I said, there are only three gTLDs that have that feature, that provision in the contracts. They'll get a name.

I should like to mention that there is in the (unintelligible) comment from IPC in the opposite direction to what all others were asking and saying they were -- saying we should not include at this moment a requirement for differentiated access for all gTLDs. There was - and it's premature to do that since there is ongoing work. And that is of course the RDS, registration data - registration directory services PDP, that is ongoing. And that's PDP has clearly in scope the matter of whether there should be differentiated access or not.

Next slide please. So our current thinking is that, and this is of course subject to discussion and as I just mentioned, we have a session tomorrow at 1:30 where we intend to go into detail into this topic and get input from the community.

So our current thinking is that those that are interested in having differentiated access turned on for gTLDs, probably the best venue they have is the RDS PDP. And some people have already signed up to participate in that discussion.

In the meantime we think we should move on with the implementation of RDAP even though there are other benefits that RDAP provides, leaving aside differentiated access. And also taking into consideration that the RDS PDP is likely going to take some time before it's finalized. We don't even know if there would be consensus on it, I mean, for example differentiated access. We think, and of course you can tell me if we got this wrong, but we are thinking that probably a timeline for implementing a potential RDS PDP is in a matter of years.

So, oh, I should also mention that in the meantime registries have the option to pursue the proper existing procedures in their contracts to pursue an amendment to their agreement so they can like (unintelligible) a name get a change to their agreement that allows them to do differentiated access if they were interested to do so.

Next slide please. Another - there are two other issues that have come up in the discussion that are interrelated. On one side we have the registries that have questioned interpretation that the thick Whois policy recommendation requires them to include four fields that they currently are not showing in their RDS output. The four fields are listed there. They think that that's beyond what the policy recommendation requires them to do.

And this also will require them to implement (EBB) extensions. Instead of saying we don't need to include these four new fields in our thick Whois output. On the other hand, next slide please, we in the profile we were considering that all the fields that are currently shown in Whois be registry or registrar, are going to be more to the - to the registry side.

So thinking on that we were already considering in the gTLD profile that given that all the information was going to be shown in the registry side then we were agreeing to say that the registrars then don't need to have an RDAP service given that all the information was going to be shown in the registry side.

However, we have received comments from some registrars that they think that they should not do RDAP. So here we have a decision to make. We can do - we can do one or the other. We can either agree with one side be for example that registries don't need to include these fields in their output. Or we can agree to the other side and so that registrars don't need to provide that RDAP service. But we probably cannot do both because otherwise those four fields that I mentioned before will not be any more accessible to RDS users.

Next slide please.

James Bladel: Francisco. We have a queue forming or at least I have one. Is this is a good point to stop and take some questions or would you - are we in between topics or - can you let me know when it's a good point to address them in the queue?

Francisco Arias: I think I'm almost...

Akram Atallah: One more slide.

James Bladel: One more slide okay, thank you.

Francisco Arias: Just talking about the options that I mention is - and these are, like I said, open questions that we intend to have an open discussion tomorrow in the 1:30 session is should registries offer RDAP or should the registries show the four fields and we would like to get input from the community on these topics.

And I believe that was the last slide. But so I think this is a good time for questions. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Francisco. And apologize for jum1ping the gun by one slide. But I just saw some hands going up. So I have a queue. First is Volker and then Rubens. And I would just - and then Jen. And then I would ask please state your name for the transcript. We got a little bit sloppy about stating our names last session yesterday so thanks. Volker, you're up.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, James. Volker Greimann stating his name for the transcript. Yes, the RrSG is very critical of this implementation requirement as we believe it serves no purpose whatsoever. If anything we will be forced to implement something that will be needless once thick Whois comes into play which we expect will be less than a year after this would have to be implemented. It serves no additional benefit for the community yet would result in significant costs to the registrar community which would have to be passed on to registrants - rising domain prices which is probably not desirable for the community.

In the last slide you - if you could go back - you wrote that some registrars commented that this would not be a good idea. I would like to clarify this statement by the Registrar Stakeholder Group - not comment by some registrars, it's a comment by the Registrars. There may be some outliers but in general stakeholder group comments should be taken as the Registrars commenting, not some registrars commenting.

