Revision A

ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
Joint RySG RrSG Session
Tuesday, 8 March 2016 1330 UTC

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.

Also found on page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Go ahead Jennifer.

Jennifer Standiford: Jennifer Standiford - ICANN staff recently sent out an email to the registrars last week asking - or requesting to combine IRTP part C and D with an implementation date of August 1. At this point in time we have not responded to the request.

Michele Neylon: Yes and that's all we were doing - touching base with it, Jen. The C date was August 1, they want to add D to it. Right - C we're still on the hook for 1 August, folks. Registry operators, understand that's not negotiable. The question is do we ask for more time for D? And it sounds like, yes, we should. Okay, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and I just want to let people - the registries know that this is the issue that Barbara Knight sent to the list several days ago and I resent it either yesterday or today about whether we support combining the two for August 1 or not. So she's been waiting for feedback on this so this is very timely.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Chuck. I think, you know - okay, I've got James walking up to the mic, but before - go ahead James. Go on. No, go on. I was bound to the GNSO chair.

James Bladel: I just have a question. I mean this is James speaking for the transcript and I think we have a workshop on IRTPC specifically scheduled for Thursday at...

Michele Neylon: 8:00.

James Bladel: 8:00 - and one of the things I think we are intending to bring to that workshop - spoiler alert - is we're asking for a delayed enforcement. So even if they stick with the August 1 date that - and I think we're not alone, there's several large registrars that are encountering some difficulties, some operational challenges, implementing this - so we're looking for some gap in enforcement. You know, if that's to the end of the earth, something like that. As far as IRTP D, you know, I don't think we have the same strong feelings.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James, that's helpful. I think - just so we're clear, so IRTPC either delaying the implementation or at least delaying enforcement either would be very helpful. We also get the impression that even if we have the workshop here on Thursday morning, it won't be enough to resolve some of the open questions and issues around implementation. Paul, back to you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you. Thanks Michele. Just for clarity on the recording - this is Paul Diaz, Chair Registry Stakeholder Group. This is the joint registry registrar session on the 8 March in Marrakesh. Just need that break for the transcript.

The one other admin issue before we launch into our proper agenda is a reminder to registries, we had the vote - the first ballet underway for the board seat 13. We've had a pretty response so far, but we're far from all those eligible to vote who can vote.

Certainly some are taking this very seriously have a process, but we ask please don't forget to vote and per the structure that we arranged with the registrars the deadline is 18 March. We will communicate the results either a clear frontrunner, somebody who poled grid in 50% or the top 2 names who will then - we will begin a joint vote on a runoff ballet for a candidate. The goal

is to have the individual identified and we can tell ICANN at the beginning of April. So, registries, please don't forget to vote for the board seat. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead Paul or do you want to continue? Okay, so the CCWG accountability I think is one topic that we discussed in our session this morning. I won't bore you with the details. We're happy to vote in favor of it. I'm not sure where you guys are on this - I mean where are you guys on this? Chuck, go right ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Michele, could I get a clarification on what you - does that mean that you're in favor of voting in favor of all 12 recommendations since that's what will happen first?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Yes, the registrar stakeholder group councilors will vote in favor of all recommendations. The registrar stakeholder group will be - wants to move forward with everything. We have no objections to that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, based around discussions earlier, Michele, the registries feel the same and intend to vote the same.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so next topic. I mean we could get bogged down in discussing what other people are going to do, but I don't think that's going to be particularly productive. So our next topic is - it's James Bladel at the microphone.

Michele Neylon: You again?

James Bladel: Sorry, James speaking and I just ran up here as quickly as I could. Question, I don't - I would also add that registrars are probably not intending to submit any rationale or signing statement to their vote and I wonder if that's also true at the registries?

Michele Neylon: On senior accounts it's not just James.

James Bladel: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. So the other - well, moving back up the agenda (unintelligible), the preparation for the board session. As everyone knows, we always meet with the board. We've been meeting with - as a joint group, I think we did the first time of the last meeting, unless, of course, my memory is wrong. And normally they come to us and ask us, do we have any questions or topics for discussion with the board. But this time they also sent us a few of their own questions, which was a refreshing change. We have been discussing these a little bit on the joint (EXCOM)'s mailing list and I also - I assume you guys have been discussing with your members list as well. I know we have.

So the topics that we, as the contracted party has, but registries and registrars submitted to ICANN's board were as follows - the board's (unintelligible) strategic priorities, objectives for the new CEO, cost overruns on impact. I don't know if anybody wants to include who is going to be talking to any of these things. I mean we probably need to decide that. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Let me share, we had quite a discussion about some of these as we worked through the list. The - in linking it with the board's own questions to us the second half - the second set of bullets up there on the screen in front of you or behind. The board asked of us in particular around the question of diversity and, you know, I think we - both stakeholder groups can make an argument - a very strong argument that we are quite diverse by many definitions of the term.

So when that comes up, you know, we are actually role models in the - at least the GNSO. There was also for that third part a question about the impact on the CTH. In particular, we wanted to focus on the global demands division and kind of call it out. It is supposed to be our partner. The next is

between us as part of the community and the rest of ICANN. The staff - it doesn't always live up to that kind of grand expectation. And, in particular, to ask the board as part of the question of the objectives of the new CEO if (Akrom) is acting, how does this work for the next three, four - five months? You know, what are the expectations of the board? Because we certainly have some and we feel they're already coming up short. You know, put the board on notice that we expect more of this partnership than we've often received.

