Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
GNSO: RySG Membership Meeting Part 1
Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 09:00 AST
Note: 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.

The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Paul Diaz: Welcome everyone. It's Paul Diaz, Chair Registry Stakeholder Group. This is our Constituency Day meeting for my God, what is the date, the...

Sue Schuler: March 13.

Paul Diaz: Thirteen, 13 March thank you, very full agenda. We're going to begin with our GDD staff colleagues. Before we dive into it just looking at the agenda that's been circulated previously any issues to raise, any things to add? Certainly as we go through the day we can add things as we'll make time. All right and certainly if you want to speak -- and this is an odd set up because I've got quite a few people behind me -- just ask. You know the signal. If you're at the tables use the mics. If you're behind please just kind of squeeze up here, certainly want to have your voices heard. So as I noted GDD staff's with us and we have a number of items that they're going to lead us through, thinks we ask for updates so with that let me turn it over. Cyrus or Russ?

Russ Weinstein: All right to good morning everyone. I'm Russ Weinstein, Director of Registry Services and Engagement. If you haven't had me before please come say hi. Before we get started maybe the GDD in your room can just raise their hands so everyone can see. There's a number of us here. If there's something you need please let one of us know and we'll try and help you. Not quite there on the slide yet but first topic we are going to talk about today -- we can go to the next - go to Slide 4 maybe -- is the GDD Summit. So as you know we're

having our annual GDD Summit coming up in May. We have a fabulous venue in Vancouver Richmond, British Columbia outside of Vancouver. We can go to the next one please. And looking forward to seeing as many of you there as we can.

We've been doing a great job with the Planning Committee to get an agenda in place. There's now a draft agenda available on the Web site. And I think the next call to action for both the ICANN side and the contracted party side is to come together and develop those sessions so we have real productive discussion to make the most of our time when we're together in Vancouver. Paul I don't know if there's anything you wanted to add on this topic.

Paul Diaz: Yes thanks Russ. Everybody we circulated the agenda on the list, strongly encourage everybody please take a look at it. The layout of the three days or 2-1/2 days is deliberately different than we've done in the past. We're going to have a track approach so any given timeslot there can be three different sessions going on.

We're trying to be as comprehensive inclusive as possible. Some are very specific kind of technical. Some are the other stream meant for newcomers, very high level recognizing that we have a very broad consistency across both registries registrars need to meet the needs of most everyone. So please don't say, "Oh we don't need all these one on ones and stuff." That's not the point. We're trying to make this a Summit for all.

With that said though if there are issues that you feel are very important and for whatever reason were missed on the agenda is it is a working draft and we can make adjustments. But we need to hear from you. And I think when I had posted I'd asked, you know, by the end of next week that way the planning committee can begin the process of recruiting leads for the various sessions basically drawing upon the people making the recommendations and it all depends. It's going to be driven sort of from the bottom up.

If a panel's appropriate great, the lead will have to recruit the panel. It's going to be more interactive like the roundtables we did in Madrid with groups, you know, the dynamics and figuring out how that's done will be on the part of the lead. But again we want to get as much of the heavy lifting done in advance as possible. I'm not winging it when we get on the ground in Vancouver so again encourage everybody to take a look at those at the agenda. If there are things that are missing speak up. Otherwise we'll expect to move forward with the draft and work on flushing out the leaders, the participants for the various sessions.

Russ Weinstein: Great thanks Paul and echoes that. Yes, we're really looking forward to the summit and making it a really meaningful event this year. The other thing we announced recently was we picked a region for the next two summits. So the next one is going to be in the APAC region for 2019 and then the following year we'll go back to Europe and then start a rotation I think from there was the idea that we had worked out with the contracted party group.

The last thing related to Summit is the next slide supposed to give a plug for the Registry Operations Workshop. That's going to be held at the same venue on the Thursday afternoon following the conclusion of the summit. So if you're interested in that I believe the main topic on that is going to be RDAP if I'm not mistaken so lots of good discussion to happen there related to RDAP and hopefully getting that closer to implementation. So please go ahead and sign up for this event as well, go to the next.

All right so our next topic I wanted to bring to this group was an update about IGOs. We can go to the next slide. There's been a little bit of activity recently related to IGOs so I wanted to just catch everyone up. In mid-January we published and sent out an announcement regarding the announcement of the policy for protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs. I'd sent a note to Paul before we did that I believe, forwarded it on to the list. We also sent the legal notification out to get everyone aware that it's coming.

The quick summary of that is by August 1 registry operators and registrars we'll continue to reserve a full name IGOs described in the list. And they will provide a mechanism to allow IGO to register their own names in the TLDs. A reminder that acronyms are not in scope for this policy implementation. They remain reserved on an interim basis. I know that's a point of frustration for this group and you're going to be talking about it with the board later today which I think is the right venue for that conversation to happen.

Paul Diaz: Yes a question?

Russ Weinstein: Yes one more that I just wanted to remind everyone of. So in the end of 2016 we published the release of the two character codes but that does have some fine print with it that you need to continue reserving other protected things that fall within two characters. So acronyms are one of - IGO acronyms are one of those. There are some IGO acronyms that are two character labels. I think (Michael) tells me five specifically. So please do not get those two things confused even though two character codes are okay, not if they are an IGO acronym is listed.

So the other thing I've put additional slides in the appendix of this. Mary Wong and some of our other policy staff briefed the GNSO yesterday I believe, maybe it was Sunday about IGO, the various threads of work going on in IGOs related. So there's an active PDP going on for curative rights. And there's been some progress related to facilitated discussions between the GAC and GNSO on the current reservation of IGOs. So that information is in the appendix of this and there's a link to that session agenda where you can hear the update as well. So now I'll turn it back to questions.