James Bladel: Thank you, Volker. Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, Registry Stakeholder Group. I would like to comment both on RDAP and thick Whois. But first on thick Whois, one of the issues we have with this provision that is actually smuggling changes to the contract through policy development. So thick Whois had nothing to do with making Whois output between registries and registrars equal. And being consistent is not -

does not translate to being equal. You can consistently wear clothes but you don't wear tuxedos to go to a sauna. So registries and registrars perform different roles.

So it's to be expected that we have different outputs and different information. So trying to make everything equal is just some kind of obsessive compulsive disorder of making all things look the same. But they are not the same. And they should - even be consistent. We should apply Postel principle here and be liberal in what we accept. We also must try to follow standards and so forth. That's why we are talking to RDAP. So let's move into RDAP.

The operational profile is ICANN simply dictating unilaterally what it wants. It's not technical development and is not contract negotiation. So RDAP profile should belong in either of those two venues on your choice. It should be either be done IETF as protocol development, as registration development, which is actually taking place for many registry extensions including RDAP.

Or it could be done by contract negotiation. So what's currently being tried is unilaterally establishing a profile which is something not foreseen in the agreements. And we strongly object to that.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rubens. Response Francisco?

Francisco Arias: Yes. Thank you, Rubens. So and on the last topic you mentioned on this - the way we see the profile is it lives in a strange place. It's an area between relating to legal provisions but also is related to technical issues. So for that matter we thought that the idea was not the right place, the idea was about technical issues. And as you know, and I think you mentioned there are some EPP - some sorry RDAP (unintelligible) extensions also, that are related to these (unintelligible) RDAP and the (unintelligible). And both are being discussed in the IETF. That's the - probably the right place to do that. And we agree with that.

But the profile it's not an RDAP extension, it's just mapping the features from the protocol to the contract and policy requirements. So in that sense it's probably within ICANN where it lives - where it finds the better place to be discussed by the contracted parties and the other interested parties in the ICANN community to define what it should be. That's the reason why we did consider making this an interim (unintelligible) but decided that that was not the right place to discuss it. Thank you.

James Bladel: Rubens, for a follow up/

Rubens Kuhl: That's a choice that ICANN made. We are comfortable with you making the choice of not going to IETF. But then if you're not going there you need to bring those changes through registry amendment procedures, not through unilaterally dictating terms. We have already welcomed many changes to the agreement that will soon be posted for public comment in the first round of registrar amendment negotiations. Those other negotiations can be brought to the table at any time ICANN wants. ICANN may trigger registrar (unintelligible) procedure so if you prefer doing that we welcome that as well. Just don't try a third way that does not exist. Pick one and follow it. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Rubens and Francisco, quick response and then we'll go to Jen.

Francisco Arias: Yeah, very quickly. So just want to clarify a couple things. The registry and the 2015 RA agreement already contains provisions that require implementation on RDAP. And for what it's worth the profile is not something that ICANN staff is putting unilaterally in term of the contracted parties. As you know, we have been discussing this with you, the community, for several months and we would like to get to something that it's - makes sense to everyone here. That's why we're discussing these topics. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Francisco. Jen.

Jennifer Standiford: Thanks, James. Jennifer Standiford for the record. Just a quick question on how you foresee the RDAP and the thick Whois initiatives working in parallel. For instance, do you see the RDAP reaching end of life once thick Whois is implemented? Or how do the two - how do you see the two working in parallel with one another?

Francisco Arias: Yeah, so the - they have a similar timeline, that's why we are considering this two initiatives to get bundled. So we are trying to make the life of you, the contracted parties, easier so that you implement at one time two things that have the same timeline as opposed to give you the requirements you implement, say, thick Whois now and three months later give you the requirement to implement RDAP. We're trying - that it will be - make your life easier if we tell you let's make these two things go together to implement RDAP and thick Whois at the same time and they have a common time to implement. Does that make sense?