Michele Neylon: Okay, so I mean we could discuss this a little as well in our meeting this morning. So on the board's view of strategic priorities the kind of thing that we're a little bit concerned about there is ICANN's approach to certain strategies that they have. One that we have had to have lengthy discussions with them was around the underserved regions discussion. Because although we asked repeatedly ICANN never really gave us a clear answer as to what constitutes underserved. So from the registrar side - perspectives across the globe and pretty much every single country on the face of the planet, so what's being underserved? ICANN also announced on Monday that they were opening another office.

So the question we were interested in asking was, you know, what are the metrics around these choices? You know, what - when they go and open a new office somewhere, what's the rationale behind it? What's the economic benefit? On the CEO thing - I don't know if we really discussed that in much detail, but the fact that there's going to be an interim CEO and then a new CEO several months later is something that I think - yes, we're not 100% sure on how that's going to pan out.

On the cost side of things we don't really want to attack the board so much as just to ask them how they view the expenditure and ever expanding budgets, ever expanding costs. Just to see what their views are on that. Because we gather that some of the board are also concerned about this that other people want to speak to this. And to share that we had the same view that we don't

want to go on the attack. We don't want to be combative or argumentative. Budgets and how expenses are acted upon is always a sensitive issue. We've actually been down this road with the board before. So, you know, we don't want to trod or go back into the same concerns. UA?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, this is Stephane. We've also - the registries had discussions this morning on adding a point with regards to the question being asked by the board about diversity in there also to help what can ICANN do to support our efforts towards diversity. We'd like to link that to, you know, universal acceptance and the fact that anything that can be done to promote universal acceptance also inherently promote diversity. Diversity of the registrant pool, the number of people, the type of people, what the reach of people it can have, access to domain name registrations. It also promotes diversity in the industry. The number of companies or businesses that can expect to be part of this industry that may not be able to if there are diversity limitations. So we've prepared a very short text that I'll be reading. It's not a text - it's just three sentences that I'll read out and we'll touch on that point then.

Michele Neylon: So, I mean the question I suppose I would have is how are we going to divvy these up? I mean we need to divvy them up. Open to suggestions.

Rob Hall: I don't think you actually need to. I think you run through them and if people from both sides want to speak to it, that's fine. I think the keyer point is let's keep the timing down so we don't run, you know, too long any one. But I don't think we need to say registries only can speak to this and only registrars to that one. I think there's enough opinions in the room that we should hear from everybody that wants to speak to any of them.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Rob. It's Michele for the record. The thing is it's based on previous interactions. I wasn't suggesting for an instant it was either registry or registrar issues. It was rather that, you know, on topic A person B might be the - can kind of be the one to kick off that discussion rather than everybody

kind of frantically looking around going who feels comfortable talking about this? So which one do I volunteer you for?

Rob Hall: I think - no I think I get into the second one, but I think given their conversation earlier, that you weren't purvey to, in the registry constituency there's going to be a number of people step forward on a lot of these. So we can try and spend some time now identifying, but I think our executive will likely start the ball rolling and then others will chime in immediately. There was quite a robust conversation almost.

Michele Neylon: I know - oh, I know as a sense of the thousands died and the rush to get to the microphone scenario isn't helpful either. Just to - ideally if we could just identify, you know, one or two people just to lead that a little bit would be just helpful.

Man: To Rob's point - and I don't know exactly how the board will structure this. If it's like the GNSO session when they asked the same questions and they alternated I would hope we can start, take our question first, I'm happy to introduce it. We had some really penetrating comments and the folks who shared them jump in to the conversation. They may then switch to the diversity issue, which would be kind of nice because that fits in very nicely with the things that we're concerned about. When we get to the second or the third, I don't know. I don't want to monopolize the time, but...

Michele Neylon: Okay, that's fine - it's Michele again for the record. I mean just - the last thing I want is just one of those kind of uncomfortable silences and things that we've had a couple of times in the past. Because I know that this room is full of very shy reserved people who hate sharing the opinions. And on the diversity side of things, I think I may have mentioned this on the joint (ECOM) list and I have no idea whether that went any further or not, on the registrar side we simply conducted a poll of our members to find out a few things. Both where they were from geographically, which languages they spoke and which

business models they had along with a few other things. And so (Graham) - where is he? Who is over there.

Michele Neylon: Hi Graeme.

Michele Neylon: Graeme has a reasonable amount of data. Not all of our members responded to the survey, but we got enough responses that we can feel quite confident in saying, you know, we - our registrars - we represent X percent of - sorry, X percent of our members are from Y - so on - etcetera, etcetera. So we have a bit of data there, which I think (Graham) can speak to quite confidently.

Graeme Bunton: Sure, but - sorry this is Graeme for the transcript. I felt like we covered a lot of this in the GNSO session the other day. The board is just going to hear the same stuff again. It doesn't seem super worthwhile to me to really talk about this a lot.

Michele Ney;lon: I would caution that not everybody was here for the GNSO session, Graeme I agree with you, we don't want to go into too much depth. I have some statistics that I can - that I'm sure will mirror or at least be in line with the registrars. It's probably worth sharing and then let's move on to whatever else we want to discuss.

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible)- it's Michele for the record. We have the data anyways so depending on how deep they want to go. I wasn't actually in that session in the GNSO and I think a lot of people wouldn't have been. Mr. Bladel.