Paul Diaz: Dirk?

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes Dirk Krischenowski on .Berlin and Vice Chair of LTD group. Just to let you know we have yesterday sent a letter from the Geo Top Level Domain Group in support of our member .Africa to release .AU - not .au, AU

as two letter reserved IGO acronym for the African Union because .Africa has the support of African Union to release this term and also a non-objectioner from the Australian ccTLD government that this letter, a two letter code can be released AU for the African Union. Just to let you know that were sending this support to release it to the GAC yesterday.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Do you want to respond Cyrus?

Cyrus Namazi: Not a response. Good morning everyone, Cyrus Namazi with GDD, just wanted to also let you know that this item the list of protected IGO acronyms is on the GAC agenda actually for discussion today at 11:00 am to follow-up on what Dirk was saying. And you might consider having some of you actually attend perhaps even participate in discussions just to make sure that the GAC representatives and the GAC in general understand what it means to update the list and remove, perhaps consider removing .au and some other names from it might be a useful discussion for you to participate in, just wanted to let you know.

Paul Diaz: Okay any other questions or points? No? Jon?

Jon Nevett: Whose decision is it to wait for acronyms for curative rights? Is that a staff decision or a board decision?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Jon. This is Cyrus again. So I think the mechanism that the GAC is considering is to update their list that is now reserved.

Jon Nevett: Yes.

Cyrus Namazi: The decision to release them is really I think is pending the conversations that are taking place that Russ mentioned and the work that's being done by the GNSO to re-review their recommended policy.

Jon Nevett: That's not what your document says. Your document says that the IGO acronyms are pending the curative rights working group outcome. So that - let's start with that. Is that accurate or not?

Cyrus Namazi: I don't think it's a policy issue. It's a contract issue. So I think you should maybe chime in.

((Crosstalk))

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you.

Mary Wong: This is Mary from policy staff and Jon I think your specific question is relating to the fact that the board has not taken any action on the completed PDP meaning the outstanding recommendations and IGO acronyms and that they are likely to not take action on those until the ongoing curative rights PDP is done. And your question is why is that is the case. Is that right?

Jon Nevett: No. My question is whose decision was that? You know, I understand that someone made the decision according to your documents, that IGO acronyms will not go forward, will not be released, will - we're not going to follow the advice of the original PDP at this point until the curative rights working group PDP process is over. That's what your document right here that you circulated to us yesterday says. And my question is whose decision is that? Is that a staff decision or a board decision?

Mary Wong: I think I understand your question but for purposes of the record I just want to be clear that the board has not made a decision. So when the board makes a decision on a PDP recommendation it has to go by way of resolution. It will help what I can do is try to explain the thinking behind this. And it is that the GNSO recommendations for IGO acronyms is as we know different from the GAC advice and it is what's for a 90 days claims period. That means obviously I think everybody well knows the notice goes to the potential registrant, the notice goes, you know, to the affected IGOs.

The reason why, our understanding is the reason why that is not been acted on is that when you notice goes to whether it's a trademark holder or an IGOs that so and so or someone has registered something matching your trademark or your acronym the next step is for that trademark owner or the IGO in this case to decide what action to take. And the potential actions they can take include filing a UDRP or a URS action. And that is the subject of the curative rights PDP for IGOs. So based on that combination of protections that's why the board has not acted on the closed side of the acronyms while the curative side is being finalized. Does that help?

Jon Nevett: No but thank you. I understand the background but no. There other protections that we can have right? There's a - the community got together and said 90 day claims period, done right? The GAC had countervailing advice three, four years ago and we're still waiting right? So we can set up our own private UDRP if we wanted. We can do other - well what did do we do with two characters? ICANN staff said you guys have to produce to us sufficient protections and we'll release them. Why can't we do that?

I mean it doesn't - we don't need to wait for a pending PDP to be finalized in order to move forward. We - you know, it would be like we're looking at transfers with regard to GDPR. Does it mean we're going to halt all transfers until that happens? You know, we've been looking at Whois issues for probably continually for 14 years. Does that mean we can't do anything with regard to Whois because there's a pending PDP? That PDP right now is off the rails. It could take five years till that's finalized. It's utterly ridiculous that the ICANN - I haven't gotten an answer yes so I don't know if it's the ICANN staff or the ICANN board is taking a position that a temporary restriction reservation done in 2013 is going to continue for another could be five years pending a PDP that's off the rails.

Paul Diaz: Sure, go ahead Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Jon. I'm not sure if I completely understand your question but to let me tell you what at least our understanding of the situation is. There's a board resolution that says the names on this list which are considered acronyms for these IGOs must be reserved.

Jon Nevett: Temporarily?

Cyrus Namazi: Well yes temporarily. It - I don't know what that means the word temporarily but that's where we're at. So the organization, the ICANN or the GDD staff right, we're not empowered to essentially move beyond that until the board comes and tells us, you know, you can go ahead and do it.

Jon Nevett: (Unintelligible).

Cyrus Namazi: Yes. And this is I think where you need to take your - I'm very sympathetic that this has taken a very long time. Both the IGOs and the registries are obviously getting impatient but our hands are really tied in this matter. We have no power to move that and I hope that helps.

Akram Atallah: If I may Paul? This is Akram Atallah for the record.

Paul Diaz: Sure.