Jennifer Standiford: My only comment to that is I don't believe it makes our life any easier. I'm still looking for an answer, more clarification on that - lines regarding - because there seems to be that there's some requirements that are coming to light within RDAP that would conflict or contradict to those that are existing in the thick Whois initiative today. But we could take that up.

James Bladel: Akram wanted to respond, Jennifer.

Jennifer Standiford: Thank you.

Akram Atallah: Thank you. Look, the requirements are very clear, they're not our requirements, they're your requirements. The contracts say that we have to implement thick Whois. There is a policy on thick Whois. And the contracts say that we have to implement RDAP. So it's not a choice that we have to pick and choose which one goes where and first or, you know, we have to implement both of them. And we're going forward with that.

I think that it's important also to look at the benefits of implementing both of these. We know that there are policies that are coming up from different countries and different areas that are maybe in the future going to prohibit us from - prohibit a registrar from moving data from one country to another. In that case having thick Whois will not solve our problems, RDAP would. So having both I think is a good long term thinking to have the flexibility as laws are being developed on privacy and protection of data. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Akram. I put myself in the queue because I wanted to comment on this from a registrar perspective so I just wanted to be clear on that. And just to echo, I think statements that were made by Volker and Jen and then also from Rubens.

This is the topic that when I go back and explain to folks internally about what we need to do coming out of ICANN where they start to giggle at me a little bit. Okay, because we're asking us to take on a very significant development and potentially costly development project that is effectively end of life very shortly after it's deployed for registrars.

I mean, I understand what you're - and I take your point about registries having a different challenge. But for registrars in particularly we're going to put this out and the clock is ticking on how long it's obsolete as soon as we develop it. And it's not an insignificant development test so that's why you're getting this - why it's obsolete?

My understanding is because the registrar component of RDAP diminishes significantly once all the thin Whois registries and TLDs transition to thick. And there are no more thin TLDs. When thin TLDs go away the registrar obligations for RDAP also go away.

So I think that's the concern. It's not a question of a material criticism of RDAP the protocol, it's more of a timing function is that maybe RDAP was too

late or maybe thick Whois was too early. But it seems like they're not lining up very well to the point where we're going to undertake this very significant development project for something that's dead on arrival.

Francisco Arias: Thank you, James, for saying this because I was not aware that actually the obligations for the registrars on RDAP were going to go away. So that's news to me. Okay thanks.

James Bladel: They will. I mean, my understanding is that we will be then at that point an interactive Whois-only obligation. So and then the second point - and then, yeah, Francisco, definitely. And then the second point I think to Rubens's comment or his concern, is I think just ICANN generally and the Council and PDPs should be very wary about commitments in contracts to adopt work that isn't complete yet, that is going on in other groups like the IETF.

So saying, you know, signing a contract that says when the IETF comes out with some successor protocol we will implement it, sight unseen. I think that's, you know, I think we dropped the ball there. I think that all of us, you know, operations, policy, you know, everybody in the room probably - I want to say were asleep at the switch a little bit there or maybe kicked the can to someone else and we're not happy with what they kicked back to us. And - or we're not happy with exactly the terms of how it came back to us.

And I think that's something maybe a lesson learned for the future is how we, you know, I think - I was on the 2013 RAA, we didn't really argue about this particular point and yet it's coming back to bite us in a big way and I think that that's just a mistake, an oversight on our part during that process. And I would warn or caution against doing anything like that in the future where we agree to some work output from a different group without seeing it. So let's just - I think that's what Rubens what getting at is kind of agreeing in advance to something that you haven't seen.

And then, Francisco, you wanted...

Francisco Arias: Yes, just very quickly on the issue - I get your point, James, on the - what Jennifer and Volker said before. You guys - the registrars are saying what make me do RDAP if later once we move all the registered thick Whois, we don't need to have RDAP for this. The issue we are seeing is on the other side you have the registries that are saying don't make me take all these other fields that will complete the thick Whois picture.

So we can do one or the other, we cannot do both. I don't know if that makes sense. We agreed to the registries they should not take those extra fields, then you guys need to show them because otherwise the users will not get to see them. So we have to decide one way or another but we cannot do both.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Francisco. And then we could just back to the queue. David, you're next.