James Bladel: Hi, James speaking. Thanks Michele and just a quick observation is, yes, we did speak about this in the GNSO and we spoke about it yesterday in the public forum. I mean clearly it is a priority for the board at this particular meeting. I think they're focusing on geographic diversity as well and how we intend to use these meetings to expand our presence, particularly in Africa. I think that that's something that they want to be seen asking all of their

groups. So I don't think we should give this an abbreviated treatment even though it is somewhat repetitive. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Jordyn Buchanan?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, I think the best way to approach - sorry. Jordan Buchanan, Google, for the record. I think the best way to approach this is to answer the question that they asked, which is how can they help. Right? And I think, you know, we talked about universal acceptance as a mechanism, the registry has had some conversation about travel support and the way we approach that. I made a separate suggestion in our meeting as well if they want more diversity in terms of registry operators, particularly from the global south, they need to have another - they need to expand the set of registries that exist. Because we can't invent registries - membership from the global south until there's registries in the global south. So they can help by having - by allocating more TLDs, including those from the global south. So those are just very tangible specific things that answer the question as opposed to spending a lot of time rehashing data that we can just point them to.

Paul Diaz: I'm sorry, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Well okay - one moment. Just very briefly, Jordyn - this is Michele for the record. This, I think, also kind of fits in a little bit with the question we have around the strategic goals. You know, this seems to be a kind of misconception that if they pour lots of money into all sorts of fuzzy projects that is going to suddenly see a massive number of registrars or something appearing out of nowhere. And I know from some - from talking to some of our members who are from various parts of Africa, for example, that they wouldn't be overly pleased to discover that there were a ton of - much smaller registrars were barely able to keep themselves in business popping up overnight with ICANN support, but something that has to be kind of balanced out. All right, back to you Paul.

Stephane Van Gelder: (Unintelligible) - Thanks, Stephane speaking. Yes, I think, you know, Jordan is right. We've - what we've tried to do and I think what we've done right now is to be quite specific about our answers to their question. Not everyone was at the GNSO. Not everyone was at the public forum yesterday, but this is also a chance for us to have a different interaction with them. But we are being - suddenly what the registries have started to do is be specific and we're - you know, Rob was saying everyone should be able to speak up. Perhaps what you're looking for, Michele, is we have one or two people that chew these up. So we know what we're doing on the diversity. We've prepared a text. You know, and I can lead it. Jordan can then piggyback, Rob can say something if he wants, but - so we've just teed up the topic and then, you know, it's an open conversation. But we certainly are trying to be on point to - you know, the board has asked how can we help? This is us answering that specific question.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Stephane. Just one other thing a well - just talking about diversity. Just throwing it out there. I mean do any of us have concerns about the diversity within ICANN staff themselves? They still are hiring a hell of a lot of staff, primarily in LA as opposed to elsewhere. I mean do we care?

Rob Hall: Didn't you just argue the opposite end of that as, oh my god, they're opening another office? So I think we want to be very careful with that one.

Michele Neylon: No, I mean...

Rob Hall: Because I think the last thing we want is them opening up more offices and spending more money.

Michele Neylon: No, that's not exactly the same thing Rob. They have offices already in various locations. So, for example, in Europe - within the European Union they've actually scaled down the office, which several of the European registrars have concerns around because they seem to be putting resources into the Istanbul office, which is outside the European Union. So they - we

would now be obliged to transfer data outside the European Union if we're being - if there was an audit or something like that. Whereas they had an office in Brussels and they scaled it back.

Rob Hall: So I suspect - and I won't speak for the registries - but I suspect we would come from the point of view that we had a lot of talk about cost overruns and lowering the budget, not increasing it. And I suspect opening more offices and employing more people in different parts of the world would run counter to our desire to have a lower budget.

Michele Neylon: I'd have to disagree with you on that. If you look at the salaries paid to IT professionals in Europe, they're significantly lower than in California. If I was working for a company in California I would probably earn a multiple of my current salary. So I disagree on that. I saw a hand down there. Jennifer, Kristina and then Jeff.

Jennifer Standiford: Obviously there's overarching themes here around budget and outreach. And I think - I brought this up the other day in the GNSO council meeting and (Crocker) agreed that they would come back to us on metrics around the engagement centers by our next ICANN meeting in Helsinki. I think one thing for us to do as a contract party (unintelligible) is to provide them with some parameters of metrics that we're looking for from a KPI perspective. But also, you know, in the question of regarding the outreach when they say how could they help, well they get help by telling us where they, you know, by putting these engagement centers in place how are they producing? What are they producing regarding outreach? Are they justified? Where is the ROI? You know, we're over budget, there's no checks and balances, we're supposed to be doing outreach.

Heck, I'll put an engagement center in my back yard. I mean what's that going to produce? So ultimately I think that before we discuss, you know, adding additional offices and labor locations, it's a matter of justifying what exists today and that's important to note.

Michele Neylon: Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Sorry to get us a little off track here. I want to zip back - well, or maybe kind of focus a little bit back on diversity. Given some of the tweets that are coming out of some of the board members, I think we need to be a little mindful of the diversity of the persons who are actually speaking on the diversity issue. So, you know, both stakeholder groups have a number of diverse officers and persons in leadership and, you know, I don't mean to suggest that we need to script this out, but I think the message that we plan to present is undermined quite candidly if the only people who are presenting are white men.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Kristina.

Jennifer Standiford: (Unintelligible) with that.

Michele Neylon: I don't disagree and I would - especially not on international women's day.

Man: Maybe not with Kristina either.

Michele Neylon: No, with Kristina I'm quite happy to disagree as she well knows.

Kristina Rosette: If I wanted to speak I would say that.

Michele Neylon: Mr. Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks and Kristina actually made one of my points. Because I've been following some of the tweets too and they certainly are commenting on who is presenting. So that's one comment, but the second one is - and for whatever reason we're always afraid to ask them the question back when they ask us a question, but one of the things we should ask them to speak to is why. Why are they asking this question? Is there some kind of an event or some feedback that they got from somewhere in the world that's led to them asking

this question? There's always a reason they ask the question and it's usually something that we know nothing about.