Akram Atallah: So Jon we will bring your concerns to the board members that are looking at this and we get back to you on what actions they want us to take so okay? Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Jeff, related to this?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jeff Neuman. I think Dirk's situation that he mentions is a little bit different. I think that's not really covered by the PDP. It's when the organization that it's - I don't want to say protected because we should not be using the term protected. There isn't a law to protect to these. So it is

reserved because of let's say in Dirk's case the African Union. If the African Union wants it then that should not have to wait for the outcome of the PDP because I'm not 100% sure the PDP even if it addresses it it's not inconsistent with that.

So I think there's no reason to wait for a quick resolution to the board saying in cases where the name is reserved and that name is sought by the entity for which or because of which it was reserved then that should proceed with like a letter or something. But that doesn't seem to be that type of thing that should be held up.

Paul Diaz: Cyrus?

Cyrus Namazi: Jeff thank you. I think that your explanation is quite reasonable except that I think if we actually go down that path and peel it back a few more layers than the implication of that type of direction would be that actually the IGO has a specific rights to that acronym which is the subjects of debate in GNSO right?

So I think it easier path forward would be for the IGO to have - if they would like to they can considered - which is I think what the asking - union is asking for having their acronym removed from the list which with it all the temporary protections quote will also go away with it. Then anyone could actually register them. But if the decision hasn't been made if the IGO is entitled and only the IGO is entitled to that acronym and I think that's actually the crux of the whole debate that's taking place in the community.

Paul Diaz: Okay I see Maxim. Chuck has been waiting very patiently so let's kind of get through this and go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: If Maxim's going to talk about the exact same thing let him go ahead. Mine's a little broader.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record .Moscow. Do you - does it mean that the government of real country has to ask an organization about allow us to do something? It's big different level. You know, governance to governance, organizations speak to organizations. And governmental representatives in this particular organization can speak to like the board organization or whatsoever. So it creates station where organizations have precedence over governance. I'm not sure it's going to be received well actually. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay then Chuck thank you for waiting patiently.

Chuck Gomes: No problem, Chuck Gomes, observer. But I want to endorse the suggestion to have someone at the GAC meeting on this topic later today. I don't know if any of you were at the GAC session. I think it was Sunday afternoon. I'm already losing track of all the meetings.

But one of the things that was very clear there that is that the IGOs are continuing to push for acronyms. Now I understand the registry's position on this and actually fully support it and from a personal point of view. But just wanted to let you know that's why it would be good to have somebody there. And I know we - you have a meeting going on here but I endorse that suggestion because they are continuing to push that with the GAC and I'm sure they will later today.

Now the second - my second point maybe come up later so I won't say anything. Are you going to cover the Red Cross names? No? So I'll just mention that and of course Mary's a better person to talk to this than me and (Thomas). I don't think I see (Thomas) here because he chairs the Reconvene Red Cross Working Group on - and basically what that group's working on is some supplemental names associated with the national Red Cross organizations.

Now some of you will remember that I was one of at least a couple people from the registries representing that. David Maher is still on that as well. I

don't know if David's online but and okay so I think that's going very well. Right now there's - and I don't think it'll take - that's one of the PDPs that will probably wrap up in the near term.

But basically right now what's happening is that they're waiting on the Red Cross to finish a list of these supplemental names and their IDN versions and so forth. But I - and the council has asked for a finite list and not a formula like the working group was suggesting. So just - that's just an update in terms of that. I think that's going well. The ultimate goal which I think will be approved by the working group is to look at to have this finite list of supplemental names okay? Okay.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Chuck. Cyrus?

Cyrus Namazi: Just a very brief comment that I never thought in my wildest dreams I hear those words Chuck the observer in one sentence. So it's great to have you Chuck. Thank you for your comment.

Paul Diaz: All right back to the agenda. Go ahead Russ.

Russ Weinstein: Sure. So I don't think we have anything else for this group on IGO updates. I understand the frustration and certainly. And as mentioned we do encourage that discussion with the board later today.

Man: Thank you.

Russ Weinstein: Next?

Paul Diaz: Yes, okay.

Woman: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Go online and Maxim I missed you as well. Just read the comment and submitted by admin. "(Billy) and Jeff's question puts (RS) addition which - then (we) concurs with which is without the process the IGO would have trumped any other competition. However in the case of .Africa if they put au.Africa as a registry reserve name as well in the case of .Africa that shouldn't make sense also. And the situation's different yet again. And it goes back to Jeff's question suggestion being reasonable. So I think I hope the GDD would be sensitive to avoid prohibiting such a request unnecessarily." Okay and Maxim I'm sorry I missed you. Please go back.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. It's a question about the list of reserved names for Red Cross. Is it going to be addition of some records through this list or is it going to be look overhaul of the list because the current list contains mistakes and terms which Red Cross has nothing to do with? Thank you.

Mary Wong: This is Mary from staff and another staff member Berry Cobb is also working on this effort. Our understanding is that the work that Chuck described is just on the national society names but obviously as part of finalizing the list. And Maxim I know that you brought this issue up before. That is under discussion that we will do a final cleanup obviously.

Russ Weinstein: Okay. Okay we closed out the IGO discussion now. So next topic we want to talk through was IDN tables and their IANA repository. For those of you who are operating TLDs where you're also registering IDNs at the second level you have a requirement to publish those tables, registration rules and practices in the IANA repository. As you know in the new gTLD contract at least the IDN tables are codified in Exhibit A of the registry agreement. We did some analysis related to another activity and found we've had a bit of a gap between what we expected to see and what the reality. So this table kind of outlines that gap. And I understand the percentages don't add to 100% and I can explain that as well.