David Cake: Okay so I just wanted to say I'm part of the leadership team on the next generation RDS working group. And I want to phrase this very carefully because I don't want to anger Chuck.

The - I think there is a reasonably high - while that is an enormous monster, like a very substantial bit of policy work, and it will be a long time before we are completed, I think there is a relatively high possibility - high probability that we will move relatively early in that process whether or not we are likely to recommend differentiated access.

I'm not - you know, I'm not promising anything, I'm just saying probabilities. So I thought I'd pass that feedback. That is likely to be one of the decisions that we consider I think early and have - and I say likely so it may be that even though that is an enormous process we will have some idea whether that is something that is going to be a recommendation fairly - I mean, and nothing is over until it's over but just wanted to pass that on that even though

this is an enormous process it may be that you will have a strong intimations earlier on about whether on that specific point. So just passing that on.

James Bladel: Thank you, David. Cyrus, you wanted to respond?

Cyrus Namazi: Yeah, thank you James. Yes, I just wanted us to take a step back perhaps and just look at the picture from a bit of a distance so look at the whole picture and ask the question of who among us is really empowered to make these calls when we have contractual obligations, when we have policies so of brought forward by the community, adopted by the board.

If the community wants to see it done differently then it needs to come from the community. If the Council has, you know, opinions on this then sort of put it forward as more of a formal communication. Don't put us in the position of sort of deciding what needs to be done. We're not empowered to do that from the staff side. It's not the right thing for us to do.

James Bladel: So I guess the question would be - and I don't know that - I don't want to presume that this something that we want to take up either as a Council or maybe individual stakeholder groups. But what would you - what would be acceptable to the GDD in terms of a communication? I mean, obviously another PDP? But short of that, I mean, is there - because I believe the implementation and the timeframes for implementation when these things go into enforcement in fact those are staff decisions, correct?

Cyrus Namazi: On RDAP it's not - there's a certain number of days specified in the contract, 135 days I believe it is from IETF publishing.

Akram Atallah: It seems that maybe we need to have at least a consensus from the GNSO that says, you know, this is our recommendation to move forward. And if we can maybe put it for public comment so that we get the entire community's opinion it. And if there is no issue that I think we're fine so.

James Bladel: Any - I see Volker's in the queue and Rubens. And I guess I'd be interested in hearing from non-contracted councilors. Susan, fantastic. Susan, you get to go first. Because, I mean, obviously we clearly laid out a couple of registry and registrar concerns about the implementation schedule for RDAP. And wondering if those are unique to contracted parties or if there are other concerns outside of that.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I do apologize in the fact that I didn't get the issue prior to this - to your presentation. And I do follow this pretty closely so I wasn't quite grasping that there was sort of an either or going on. And I'm not sure I can comment. And by the way, Susan Kawaguchi from the BC. But I can - in the discussion today I can underrated the registrars' pain in implementing something that may go away. But we've been working on thick Whois forever.

It's been a discussion and so why aren't we implementing thick Whois with these four additional fields because all four of those fields are very critical in the Whois record. And there would be no reason - I just - I'm not getting the technical reason that those would not be included. So we need one central source, especially for dotCom, for the Whois record for the registration data record.

So to me it's sort of a slam dunk that the registries should be responsible for showing that information including all the four fields you listed. Can't really get into the debate on whether we should do - the registrars should do RDAP or not, but I do understand, you know, in listening today why that is a heartburn for them. Can we just move forward with thick Whois and just get that implemented and not have to deal with the registrars and RDAP?

James Bladel: Francisco, response?

Francisco Arias: Well very quickly I - there are some arguments the registries have put forward. I don't recall exactly why they were arguing against adding the four fields. I think perhaps tomorrow when we will have more time during the

session we could have the arguments on the table. Hopefully on the registry side they can explain why they think this would be complicated for them to do.