So if we could ask them as part of our answer, you know, what event or what's precipitated this and, you know, I think that's helpful. And I'll just say, yesterday they asked all the SOs and ACs about diversity and what their priorities were. And I went up to the board awards and I said, you know what would be helpful is to know what your priorities are for this meeting. And they looked at me with this kind of amazement going, you know, that's a really good idea. No one ever thought of asking them that. So I don't think they'll be insulted by us asking that question, but I do think it's good to know why they're asking the question and if something has precipitated it.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Jeff. Jonathan and then Keith.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I think I support when Jeff says why and I think the second follow up question is - and what - how - have you asked the question of your own organization? You know, of the staff. You know, of what's going on in ICANN as well.

Michele Neylon: Keith and then we'll go to a remote question.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Michele. Jeff, I think it's a great question to ask. I fully support asking it. My expectation is that accountability and diversity are two things that have come up in the CCWG. They're both part of work stream 2 and SOAC accountability is one of those. So I think there's a combination of things coming out of the CCWG work that is coming down the road in work stream 2 and diversity and SOAC accountability are two of the work stream 2 topics. So I expect that that's at least in part driving it, but maybe not entirely and it's worth asking the question.

Michele Neylon: Thank and there's a remote question. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes, we've actually got two. Ken, you are first in the queue. Go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, thank you. First of all, I have to agree with - completely with Keith. Much of the force that's driving these questions is optics. You know, all you have to do is look at what's going on around this IANA transition and comments from people from Brazil - I spent three hours listening to the GAC yesterday - and ICANN is still getting significant criticism for not having a more diverse presence and I think that's got more to do with it than their concern about equality within their organization. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thanks Ken. Calvin, is that an old hand or do you want to speak? Okay, it's in the comment. Yes, from the Adobe then. Calvin Browne asks or comments, of course there's still barriers to entry. For example, ICANN recently waived requirements for insurance. Unfortunately it doesn't take away the requirement as all Legacy ICANN registries still have the requirement in their RRAs. The waiver actually means nothing. So unless you don't want to sell any of those Legacy TLDs, for example, you still need to get the insurance.

Michele Neylon: Stacy Burnette?

Stacy Burnette: With all due respect, I think you have to be very careful about how you're going to ask the question why are you asking the question. Because I think there are a number of people who could - in this room, probably answer why some of these questions are being asked. I do think there's a good question about have you done this yourself. So just keep in mind that there have been quite a few people in the community that have been asking this question for quite a long time.

Michele Neylon: Just coming back then to what was raised as a valid point around this discussion of diversity. Since we don't really want a bunch of white buys and dealing with this on the registrar side - Darcy, thank you. And, Jennifer, I'm

just going to give you the eye. On the registry side - I mean I know there's plenty of people to choose from.

Rob Hall: Yes, we do. So Reg and Sam will take it for us.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect. Go ahead.

Rob Hall: At the mic?

Michele Neylon: At the mic.

Rob Hall: Please identify yourself for the record.

Lucky: Lucky (Unintelligible) from South Africa (unintelligible). I always feel compelled to - when diversity issue is raised to say something. Even though, you know, it wasn't my intention to express any opinion. It's safe to say that participation is required at all levels by all stakeholders around the room and we need to be fairly - treated in that participation. And in view of what is currently happening with registers and the costs of being a registrar. Those are some of the issues that can contribute towards addressing matters and issues of diversity. If I were to cite and example for us in South Africa, I spoke yesterday at the GTLD group. Showing issues of transacting in multiple currencies and having to pay in currency in dollars where the exchange rate for one country is extremely skewed - it goes to 1 to 15. And having this quarterly fees to be payable to ICANN. It makes it very difficult to run any operation of GTLD.

You literally are subsidizing ICANN and at the close of the GTLD, the country, will be next to zero. And if you look at the rest of the continent - I'm referring here to Africa - you'll find that it becomes even remote to even think of participating in the GTLD space because of the costs involved. Yes, we've sent recently the waivers on insurance, but that is not as sufficient. For us paying this quarterly fee of $6250 dollars is extremely - if I would say punitive

it's paralyzing on our operations. We pretty much have to cost subsidize this operations from the SLD - from the (unintelligible). And that on its own until it is addressed will also impact on the multiple areas that we're trying to address. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Do we want to move on? Oh, sorry Reg. Go ahead.

Reg Levy: That actually dovetails very nicely with some of the discussion that the registries were having earlier about answering this question. So I think that's a good point. Thank you very much for bringing that up.

Man: Well on that - would he mind raising that during that - where'd he go?

Reg Levy: Would you be willing to tell the board that?

Man: I think that's a great point.

Reg Levy: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Rob, go ahead.

Rob Hall: I want to be a little cautious here. There was a long period of time where we were asking ICANN to get rid of the insurance requirement - back to the insurance requirement discussion. And they finally did it. I don't think we should be the ones going out and screaming, didn't we ask, but there's some barriers that you didn't remove? It's kind of hard for us to say for years we asked you to remove this, hey you did it great job, but screw you - you really didn't do anything that helped us. That message needs to be very carefully delivered if we're going to try and deliver that from our perspective frankly. I mean I know it's more of a registrar issue perhaps, but, you know, we screamed at them for years to do this. They did it and now we're still unhappy.