But the first line is where we see the match that we are expecting all IDN tables that are in Exhibit A are also published in the IANA repository so there's no action required there. That's about 13% of the gTLDs. The second one is where IDN tables are proven a list in Exhibit A of the contract but they haven't just been published in the IANA repository. So there's a need for the registry to go submit those tables to the IANA repository for publication. That's about 46% of the TLD so that's a big number there.

And then the third one is I've flagged in red because it's a more complicated solution is that the tables are published in the IANA repository but haven't been approved in your contracts. And that's about 28% of the population. The remaining 13% from what I gather they don't support IDNs or they've initiated support for IDNs but don't have any actual languages or tables approved in their contracts so there's no issue there. So it's really probably 26% in the number one column so chooses up to 100%. Next slide.

So what are the next steps on this? We found a gap and we need to close it together as a group. For Scenario 2 where your tables are approved in Exhibit A of your contracts but aren't yet in the IANA repository please go submit those to the PTI organization to get them uploaded into the IANA repository. We can send some targeted emails if that'll help and we probably will to give you guys the boost that you need to go do that.

The third scenario as I mentioned is a little more complicated because it would require aligning our contracts with their - to make sure we have all the right tables codified there. Currently we do that through an RSEP. I don't think 300 RSEPs or so all at the same times is really feasible for ICANN or the right solution necessarily. So this is where I'd actually like us to get together and work together to figure out what the right solution is. What I'd suggest is maybe I understand there's already a working group that's from this group that works on IBMs stuff.

I don't know if that's the right working group where we just get a quick call for volunteers and people from my team or from a GDD team and this group can get together and brainstorm some efficient solutions to this problem and maybe bring those back for discussion either at the GDD Summit or at ICANN - by ICANN 62 so that we can have a path forward. So I guess I'd pause there and let the group kind of resonate on that.

Paul Diaz: Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. Have you analyzed which part of those records were put on IANA when IANA was part of ICANN and which ones after the transition because before transition effectively IANA was part of ICANN. So say that one part of ICANN approves and the other doesn't it's be strange (sic). So as I understand the new process is intended for those registry agreements which were executed after the transition. Am I right?

Russ Weinstein: Not quite actually. I think the way it's been carried out pre-transition and post transition is actually identical. The registries always had the obligation to go take those tables to the IANA repository themselves and publish, something I'm personally not a big supporter of. I think we can better serve you by the GDD handling that for you is one of the ideas in my head. But in terms of was the data different pre-transition to post transition, no. The same process existed. The same obligation was there. The gap has just gotten wider.

Paul Diaz: Jennifer?

Jennifer Chung: Jennifer for the record. So we just want to know if you have coordinated with (Samrad) and the IDN groups before? Okay that's good because they're actually discussing this issue so - of those scenarios two and three were consulted first with them as well.

Russ Weinstein: That was actually the source of...

Jennifer Chung: Okay.

Russ Weinstein: ...of discovery.

Jennifer Chung: Okay.

Paul Diaz: Yes and Russ for the group -- this is Paul for the record -- some of our colleagues that are real experts in this are not necessarily in the room today so your request for volunteers will be taken to list. We will get - we do have a talent poll that can assist with this. Question?

Atsushi Endo: Yes Atsushi Endo from JPRS. I understand what you mean at the published in IANA repository but the - could you clarify what you mean? It's a table codified in Exhibit A of the RA. Then is it possible that the - each registry operator can - I mean it - I mean just 13% or 46% how to find it? Thank you.

Russ Weinstein: So in the new gTLD the agreement on Exhibit A we list if the IDN services is one approved and how it will be carried out, how variance will be handled whatnot. And then two we list all of the tables or languages or scripts that are approved for that registry it operates. So that was what I was describing as codified in the agreement. Memorialized might have been a better term.

Atsushi Endo: So that the exhibit is some like a IDN services Japanese or Korean or Chinese. Does this mean that in this codified in Exhibit A? I think that it's kind of a table is coupled with the RA it's a misunderstanding of things.

Russ Weinstein: Yes it's not the tables themselves that are listed in. It's the languages or scripts that we've approved - or sorry about the miscommunication there. Thanks for clarifying.

Paul Diaz: Okay Maxim (unintelligible).

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, small follow-up which question. How to identify if our TLD is in like green or gray or red basket? Is it possible to know somehow?

Russ Weinstein: Yes I think we have the data and we can share it. We were - so I - as I said I think we can send targeted emails to the batch two. We can even send them to batch three. I guess we just didn't want to scare them into going and doing something before we came together as a group and thought about what the most efficient solutions to that problem is. So this is just us trying to work together with this group and not dictate something. It is a contractual obligation when we think there's an opportunity to maybe do something more efficiently.

Paul Diaz: Thanks. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Paul, Donna Austin from Neustar. So Rubens I might need your help on this one. I think during our worktrack or the subsequent procedures update Rubens put up on the screen some contract language associated with asset requirements that also go to the IDNH question. And it's - and I'm not sure if you know what I'm referring to Russ so I might need to rely on Rubens to be more clear about it. But it seems that some language has been developed, contract language that if you submit an asset on IDNs. And I think there's a couple of other things that there is some standard language that you've developed around that.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl here. Those are the (domain) templates for commonly requested registry services.

Donna Austin: Could you explain a little bit more about where that came from and how long it's been sitting out there?

Russ Weinstein: Sure. So where that came from that was one of the things as we've been working on an RSEP improvement activities with the working group from this organization we've been working real hard internally to think through ways to

make RSEP more efficient and leaner. And one of the things we noticed is over the last couple of years most of the RSEPs are falling to a common category. They're things that are occurring over and over and over again.