James Bladel: Thanks, Francisco. I note that we're running behind schedule and we have other topics to cover and I know other folks want to ask questions on some of those other topics. But, Volker and Jen and Rubens, I note that you've already kind of raised your concerns. Is there something new that you'd like to raise now? And if so can you do it extremely quickly? Okay, Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yeah just briefly, I mean, we had a public comment, to Cyrus's comment, and we have commented on that. But that's beside the point. I think this suggestion that Susan made is very sensible. And that's something that we've been looking for all along. We just do not want to implement something that goes away half a year later or a year later, that makes absolutely no economic sense. And we would not be able to justify that at home or to our constituencies in any way.

James Bladel: Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: I'm just raising a suggestion from Jeff Neuman in the chat. He suggested that we discuss the issue number two here which is on the screen, whether registries should offer the (unintelligible) during the GDD summit where both registries and registrars will be there and we will be - that will - that length of time to discuss this. So just to raise Jeff Neuman's issue.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rubens. That's sensible - and thank you, Jeff. Very good. Okay thanks. All right. Thank you for indulging us on that point. Oh, Susan. Yes?

Susan Kawaguchi: Just respond to Jeff Neuman's comment. This is not just a registry and a registrar issue. This is an Internet user/consumer issue that Whois is complete and from one source. So I don't - I'm a little bit - if that was the

suggestion to make a decision about this without the full community, if I'm understanding that correctly, I don't agree with that.

James Bladel: So I may be wrong, Susan, I didn't take it as it would be exclusively a discussion for the GDD summit, just that it would be on the agenda.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: And we have a session tomorrow. I think this is also on our docket for Wednesday. So if we can - okay if we can please let's move on. I think we have some other slides from GDD and we're behind time so if you would continue please. Thanks.

Fabien Betremieux: Hello everyone. Fabien Betremieux. GDD staff. So on the thick Whois policy implementation here just a quick background on the expectation from the policy recommendation we've identified two expected outcomes, transition from the thin to thick for dotCom, dotName and dotJobs and consistent labeling and display for all gTLDs per Spec 3 of the RAA 2013. So those are the outcome expected from the policy recommendation.

So status on each of these, consistent labeling and display, we've published a draft consensus policy language document for public comments. That was in December. And the forum will run until next - the end of next week - sorry, in two weeks actually. In terms of what we proposed that's a phased implementation.

There is one phase with low impact changes such as reordering of fields from adding of data. And there is a second phase with more substantial changes and those are what Francisco discussed before, the registrar registration expiration date (unintelligible) contact and reseller information. And we've also proposed that as was discussed if the implementation is synchronized with the RDAP (approach) and profile.

Currently, the assumption is that the policy effective date for both phases would be August 2017. Regarding the second outcome, transition from the thin to thick, following the release of the legal review memo, that was Recommendation Number 3 of the policy recommendation, the IRT and staff have been discussing implementation details and we're currently exploring an implementation path which would have two tracks which would run in parallel, the transition of new registrations and the transition of existing registrations.

And so in the context of that discussion, the IRT will engage the (unintelligible) group on Tuesday with a view to conducting a data analysis on existing registration to inform the definition of the implementation plan. That completes the status of the policy implementation. And let me just add a reminder that we will have the IRT meeting - the thick Whois IRT meeting today at 12:00 in the Orangeraie room.

Next slide please.

Caitlin Tubergen: Hello everyone, Caitlin Tubergen from GDD for the transcript. For the privacy proxy accreditation implementation, as you know the GNSO adopted this. The recommendations are out for public comment which are due March 16. And they'll be up for board consideration most likely in May.

Staff has been meeting internally to discuss an implementation plan that they would share with the implementation review team in July - most likely in July and would also recruit the implementation review team in July. And I'd also like to note that the 2013 RAA does have an interim specification for privacy and proxy registrations. That specification expires on January 1 of 2017. And when the implementation project plan is shared staff will propose to extend that temporary specification to the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Next slide please.

Fabien Betremieux: Back to me? Regarding the IGO INGO identifiers protection policy, the recommendations were adopted in April 2014. They were adopted in part because, as you may recall, there were recommendations considered - consistent with GAC advice and some other recommendation not consistent with GAC advice.