Michele Neylon: I can speak to this very, very briefly. I think we need to move on. There was this big thing about the underserved regions and there was a bit - there was quite a bit of engagement and it came from the CEO down and they - there was several sessions held at various places. The interesting thing - I think - you're right. I mean it depends how it is framed, but pointing out - I don't think there's anything wrong with saying to them, yes, this is fixed, but it hasn't actually - there are other issues that need to be looked at. I think it should be, you know, thanks for fixing that part of this.

Rob Hall: But the other issues - there's two problems. One, we were dumb enough to say maybe you should look at these too. So we missed it. And two, they're really not within ICANN's remit. I mean I don't think there's any way ICANN is going to force a registry not to ask for insurance requirements. So I don't know what our ask is. We can point out that there's still barriers, but there's nothing for us to ask ICANN to do in my opinion. So I just want to be cautious here because...

Michele Neylon: I mean - well we as registrars didn't ask them to do anything specifically. They asked for our input on a few things, which we and others provided.

Rob Hall: I'm not sure that's correct. There's been registrars for years that have been asking for this insurance (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay, well registrars asked, but I'm talking about in terms of the registrar stakeholder group. We were asked for input and there was a very healthy discussion about that on the members list and there were a lot of very valid points raised and there were concerns raised around competition issues. There were concerns raised about the overall quality of services and there was a whole very long discussion on that. And ultimately, you know, there was a discussion that (unintelligible) ICANN removed the insurance requirement, which is not disputable, but if you're saying that the registrars as a whole group asked for this, that wouldn't exactly (unintelligible).

Rob Hall: I'm sorry, it may predate you, but this is a fight that's been going on with ICANN back to the early 2000s. Where we've been asking for this insurance requirement to be removed from the ICANN contracts. They finally did it. I think we should be, if anything, thanking them for doing it and I think what I was hearing is, well, wait a minute. That didn't really solve any problems. That's probably true, but for once ICANN, you know, took 10 years to do what we asked them to do, but they finally did it. So I don't want to be beating them up too much. I'll leave it because I don't think it's a huge point.

Michele Neylon: Sure and it's a fair point Rob, but at the same time I don't see us taking such an adversarial tone that they would interpret our follow up, gentleman from South Africa, as a screw you. It's what more? What's the next step we need to do? And reduction of fees is something that we've all been discussing for a while.

Rob Hall: And that's a fair point. Right, the reduction of fees is a fair point.

Michele Neylon: Please, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Look, I think we potentially are overcomplicating this. There's a question - diversity. Jordan made the point. There's a further question - what can ICANN do to support it? You've got a firsthand account from (Lucky) who describes an on the ground issue with a barrier to diversity and that's it. We aren't yet taking a position. He's a witness to a problem and he describes it eloquently because it's his problem. So I think that's it. You know, we don't - and we don't need to convolute it with the - you know, inter-co-mingle it with the insurance issue. If there's a problem there's a question. It's sort of answered - it's not the whole answer. Because we don't know what position we're going to take, but it certainly describes a problem very eloquently.

Man (?):   Thank you. I was going to say the question was not to pay or to pay, but just the picture is it's unaffordable and it's limiting and it keeps others out if you cannot cost subsidize it. It becomes a wealthy thing. I mean early on in the

day you cited stats of the number of registrations. Globally 10% of the 4 billion of connected people and this is even bigger on the content of Africa. So, yes.

Man (?):   (Unintelligible).

Man (?):   (Unintelligible) from (Keynet). I just want to return to the topic of diversity. That's - it's my understanding that there's no general understanding about diversity. Because when we see diversity we may take into account, like cultural diversity, language diversity, even age diversity and geographic diversity. Right? There are many factor combining to the configuration of diversity.

So when we say we encourage diversity, we - I think we should have many concrete measure or understanding what diversity we are talking about. And when we say we encourage diversified participation, we also need to take into account what specific measures we can take to encourage diversification. For example, I want to use just one example. For example, say geographically, Asia Pacific region is just one region. Right? But when we say - when we have some election from this region - forgive me, my being (unintelligible). Those people from Australia or New Zealand will be more possible to win because your English proficiency, your cultural closeness to English-American culture. And the people from other languages like Chinese, Japanese and Korean are less likely to win. So I think diversity is a very subtle issue and many concrete measure and action should be taken into account. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Please feel free to share. That's a very good point and extra powerful coming from you. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung- just a quick note. I actually think what Jeff suggested to ask ICANN why is useful, but I don't know whether - where we are on this point. Because after Stacy's intervention I mean I can ask it all. I think we should

ask, but, you know, not like why, but like we think this is an important issue. What is your context of your current, you know, request? Just ask nicely, but I still think it's useful to get a sense of the context of why, you know, they're asking this at this particular time and what it is for.

Paul Diaz: Stacy, do you want to respond?

(Stacy) (?):   Just to clarify, I didn't say don't ask. I said just to be careful how you ask. Yes.

Paul Diaz: Fair enough. Stephane and then Jordan.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Paul - Stephane. Just to say that, you know, with all the discussion that we're having on this people should feel free to speak up as well. You know, this will be moderated by our excellent leadership and the board's excellent leadership. So people should certainly feel free to speak up. That's also diversity by the way. As some of us are very used to speaking up and others aren't. Be it language, personality, whatever. But if we do our bit to reassure people that they can feel free to speak up, as long as they don't claim to speak for the whole SG or the whole house if they're not certain that the point that they're making is a point that's shared by everyone. I don't think there's any issue with that.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Stephane. Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: So on the context of asking why, I mean I don't disagree with that as a general principle. In this particular case it just seems unnecessary. Like they're asking how they can help us. They're not asking like are you diverse enough or any - it's not a confrontational question and I think there's a big risk of turning it into a confrontational-adversarial discussion by posing that question in this particular context, especially when they're just asking us how can they help. Let's answer that question and I don't think we need to delve - like we don't end to get into the motivations because like if we all agree that

diversity is in fact good and they're asking us how they can help us, let's just answer.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Okay, this is Paul for the record. Excellent - we'll tee it up as neutrally as possible so that we have the kind of conversation we're really looking for - not an adversarial one.