And one of our goals in authorizing the services is to have common language where we can where it makes sense so that it can be more uniform for the registry operators, be more uniform for ICANN to enforce against. And so these were all just sitting in all the various agreements. And we had templates internally but we didn't share those externally. So we just wanted to share those externally to help make the filing of an RSEP a little simpler. If you know the service you're doing is really just a copycat of something that's already out there in the industry that can be part of the RSEP questionnaires dropping in that language that will end up in Exhibit A or contract through an amendment. That's all that is.

Donna Austin: So it's the language that can potentially appear in the RSEP and also follow the adopted in that contract as well?

Russ Weinstein: Yes that's correct.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks Russ.

Russ Weinstein: Okay. You can skip ahead pass this next slide and maybe go to - go on the following. So the next thing I did want to talk about related to IDNs was the IDN implementation guidelines are currently in progress of an update. Those are documents that are - that's a document that's incorporated by your contract, incorporated into your contract by reference for most registries and most registrars so that's a big deal for you imposing obligations.

The activity that's underway right now is a community working group that's being facilitated by GDD staff (Samrad) and (Petinan) from our IDN program are facilitating that working group. But it's a volunteer working group working

on updating those IDN implementation guidelines. And that work was requested by the GNSO a couple years back I believe.

What this IDN implementation guidelines talk about our requirements and recommendations for second level IDN registration policies and practices. And so I just wanted to make sure - I know this group is aware of it because you have participated in the public comments and we thank you for that. I did want to offer if there's any need for further facilitation between this group and the working group. We can offer our support to make sure that your concerns are being adequately addressed and heard. But I don't think it's a problem. I just wanted to make sure and flag it.

There was a session yesterday about this work that hopefully people participated in. And then there's a session tomorrow afternoon I believe about the IDN program over all where this will come up again. So I just want to make sure and give this group the awareness and an opportunity to participate in this as it is things that will become obligations in your contracts and so the more participation you have up front the less challenge we have to implement those after the fact.

Paul Diaz: Okay.

Russ Weinstein: I had...

Paul Diaz: Yes please go.

Russ Weinstein: Yes. Let's go ahead to the survey topics. Okay so wanted to give a quick plug to the Contracted Party Satisfaction Survey that's now open. This is a follow-up activity from the survey we ran last year. It's open to all the registries and registrars on the primary contacts of those organizations. And it closes on 13 April so please submit your feedback. We appreciate all the feedback we got last year.

Just a reminder this is a survey that's conducted by a third party for us, the MITA Group. They anonymize the results before providing it to ICANN. We've shared all of the data from the last year's survey. It's on the GDD Metrics Page. And those are all linked here for your review.

What we did with that survey data last year was after we've analyzed it we put an action plan together then we presented it in Abu Dhabi to this group and subsequently published as well.

And what I thought might be helpful is if we ran back through that action plan that we presented. And they're just going to talk through some of the things we've done since then to provide an update. And we can make this a conversation. It doesn't have to just be me talking. So hopefully things are resonating and things are continuing to improve. That's the goal of this.

One of the genesis of this activity was the love letter, affectionate love letter from last year. So this is important for us to continue to monitor the satisfaction of the contracted parties and figure out what we as GDD and we as ICANN as a whole can do to continue to improve the quality of this relationship and the quality of the experience you have working with ICANN.

Next slide. So there are four main themes in that action from the data we saw where needing to obtain better understanding and improve our knowledge of how registries and registrars function and how the marketplace functions as a whole and the challenges ahead of you. How the - to increase our sensitivity to global, regional and local issues that impact your businesses and your communities and how that interacts with the ICANN organization.

Our communication where often the feedback we got was it's very matter of fact and doesn't provide contacts and rationale. So trying to increase that in our communications and increase the quality in general. And then focus our efforts on improving the quality and design of the solution so that they are simple, easy for you guys to adopt and implement and make sense. So those

are the four kind of key themes. And now I'll give you guys the update of what we've been doing to try and work towards these improvement in these areas.

Next one. So better understanding of the marketplace and the business and regional sensitivities. What we said we're going to do is up here. And the things with checkmarks are things that we've already got in progress. The day in the life on the registry side we haven't had a chance to do that yet. It's it is still something we'd like to do is to get out and see you guys more. We've done it in a few years back but the team's turned over a little bit since then so it would be good to get back into the field and really understand and how the registries do their business, how they implement the obligations that are in their contract, what causes challenges.

The Registrar Team has done this a couple times already and so I will give Jennifer her credit on that front. They're doing well at this and have really positive interaction when they have done it so it is something we still would like to do.

We have had we've hired a few folks from the industry, Jennifer Gore, being one of them over the last couple of years. And her and her team have put on several trainings about the DNS, the domain market and registrar activities and the registration lifecycles to try and help improve overall knowledge not only with the GDD team but just what goes on for the whole staff so that ICANN as a whole is getting better sense of awareness.

We've had people from the GDD participate in non - in just non-ICANN events including the Internet days up in Stockholm Sweden and some events in Turkey and NamesCon in Vegas and we're developing - we've developed some internal mechanisms to better share knowledge, market intelligence as we call it across GDD so that it's getting to the right sources and people are better informed as they interact with all of you.

We're also actively working with our Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, the team that's run by Sally Costerton's organization to better find ways to work together so we can extend the reach of our engagement activities and better serve you where you are. Next? And is there any feedback yes?

Paul Diaz: Yes. Donna please?

Russ Weinstein: Yes.