So currently the policy implementation is dealing with the recommendations that were adopted by the board and that were consistent with GAC advice. And that means the implementation of protection at the top and second level for those identifiers that are listed here I'm not going to go in details but if you want more information please find me and I'll provide them. So that's just part of the scope of this full policy.

In terms of current status, we started discussing draft consensus policy language with the IRT. And we are iterating on that. While we will now be focusing specifically on some prerequisite to the - for the implementation and that's, for instance, building the list - the authoritative lists of DNS labels that will be eventually protected. As you may recall the policy made recommendation on identifiers so those are common names. But in order to protect them in the DNS we need to define DNS label so that's a big piece of our work.

And in particular we have challenges in that area in relation to the languages that are protected for those identifiers as well as some contact data that we need from INGOs in order to implement the claims protections. In terms of policy effective date, we're currently looking at August 2017 as well.

Caitlin Tubergen: Next slide please. For the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy part C, again this deals with the creation of a change of registrant policy. And also some updates to the form of authorization, or the FOA rules. These changes were announced in September of last year and will become effective on August 1 of this year.

I did want to note that there will be a registrar led round table workshop this Thursday from eight o'clock to 9:15 in the Rosearaie room.

For IRTP Part D these recommendations deal primarily with updates to the transfer dispute resolution policy, namely the statute of limitations to file a transfer complaint would be extended from 6 months to 12 months. And also the registry level is being eliminated. So if a registrar went to file a transfer dispute it would do so with an approved transfer dispute resolution provider. And those changes would also become effective on August 1 of this year.

Next slide please.

James Bladel: Yeah, Karen.

Karen Lentz: This is Karen Lentz. I wanted to add in - under the heading of policy implementation updates, and I apologize that the slide didn't get in there. But it's on the translation and transliteration policy recommendations. The status of that is we have the call for volunteers for the IRT teed up ready to go pretty much after this meeting.

There was an expert report on internationalized registration data that the board is considering at this meeting. And we expect that the direction will be to take into account those recommendations, you know, as much is feasible in consistency with the policy recommendations as we work with the IRT to implement the translation and transliteration recommendations. So that's the status on that one. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. Are we ready to move to the next topic here? I don't see a queue. Continue. Was that the last slide?

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay.

Karen Lentz: Okay so moving topics then. That there's an update on the new gTLD program review processes which was the previous heading slide. So just to highlight a couple of things that are new since the previous update. In terms of activities, kind of a big milestone is we have convened the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice review team in December, and that team has kicked off its work starting in January.

So there has been a lot of work leading up to that and kicking that review process off. I think you have an update later on on your agenda on that so I won't go into too much.

Also you may recall there was a program implementation review report published last year that was meant to be an input to the CCT review team. We concluded the public comment period on that report and published the updated version.

We also completed the comment period on the - what we call CDAR which is continuous data driven analysis of root server system stability. That comment period was on the study methodology. And that comment period concluded. The study is now in progress in terms of the data collection and analysis. Next slide.

The timeline I don't think has changed in any respect since what we've previously published. We are - the - I don't know if you can see the colors very well but the top set of lines in blue are all things that are designed as inputs to the CCT review team.

So we are gearing up currently to do the second iteration of the global consumer survey and the economic study that were done last year. We also are about to publish a paper relating to the safeguards that were built into the program on mitigating DNS abuse so that's something that you can expect also shortly after this meeting.

And we've also added the - now that the subsequent procedures PDP has kicked off we've kind of added that to our timeline of things we are tracking. Not to presume to set the schedule but just to note that that's activity that's going on there. And as that progresses we will, you know, be able to report or reflect what the schedule of the group actually is.

Next slide.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, before we move on we had a question from Rubens on this slide.

Rubens Kuhl: Actually it was two slides ago. Sorry for that. It was about the new gTLD implementation report. We saw the final report being published and we noticed that it took very little from the public comments. The only one paragraph I could find that was changed was that the implementation report now reflects the opinion of the community. But that does not hold out because the report is actually almost entirely the same that was proposed initially by ICANN.