Michele Neylon: There's no shortage of opinions anyway, that's for sure.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Okay, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Paul - Keith Drazek. I agree with Jordan on this one. In talking - in teeing up the question positive or negative or confrontational or not. I typed this in the chat. I thought about it a little more. I think we need to be very, very careful in terms of using overly broad criticisms of GDD and staff in our conversations with the board. Having a little déjà vu from a couple of meetings ago where we went into a conversation with the board. It was the first time we had that new format and there were some general characterizations made about our dissatisfaction with GDD staff. And the question that came back to us, well can you provide specifics. Be specific. What is the issue that you're dealing with?

And so I think if we're going to go in, whether it's a question about prioritization and, you know, what happens when Akram is acting and what's the implications for GDD. I think we need to be real careful not to be overly broad and to try to be constructive with the board. To say here's an issue that we're concerned about and, you know, what are your views or how are you going to help fix this? And the overly broad statement gets us into that confrontational mode and really isn't constructive. So just - sorry I didn't bring that up earlier, but I was thinking about it over here and remember back to a couple of meetings ago where it really didn't turn out to be a great session. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Keith. There were a couple of other topics, I believe, we wanted to discuss in this session. So looking at what we have on the agenda. There was the PDP on RPMs for both the current and - sorry, for both existing and new GTLDs. Did you guys have anything on that one particularly?

Paul Diaz: Does anybody want to take this? Perhaps one of our counselors? I mean we didn't discuss this in detail during our previous sessions. (Unintelligible)?

Man: (Unintelligible), we're just planning on approving it and (unintelligible) on the road. Simple as that.

Paul Diaz: Okay, Donna?

Donna Austin: I guess the question, Michele, is what's your - do you have a concern about it? Or what's the issue? And if we can understand what your issue is, maybe that will help us.

Michele Neylon: I think James might be able to speak to this - wherever he's disappeared to. Oh, there he is. You should just stay near the mic James.

James Bladel   Hi, James speaking. And Donna, no, we didn't have any specific concerns. I think we wanted to ask you. I think there was a question about sequencing and whether putting the UDRP in the first phase or the second phase was going to hold up subsequent rounds, but if you guys are good with it we're good with it. We're all good with it. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks James for acting as my memory. The concern, of course, was if - depending on how that was - the PDP was sequenced and how long it took whether you guys had a felt that might be delaying future rounds. We could have a much deeper conversation about what our thoughts are on the whole thing, but that wasn't the idea. The other item on there was the GNSO review. We raised this in our meeting this morning, but there wasn't exactly a lot of discussion around it. So I don't know, do you guys have something on this?

Paul Diaz: Yes, we haven't - this is Paul for the record. We haven't really talked about it, but - again, (unintelligible).

Man: We're just hoping for it to be dropped from the agenda. Because otherwise someone would ask for a deferral of it. We're hoping for it to be withdrawn.

Paul Diaz: So you're looking at differing - is it up for a vote or something?

Man: So my - it could go down for a vote, but we just hope that the motion will be withdrawn before anyone has to ask for a deferral of it.

Michele Neylon: Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: (Unintelligible), can you clarify - maybe I'm not understanding. I didn't realize that - what motion are you talking about?

Man: It was a motion by (Unintelligible) from our (RSPTC) proving the recommendations or not approving or endorsing - acknowledging the GNSO review from West Lake. So it is on the agenda. It was proposed, but it's very likely that will be withdrawn before it gets - comes to a vote.

Stephane Van Gelder: And if it gets withdrawn does that mean that the West Lake review is automatically accepted?

Man: No, just stakeholder groups (unintelligible) have more time to consider it and then provide feedback.

Paul Diaz: Chuck and then James.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Michele. I just want to provide some context to what (Ruben) said because everything he said is right on. In the absence of (Jen Wolf) over the weekend, who was the Chair of the GNSO Working Party, I gave a

presentation - an overview of the recommendations. And I actually suggested that - and in fact I did this when the GNSO was working with - meeting with the board as well over the weekend - that there's not time - they didn't have time right now to review all 36 recommendations - in particular, the ones from the working party.

Because we suggested which ones we think should go forward, which ones should be eliminated, etcetera. I won't go into all of that now. And so I actually suggested that they need more time. That could happen in a couple of ways and it actually hasn't happened yet, but may happen in the meeting tomorrow. Where (Wolf Alric) actually withdraws this motion. I mean he could have got a second and then they could have withdrawn it. I mean there's various ways, but bottom line is the council really - it's pretty important to the GNSO and in the near and longer term. So they need more time. And so that's all that's happening.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And they will consider it in the next meeting or two I think.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Chuck, it's Paul again for the record. And just to be clear, the next meeting or two prevents a withdraw, which means not dealt with now. It gets kicked the can down the road. Okay, thank you. We had an issue that was raised in part of other discussions that we wanted to broche with the registrars. Registries wanted to ask where to point with all the various work going on around who is (RDAP) next generation, who is - there is a comment period coming due pretty soon. And the question that we had is, you know, is there an opportunity here to work together and kind of clarify what is contracted parties. Do we really expect to want out of all these efforts? It feels like there is a lot going on. It's very hard to get our heads around it and, you know, setting expectations. It's not really clear what you're willing to do, what we're willing to do - we haven't had enough cross communication I think.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Paul. I think this is a very, very important issue. Before I go to James who I keep thinking should just, you know, take the microphone and sit down with it, now his nose is out of joint. Okay - no, there's a lot of stuff going on. There's - a lot of it impacts us directly. It will have direct intangible impacts on our operations. From our side, the number of parallel overlapping potentially contradictory conflicting work streams around who is, is just, you know, this is leaving us going, you know, what the hell? I mean this makes no sense to us.