Donna Austin: Thanks Russ, Donna Austin. So just on the - I know that you're in session yesterday that we had on more kind of issues of a new gTLD registry operator. We did that as a conscious effort that we haven't been good at informing the community about new gTLDs and how they're operating. And the (Katy) yesterday was really more focused on, you know, what does success look like and some of the challenges and some of the surprises that the registries have gone through.

But I just wonder moving forward now that your team was in the room whether there's any value in us continuing a series of that kind of theme that would be helpful for your team in understanding? And perhaps it might lead to better communication between the two of us as well.

Russ Weinstein: Yes absolutely Donna. And that session was fantastic yesterday by the way. I learned so much and I was talking with my peers and we all learned quite a bit so thank you for those if you participated in that and put that on. I think that was a really great initiative that you guys championed there and hopefully the community found value in it.

I think continuing the type of activity would be great. We try to encourage the engagement managers for each of the accounts to better learn the stuff about their accounts and be able to now bring that back and share it. But if there's opportunity for this group as a whole to talk about it I think that would be fantastic.

Cyrus Namazi: And if I could just add to that, this is Cyrus. I think - thank you Donna. I found this session to also be quite informative and not just for us on the staff side but also I think for the community to get a better sense of what's going on in the gTLD space, TLD space really as a whole.

And to that end we're also working with your leadership and the leadership of the Stakeholder Group for the registrars I think you know to actually get a session scheduled during the board workshop in Vancouver to sort of have, you know, the same theme and the same type of informational presentation to the board members who are rather - some of them rather remote from the space that we're in to help them get educated be more informed so that when we go to them and you go to them with your request and your ask they're more sensitive to and informed about it.

Donna Austin: So if we did the next one on IGO acronyms that would probably be timely would it?

Russ Weinstein: So on the theme of improving communication, that was certainly one of the things I wanted to highlight that Cyrus did. Thank you for bringing that one up. And we've been trying I think making a conscious effort to try and provide better context and rationale and been really trying to leverage the relationship we have with this group and with the registrar group to keep each other informed to identify issues before they become crises and try and figure out solutions.

And I know I feel like Paul and I are - have a really strong relationship right now and our sharing things on a pretty regular basis. So I feel like we're getting better here. I'm sure we're not all the way there and would welcome more discussion on this topic. One of the things we struggle with is we send a lot of communications out through mass emails to all of you on various topics. And we continue to struggle with is it better to send targeted emails that are only focused on one topic at a time or is it better to bundle those

communications into more of a weekly blast where there's several messages buried in the one? And I get mixed feedback so if there's anything you guys can do to clarify preference on that we'd be happy to listen and incorporate it. We're just kind of testing and tinkering right now trying to find the right balance because there are a lot of things we want to tell you but we don't want to overwhelm you at the same time.

Paul Diaz: And we can't tell you all of them. Any questions? I mean we're kind of cracking through this. It's good with everyone?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: No concerns?

Man: More (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Yes okay let's keep going then.

Russ Weinstein: Okay and then the last one is how do we design better solutions and tools? And, you know, we've got the feedback in the past that let's work together. We've designed better solutions when we work together and not just you identify a problem, staff huddles and pushes out a solution that we think addresses the need. But let's work together to develop that solution.

So we've been actively trying to do this this year quite a bit. I think the RSEP improvements activity that keeps progressing is a good example of that collaboration. The RDAP pilot another one and the process for changes to Spec 12 that we've been working on with (Craig Schwartz) and the community TLD working group that's currently open for public comment I'm sure you know is another example where we're really actively trying to work together with you.

If there's areas where you think we should be working more with you on something please let us know because I think we're really open to that. So I just wanted to check in on that front.

Paul Diaz: Okay not seeing any questions, hands but I would echo that on a number of issues we have had much improved communications but it can always get better, keep working at it.

Russ Weinstein: So that was the end of the update really from the action plan. I know you had identified that you wanted to talk about it I think on your agenda so is there something I didn't cover that you wanted to address or are we aligned?

Paul Diaz: Sure let's open it up. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Paul. Donna Austin and thanks Russ for the update. One of the things that was in the love letter was a suggestion that when the board approves and I can't remember the language specifically but it goes to the point that we're getting to a little bit of a challenge when it comes to the implementation of policies. And I think some of the language in a board resolution is that the CEO is directed to direct staff to implement policy or something. And we suggested some subtle changes to that because we weren't I don't think we were comfortable with that approach.

On the council I'm very much aware at the moment that the IRT on PPSAI has reached - is having some challenges. And again it's around that, you know, whether something is policy, whether something is implementation. I think we still have some challenges around that. And maybe we need to have a bit more conversation about, you know, how do we resolve those issues earlier rather than later.

And just on the process for change for Spec 12 I mean that became a real challenge in some respects because from, you know, obviously from (Craig)'s perspective and the community TLDs and I think from the registry perspective

so this really a contract issue. So we were really confused about why we had to go back to the council and see whether this was a policy or implementation issue. So there was, you know, that blurring of lines is really challenging.

And I have to say between (Craig) and I that, you know, the back and forth and then the engagement with council and the council didn't know why it was coming forward and I couldn't be very clear about that either. So I think that's still an area where there's some greyness around it. And maybe it's something that we need to just continue the dialogue so that we're a little bit clearer about these things moving forward. And also that we have early identification rather than leaving it to, you know, everyone is getting frustrated. Thanks Russ.

Russ Weinstein: Yes thanks Donna. I think that's all fair criticism and identification of issues. I do agree we should keep talking about implementation and when and how that gets phrased. I think for the first part of that the language you recommended to the board maybe that's another good topic for you guys to bring up when you're face to face with the board, you know, as staff as the organization we do the wishes of the board I guess or the direction of the board. So that seems like a good area to continue the dialogue with the board and with Goran and his assessment of what the staff's role and versus the organization or versus the board and the community. I know a lot of work has been put into that project trying to outline the steps and who has got the action at any given point in time in the process.