So it's still revision history document that only tells the good part of the story, not the bad side of the story that were mentioned in the public comment. So if you are going to not accept public comments just recognize them but don't have that new document is actually being made by the committee because it's not. It's still an ICANN opinion. But we have final that but label it right. Do not label as a community opinion when it gets nothing from the community itself. Thank you.

Karen Lentz: Thank you, Rubens. So you're correct, that very little was actually updated in the report. Most of the kind of discussion and reflection of the comments that we received is in the report of public comments which is also part of, you know, what would be considered by the review team, you know, which is also the intention.

And I will - I'll say that there's - there is an interest in - keeping the report as a collection of the staff analysis on the topics that were in there. And so I think the - it's just a difficult blending to do. And I don't think there's an attempt to paint a positive picture. I think the report is intended as an input to a review team that's going to consider that, you know, as a sort of document in isolation from all of the comments that were received.

James Bladel: Thanks, Karen and Rubens. I'm not sure how many more slides you have left in the deck but we have a couple of questions just generally for some topics that may not have already been covered. So should we just - we have how many more slides you say? One? Yeah, let's go through that and then, Phil, you're first in the queue afterwards, thanks.

Karen Lentz: So the only other slide was just to highlight the dedicated session on this topic on the program reviews that's on Monday. And that as the previous slide. The rest was open questions for discussion.

James Bladel: Thanks. Once again I jumped in one slide too early. Sorry about that. Thank you, Karen. And, Phil, you're up first.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, thank you, James. Philip Corwin on behalf of the Business Constituency. My question relates to a recently closed comment period regarding the launch of supplementary registration proxy service for gTLDs operated by XYZ.com LLC. I believe Krista would be the right staff person because she was listed on the comment.

The Business Constituency was one of only two parties to file comments. We asked questions asking for clarification for certain terms in the RCEP proposal, particularly the definition of Chinese registrants. And how this RCEP policy, if approved, would apply to registrants based in Hong Kong, which who are not supposed to be subject currently to Chinese censorship rules of the nation of China.

And I'll just read one short paragraph from our letter. "The BC takes this opportunity to emphasize that government sponsored censorship of domain names for political purposes undermines a stable Internet ecosystem that promotes end user confidence as a safe place to conduct business. It also limits the free flow of data information on which business users of the Internet rely on delivering services to end users. In the report on comments," and I just lost the place where I was going to read from. Excuse me one moment.

Yeah, "In the report on the comments it says while ICANN acknowledges these comments it should be noted that this public comment announcement aims at gathering community input on the proposed amendments and not the RCEP request itself which evaluates whether Pro Service could raise stability - significant security or stability or competition issues."

So I'm not quite sure maybe if the BC comments and the evaluation criteria are kind of passing each other in the night and just wanted to see if our concerns about the effects on this on the Internet and business users and really free speech would be taken in account by GDD staff and also whether whatever decision you make there's a board review of that.

I would also note to my surprise and without any coordination by anyone in the BC that I'm aware of, that this - the topic of this RCEP request featured prominently in a letter sent by three US senators to Chairman Crocker earlier this week. So that's my question.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. I think it was specifically your question was directed to Krista. But I guess any GDD staff would like to weigh in on this that would be welcome.

Krista Papac: Krista Papac. I'm going to let Akram take this one but thank you for the easy question.

Akram Atallah: So as usual this was a very long question. I don't know if I got all the parts of it. But basically the RCEP is just a technical review. The technical review of the implementation found that there is no even concern to send it to an RCEP. Therefore we approved it.

Now I don't think that I have a statement to say about the letter from the senators to the board. But everything, you know, in the process is very clear. We reviewed the technical merits on the RCEP to see if there is any security or stability or competition issues. And if there are none then we approve it. If we are not sure we go to an RCEP and we followed the process and moved on. Thank you.

Phil Corwin: Thank you for that response.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Phil and Akram. And I'm noting that we have no other speakers in the queue. And we are two minutes ahead of schedule. Nice recovery. So thanks for that. And on behalf of all of us, thanks for coming and giving us these updates. As you can see there's a number of high interest topics.

Akram Atallah: Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks. We can stop the recording.

<center>END</center>