In terms of our own priorities we're not saying we had a meeting - well, several of us had a meeting - was it yesterday morning Chuck? Yes, it was. Sorry, it was so early it could have been another day for all I know. Several of us had a meeting with members of the board and we were talking to them about the RDS PDP specifically. And, of course, in the context of that other who is related activities came up. And I think James, who I am now going to hand over to, put it very eloquently - as did Chuck because they were much more awake than I was. That it wasn't that we didn't want to have progress, but at the same time we're trying to run businesses and it makes very little sense for us to prioritize development to solve a problem that's going to go away six months later. James?

James Bladel   Thanks Michele and Paul. James speaking. So this came up as well during the GNSO weekend sessions when we were interacting with the GDD staff, and just speaking personally or on behalf of the registrar, it seems like we've taken - it seems like (unintelligible) has evolved. Right? It's evolved from a controversy into chaos. It's kind of like when I take my kids to a buffet and they have pizza and ice cream and then they put - it's like everything just piled onto a plate here and nothing is matching with anything else. And operationally there's no overarching management to stitch this all together. I think at this point, you know, contracted parties really only have two questions.

I mean we - there's a million details, but really just two questions, which is what do they want the end result to look like and who is going to pay for it.

Everything else, I mean, is really kind of, you know, we can battle on, you know, details and fields and, you know, stage access and translation - I mean there's a lot of trees in that forest, but really I think we need to know those two questions and we need to figure out what that is and work backwards from there as opposed to taking what we've got and keep slapping new things in the pipeline.

Particularly, when some of these changes are going to be obsoleting things that are in the pipeline right behind them - or are going to be obsoleted by things that are in the pipeline right behind them. So I just feel like, you know, with regard to (who is) - and I've heard this, I think, in some private discussion and maybe it's something that we should take up, you know, at the council level because the council is supposed to be managing this process and getting our arms around all these efforts. And I think - I know you've got a queue, but, you know, and related to that is we're also kicking off review teams on schedule that are completely colliding with work that's already being done.

We're supposed to kick off an ATRT review team when we're right in the middle of implementing accountability, you know, transformation and we're also supposed to kick off a (who is) review team when we're in the middle of completely rebuilding (who is). So does any of this makes sense? It's like the left hand isn't talking to the right hand. So I think that would be a great conversation and I'd be happy to weigh in on that when we talk to the board.

Michele Neylon: Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Jordyn Buchanan. So I raised this issue in our session. I think there's a very tactical and immediate concern, however, which is that both the (unintelligible) (who is) and (RDAP) public comments are closing in the next like eight days or something like that. Those - I think we've been very reactive to the implementations work on both of those tracks and I think what we need

to be instead is a lot more proactive and help chart out our vision of what the implementation of those things ought to look like.

I think (who is) in particular, I think the GNSO also has a role in going back and saying, hey, ICANN, you're misinterpreting the policy that we passed because I think they are misinterpreting the policy that was adopted by the GNSO. But independent of that I feel like there is a path - a reasonable path forward that is a lot less complicated for both ICANN and registry operators and registrars, but we have to - I think if we could get aligned and actually put together that framework for ICANN, I think it would be a lot more powerful than us just sort of bitching about what they're doing. And I think we're bitching for good reasons because it doesn't really make sense what they're doing, but we're not actually proposing a coherent alternative.

And so what I would suggest - and I don't really have a lot of time in this meeting, but I'll make time if we can figure out - if we can get small group of folks from both sides that are interested in spending a little bit of time mapping out a position that we could both adopt and maybe put together a joint comment that spans both (unintelligible) (who is) and (RDAP) in the short term and then also suggest what James is saying, aligning the work in the longer term. I think that would be productive and help get those issues a little bit more under control than they are at the moment.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, did I see Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Michele. Thanks, Jordan. I'm not opposed to what Jordan is suggesting, I just wonder within 10 days we can pull that together and get it approved. You know, in our case we have comments finalized and on both efforts and now maybe that will facilitate what you're talking about. I get that. But I just want us to be cautious because they already extended the comment period quite a lot and I don't think we're going to see another extension.

Jordyn Buchanan: So, Chuck, one approach we could take is if we didn't think we could get formal approval by the big groups. Even if it's just the participants in that efforts who sign it in their own capacity or on their company's capacity. I think that would still be useful to have something that blends the two together. Because right now we're reacting to the two as if they're completely different things and staff is clearly not treating them as completely independent things.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jordan, Chuck again. And, yes, something like that might work within the timeframe we have. So I'm good with that.

Paul Diaz: It's Paul.

Michele Neylon: I think...

Paul Diaz: Let me just ask - Michele, it's Paul. Jordyn, are you willing to take the lead if people are interested in reaching out to you? Okay, thank you.