Paul Diaz: Excellent thank you. Other points to raise? (Nadia), Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry this is Jeff Neuman. So other points to raise on just this action plan or on the topics that we have?

Russ Weinstein: Mine was just this action plan or the love letter if there was something missed. I know that was flagged as one of the things you wanted to talk about. Okay.

Paul Diaz: Okay all right why do we keep going then?

Russ Weinstein: Okay. Then I think this concludes the material I had put together. The last - this was the appendix that I'd referenced earlier. It was more for your reference not for big discussion. We already had some good discussion on this topic. But the last item I think I had flagged that we should probably check in on is the terms of use for the Naming Services Portal. So we've been working with Jeff, and (Christina), and with (Sam) and the Verisign folks over the last several months trying to work towards an update to those terms of use that are currently on the portal.

                    I think we've made a lot of progress. I think we're down to one issue related to liability. There's a pretty tight legal issue from my understanding of it. And Jeff and (Christina) I'll probably turn the table back to you guys to see if you want to provide a more substantive update?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks this is Jeff. I'm looking is Kristina here?

Woman: No.

Jeff Neuman: Oh so she's at - okay so then I'll take it. And so I think it's actually a good time to start bringing things back to the stakeholder group. I think as Russ said I think some good progress was made. We added certain things about like requirements if there's a security breach in the protocol and there was also references made in - to make sure that this doesn't override the registry agreement. So there's still some good language in there but there's still a provision that members of the group are having difficulty with that basically says that we waive the right to basically bring an action in any kind of court or legal tribunal. So basically you're waiving the right to sue them to sue ICANN.

                    There was a suggestion in the last version that they could put something in the agreement. And this is going to be very legal but it's basically asking for

something called specific performance which is asking ICANN to do what it says it's going to do in the contract. So you're not suing for damages for money but you're - if there was a legal action it would be suing to get ICANN to do what it's supposed to do in the contract.

The - some of the members of the group raised the issue that that's all well and good but if ICANN has already breached the agreement then damages have already been incurred. And to not be able to go to ICANN to get any kind of monetary relief is not something that they think was fair or was something that members of the group feel that there should be some repercussions if ICANN breaches other than just forcing ICANN to do what it's supposed to do.

And that's really where we're stuck. There's - the some of our members of the group have said that they would rather operate as they do today with just using email then to agree to terms and conditions that do not allow registries to go after ICANN because - or based on anything. So it's really it. So I think over the next maybe couple of days if that's where it's stuck and that's the one issue I think we'll come back with kind of a written explanation to the group as to where we are what the issues are and basically every registry is going to have to decide for itself whether it wants to take on that new contract language for the terms of use or not.

You know, I think there are definite good reasons for us to have a portal. And I think it'll ultimately at the end of the day make it easier for all of us. But that said, you know, totally understand why registries may not want to sign on to another document that doesn't allow - basically doesn't allow you to go to court or any kind of legal forum to recover damages. So I think that's where we are.

Paul Diaz: Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Jeff. This is Cyrus. I just I'll leave the legal sort of debate for the lawyers to have. I just wanted to perhaps help reset us on what it is we're trying to do. We're trying to actually put I think a very useful tool into practice for both you and us so that we can get our work done and provide better service to you. And I fear and I wonder whether we're beginning to miss the forest for the tree to sort of dig so deep into some of these provisions.

And I wonder also that, you know, by not signing up to presumably the terms of use that we've it's been what almost six months, seven months we've been debating whether you're actually having more rights frankly use the email tool because I think the portal and its terms of use actually affords the users more benefits and more protection than just using email. So I'd like to sort of highlight all of these trade-offs and also remind you that this is taking quite a bit of time both on our side and your side to sort of get into this level of, you know, holding ICANN's back to the wall for something or I'm not even able to articulate from a legal perspective what the deal is. And I don't want to get into that. But let's just make sure that we also give the big picture a proportionate amount of focus and trade off.

Paul Diaz: Sure. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. And Cyrus this is - I don't think anyone's is disputing that the portal is going to have some great benefits for both of us. And I think the issue of seeing the forest through the trees I could say the same thing to ICANN right? There's very few contracts between legal entities and I'm not talking about between like you bring up all time Apple and I music right or iTunes. This is not a business to consumer product. This is a two entities dealing with each other as opposed to a business in a consumer.

So we could easily say the same thing that, you know, ICANN all you have to do is take out the provision that you agree not to sue and we're done. That's it. So the agreement not to sue for anything is was holding the entire thing up. And I don't want to get into a debate here because I think the fix is easy but

it's just it's not fair to say to the group that we're missing the forest through the trees. So I think it might be both sides that may be missing the forest through the trees. Just thank you.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba.

Paul Diaz: Please go ahead Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. As I understand in the current registry agreement and the amendment the word portal is not used. So actually and formally we don't have to use it. And when we don't even have it actually and it's from the legal point of view. So I suggest that we either continue or to revert to like proven old standards of (unintelligible). I hope we do not resort to faxes.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Other points to make? Russ, did you have more? Should we keep…

Russ Weinstein: I think that's kind of where we are. Thanks for the update Jeff. And again I think let's keep in mind this is the tool we built to make our work together better, easier, more predictable and so you can see where the process things are going and it's more secure. We have signed up to the added security protections and notifications and things. So we made a lot of good progress and we're down to this one pretty fine point issue. And so I think we're still trying to assess should we just kind of stop and let registries decide for themselves at this point or should we keep trying to negotiate to this final point.

And I think we're kind of on the fence of let the registries decide individually and then maybe see where we're at after that. Just one point I should mention is about 50% of the registries have accepted the original terms of use. So it I don't want to give the impression that nobody is using this portal. About 50% of it of the registries are using the portal.

Paul Diaz: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Russ. I do think there's a lot of - I haven't seen the portal yet
                  because we haven't clicked through. But I do think there are a lot of benefits
                  at least from the descriptions are of what's in there. So, you know, we do look
                  forward to using it. And again there were some great changes in there and I
                  think we've worked in good faith. But that provision basically says just to put it
                  in perspective like in layman's terms that we've given you all these things in
                  the agreement all these rights and it's a great agreement but you can't
                  enforce it at all.

                  So that's why there's an issue. So right if you can't bring an action and there's
                  nowhere to get relief then all of those great protections are just out the
                  window in theory. So that's what it comes down to. And I look forward to
                  using it because I do think there's benefit. So I hope we can fix that.

Cyrus Namazi: And yes I don't think ICANN has the same interpretation that they can't
                  enforce it. I think having a monetary enforcement is different than being able
                  to enforce it. And I think we're committed to living up to our obligations in that
                  agreement they're all things that we're able to. I think there's a difference
                  between a monetary enforcement and a rectifying an issue which is
                  something we often seek in our agreements is for both sides to be able to
                  cure before an escalation.

Paul Diaz: Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, about the features of the portal. Before the release it was a
                  better stage better one better two and we sent quite list of things which
                  should be changed. For example currently a registry cannot change mobile
                  numbers of the escalation (persons). And it's quite important that ICANN can
                  call the person in charge of like escalation for DNS services, et cetera. But
                  people they can change numbers they - it happens that you have something
                  different in your pocket then it was a year ago.

And do you expect that during GDD Summit we will hear something about developments and changes because basically almost all responses after the data was no, no, no we will not develop it. Now maybe it's sometimes maybe later. So is it possible to expect that during GDD Summit we will hear like what's there? What is going to be changed in which direction, et cetera, or something? Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Maxim. Chris, please go ahead.

Chris Gift: Yes this is Chris Gift with ICANN org. Yes we'll provide an update at the GDD Summit. I can also say that we are working hard on the self-management self-contact management of the contacts to allow you to update your, you know, contact information mobile number, et cetera. We should have news with that within the next - soon. But we'll have a fuller update at the GDD Summit. And we do have a team dedicated to enhancements on the registry portion of the naming services portal. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Chris. Hey and can I just ask anybody who comes from like (unintelligible) to tap Stéphane or Sam on their shoulder as I'm going to get whiplash twisting my head around seeing if anybody's there.

Man: He'll be there.

Paul Diaz: (Unintelligible) definitely. All right should also note two things administrative things myself. I've just pushed to the list our TechOps group sent in a letter to ICANN just before we came here, travel to Puerto Rico. And the group remember this is more technical experts amongst registries and registrars who identified concerns specific to transfers and opposed to GDPR implementation period. So the letter is there just for everybody's understanding recognizing we wanted to get it on - the concern on the record. It's a call for dialogue with staff.

As part of the all of our thinking about all of the things that need to happen around GDPR just want to make sure that we have a place point. As we said repeatedly everybody seems to be focused on Whois but there are many other issues. This is one of them. And the TechOp group, you know, has been really good at bridging the two stakeholder group's interest and then pushing some output out.

Similarly I will push right now trying to stay off email and focused on the meeting but I will share with the list. The RSEP group discussion group met with Russ and his team on the weekend. Staff has a proposal for a new way to approach implementation. RSEP not new updated proposal. The Drafting Group is very encouraged by this plan and we're going to, you know, share with the list. We'll discuss it in more detail during our sessions later this afternoon late morning early afternoon.

But I just wanted to be clear. And, you know, to the point made earlier this is an example of the communications the post love letter where we're trying to work closer together. And, you know, it seems like an area where we are making progress but absolutely want all members given an opportunity to look at it, digest it, a number of people have had experiences, mileage may vary any concerns or whatnot this is not final by any means looking for input from the group. We'll get back to staff and take it from there.

Russ Weinstein: Great thanks Paul. And then the one last thing since you brought up the TechOps group and the GDPR issue is we are having a session on Thursday. I think it's just before the public forum I want to say 1 o'clock for an hour where the goal of that session really is to make a working session with the contracted parties as the target audience and pull out more of these items that need further discussion and figure out what the right way to go from here to implementation is going to be.

So we're well aware that it's beyond Whois and that there's a lot of detail that needs to be sorted out. And we're going to try and talk through some of the

questions we already know about and pull more of those from this group so that we can get a plan together to figure that out and close it as we work towards implementation as a group.

Sue Schuler: Paul, just as a correction that meeting is at 12:30 on Thursday.

Paul Diaz: Thank you.

Man: Thank you Sue.

Paul Diaz: All right we're coming up on time so we actually did quite well managing the clock today. Any last word any squeeze one and in the minute we have or so? All right with that then, you know, Russ, Cyrus, Akram, staff but other staff thank you very much for your time today. Obviously ongoing discussions you know where we are so two-way street right?

                 And with that we need to take a short break for technical reasons. While they switch things over everybody to grab something to drink, bio breaks what have you. We start up again at half past. How long is the break? Okay so we have to 10:30 but we will start promptly. We're going to have some guests coming in. Thank you all.

Sue Schuler: Thank you. You can end the recording.

                                    END