Michele Neylon: I believe Edmon had his hand up before Keith went to the mic. Edmon? No? Okay. Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you Michele. So I just noted in Adobe Chat that Scott Hollenbeck back from (unintelligible) is following this, but he can't speak. He just typed - it said, at a minimum we need a very clear plan from ICANN that describes how all of these activities relate to each other and how the dependencies will be managed to minimize re-work. As Jordan just described, perhaps we should draft that plan and pitch it.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Scott and good point and everybody is interested in this - passionate about this work with Jordan.

Michele Neylon: Okay, I think on the GNSO council issues and motions the biggest one is the CCWG. I know there are a couple of others - the (RPM)s one, which we discussed. Are there any other motions that we care about passionately?

(Rubens), I'm looking at you. You're shaking your head, that's fine. Okay, on any other business - there's a couple of things that came up - sorry, (Rob), go ahead.

Rob Hall: Sorry, I have one that I don't think we've got time to debate or get into today, but I want to kind of give you a heads up because I'm going to ask that it be put on the GDD summit agenda coming up in Amsterdam. And that's the concept of how we, as registries, how registries amend their registry-registrar (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rob Hall: So, you know, it's kind of a multi-phased process right now. We're in the middle of it. We're the first guinea pig to go through hit. I think (unintelligible) was the first guinea pig. The first phase is enshrined in everybody's registry contract. The second phase involves a procedure that ICANN created that may or may not get triggered. And the third phase involves ICANN acting as the decision maker - I almost said the decider. That would be bad. The decision maker on whether to approve this or not. And I can tell you, you know, we're (unintelligible) heading towards mediation and arbitration on this. I can tell you in discussion with ICANN staff, they're not happy with the procedure because they're having to run it for the first time and realizing they don't want to decide anything ever. The registrars, I know, are unhappy with it and as a registry we are unhappy with it. So I think the suggestion is we should probably have a frank discussion about this and try and figure out what's a better one. Because I know all three parties are unhappy right now.

Michele Neylon: Yes, okay.

Rob Hall: To how it's running. So I think the appropriate place is probably to schedule a couple of hours and go at the GDD Summit in Amsterdam and really get into it, but I want to give everyone a heads up to start thinking about it. Because it effects us all.

Michele Neylon: It was already on the topics that we discussed on the first meeting we had for the GDD Summit.

Rob Hall: Right, I know it's there. That's why I wanted to tell everyone that it's coming.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Rob Hall: And I think we should be prepared for a frank discussion there, not here. But it's clearly something that no one is happy with and I think we have an opportunity to change it.

Michele Neylon: We agree. And on the registry side we definitely agree and it's one that we've - several of our members - we discussed this during the registrar meeting this morning as one of the topics that was of interest and we felt that while it might be possible to have some conversation with you guys here today it wouldn't really be possible to go into any depth and the GDD Summit might be a better venue for that. We also have the joint (EXCOM)s list, which both registries and registrars are on, plus we have the joint call. So it is possible to have some communication prior to Amsterdam. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman Yes, this is - sorry, Jeff Neuman. I would strongly encourage that this shouldn't be a discussion between the (EXCOM)s. And as we discussed the registrar meeting just before this I think we as the registrars want to meet with ICANN legal to understand certain things before we, I think, are ready to have a conversation with the registries and I encourage the registries to meet with ICANN legal as well because I think we want to be adequately prepared before going into that meeting. Plus, I think we should have some counseling from anti-trust or some other attorneys that would - that could help us understand what the scope of what we can - what we are able to talk about as well. So I'd encourage that and I agree with you, if that discussion takes place it should be at the summit.

Rob Hall: And, Jeff, just to be clear, I'm suggesting it's not just registries and registrars participating in the discussion openly, but ICANN as well. So, you know, I think getting whatever advice you want beforehand is great, but I want ICANN at the table talking frankly about it as well. Because I know they're not happy with it and I think that gives us the opportunity to change it. Because it will require a change of our registry agreements if there is to be a significant change to it and possibly a change to the procedures document that ICANN published. It's not simple to do and if all three parties were in agreement of how to do it, it would move - I think it could move very quickly. But ICANN certainly needs to be at that table as well. Not just registries and registrars.

Jeff Neuman   Yes, I agree - this is Jeff Neuman, sorry. I agree with that, but I want some guidance first on what we can, what we're able to talk about, what we're not able to talk about and I think we just need - let's plan for the GDD Summit and then beforehand do the right preparation and make sure we know what we can and can't talk about.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. Any other business on your side Paul?

Paul Diaz: Not on this. No, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Everybody is super happy?

Paul Diaz: Mm-hmm.

Michele Neylon: Yes, okay. So the meeting with the board I think is the next thing on the agenda. Are we just going there? Things are pretty much at the end of the - our time. (Unintelligible), I can't see through you. Through your head. Another point Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I would like to disagree with Michele on that point. I've been looking for an opportunity to do that because he's been doing it to me over the last several days or weeks a lot.

Michele Neylon: Chuck, thank you for disagreeing with me. But we had a gentlemen's agreement that part of my role was to disagree with you. As you said repeatedly that you didn't like having people who always agreed with you. And as I am one of the more disagreeable people here I thought I would fill that role for you.

Paul Diaz: Okay folks, we're going to break a few minutes early. Remember, we started a quarter past in the (Atlas) room - the big room - from the start of the sessions. I guess registrars were just there. Yes, those who are going to speak, if you have - certainly the (EXCOM) members - bring your name tags. IT helps folks in the audience to identify and address you by name. Those who intend to speak, please either take a seat at the table or be near the microphones so that we can easily get to you and your voices can be heard across the room. And with that we'll see you all in about 20 minutes. Thank you. We can stop the recording now.

Woman: Thank you everyone for attending today and thank you to ICANN technical staff for their support.

END