

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
GNSO: RySG Membership Meeting Part 3
Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 12:15 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://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Stéphane Van Gelder: Everyone, if I can get you to finish up your lunch and we will pick up the agenda again with working lunch sessions. And we'll start with the CSC part of those updates. I think Donna is still finishing her sandwich. So, we'll switch to Elaine and then go back to Donna if we can do it that way.

Elaine Prais: Thank you. I'm Elaine Prais and I am one of four members appointed to the customer standing committee. Cal is the other ROISG member that was appointed but he's not here in person.

So, one of the things that we have to do is provide an update to the ROISG about the work of the CSC and I thought Donna was going to go first. She's got a nice slide deck which will fill out a lot of details. So, if it's a bit sparse, it's because she's probably got a lot more to share than I do.

So, the CSC, a lot of the work that's been done in the last couple of months since our last update, we've moved forward with the remedial action procedure document. So, if there is a failure of the PTI, we now have a final draft of the remedial action procedure document which will be reviewed and hopefully approved by PTI board very soon. I'm not sure if it's this week or not but - so that's in play.

Then we also have a - in your final version of the SLE change procedure. So, when the CSC was created, there was quite a bit of interaction with what was IANA step at that time, now PTI, about what the service level agreements and expectations should be based on a year's worth of measurements for the services they were providing at that time.

Some of the functions they performed, they didn't have a full set of data about what the service might take as far as timeline goes. So, we just gasped in some places or maybe figured it would be around five minutes when, in fact, it's closer to seven. So, we decided that we need a lightweight process for changing the SLEs that wouldn't require a change to the contract.

So, we have a - we now have a document that informs us on the process of how to make minor changes to the SLEs and then if it's a little bit more of a major change, bringing it in front of the ROISG or ccNS, so for approval. So, that's near completion.

On Sunday, we had - our member meeting and reelected Byron Holland as the chair. He's the ccNSO appointed member. He's been a fantastic chair for the last, almost two years and will continue to do that for another year.

Then Cal was nominated and elected as the vice chair and Cal, we stagger the terms so that the first group of members would be a three-year appointment or a two-year appointment. Cal's appointment is up in October. So, he will need to be reaffirmed by the ROISG to stay in that position and hopefully that happens because he's been a fantastic member and is the Vice Chair at this point.

Something that we're working on right now with PTI is cleaning up a new addition to the monthly report which reports on the time that it takes for the legal generation rules to get reviewed and added to the repository for IDN tables. So, we're looking at gathering data. There are two metrics. One is the time it takes IANA to review and assess the request and the other is the

time to actually implement, so how long does it take them once the request has been reviewed to publish them to website. And we're going to measure that by time per actor because in a lot of cases, an idn table or (GR set) will come in with a missing header or they'll name the script the wrong thing or use the wrong language code for it.

And so, there's a lot of back of forth and we didn't want the PTI to be punished because of the time it takes to communicate back and forth with the registry operator on the tables.

So, that's our current work. That's the status of the group. we're enjoying a very friendly relationship with PTI and a really cohesive membership and I think it's all going very well and I'm quite pleased to be able to participate in that. So, any questions?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Elaine. Perhaps if I can to Donna first and then open it up for questions. Is that - is that better or...

Elaine Pruis: (Unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Right. So, let's open it up for questions first to Elaine, if anyone has any. It looks like you gave an excellent report. No one has any questions. So, Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Stéphane. Donna Austin, and thanks to Elaine for the update. I just want to remind folks that the importance of the CSC in the context of the potential to take the IANA function away from ICANN. So, the CSC is really important in that regard because they are the ones that if they see that the performance of IANA is starting to lag or they're not happy with the way that that is being managed and they identify, you know, systematic issues, it's the CSC that can come to the registry stakeholder group for the GNSO, ccNSO councils and say we're not happy with how this is going. We want to trigger a specific review.

So, I just wanted to remind folks that it's great that the CSC is working as well as it is. They've developed that relationship with the PTI and everything is running smoothly. But if we - if they - in the event, if there's any deterioration, it's the CSC that is able to trigger a review that could potentially lead to the removal of the IANA function from ICANN.

So, I just wanted to make that point that, you know, it's terrific, this is going really well but we need to be mindful of the important role that the CSC actually fulfills in terms of post-transition IANA. So, thanks, Elaine and Cal, for the work they put in to it.

So, the - in the bylaws and also in the CSC charter, there was a requirement to review the charter up to 12 months of the CSC having its first meeting. So, you may remember that the registry stakeholder group supported Keith and I being involved in that work along with Adela and Martin Boyle from the ccNSO.

So, we've been doing this for, I don't know, a while now. We're getting to the point where we're close to finalizing report with recommendations and I hope that we'll be in a position to post that for public comment, apparently coincides with (the basis). So, I think we're looking around the third of April to get that report out.

Sue, could you go to the next slide, please? So, the purpose of the review is to establish where the charter provides some basis for the CSC to performance responsibilities as envisioned in the IANA transition and the scope of the review is, you know, similar to above. But, really, it's just - to ensure that the chart is working well. We're not getting into effectiveness of the CSC. This is really about the charter.

There are a few things that have come up as a result of our discussions that we will put in our report as recommendations. But I just like to flag here for

this group that there are - there is a requirement for CSC effectiveness review which is supposed to start October this year. There's also an IANA function review that is - review that's supposed to start around the same time. And there will be implications to the registry stakeholder group in terms of we're going to have to provide people to do that. So, that's just a marker for folks.

Next slide, please, Sue. You can - next one. So, the major findings that will be reflected in the report is that in our mission and scope or responsibilities, the CSC shouldn't be expanded. So, in discussions that we'd have with the CSC, they're pretty happy with how it was scoped and how everything looks at the moment. They felt that if there's - we did have some discussions with folks who thought that it would - because the CSC is so good at what it does, that maybe we should expand the role but the CSC itself felt that if you do that, then you take away from what they're doing and why they're doing it so well. So, our recommendation is that the mission and scope stays as it is.

Next please, Sue. In terms of the membership. So, when the CSC was designed, there was a fair amount of discussion around the membership structure so we have the direct customers. So, Elaine and Cal and the two from the ccNSO, they're the members of the CSC. There is a liaison from the PTI that forms that membership and then the FOs and ACs can provide liaisons to the CSC and they have all done that with the exception of the ISO, I think. I don't think the ISO has a liaison to the CSC. So, they've all done that.

So, in the conversations we've had with the CSC that the membership is working well and that the structure that we have outlined seems to be no need for change. So, we're not going to recommendation any change to that.

Next slide, please, Sue? If anyone has any questions along the way, just raise your hand.

One of the things that the CSC requested is within the charter, there's a requirement that the CSC inform their stakeholders three times a year and that was based on the current - the thinking was that is similar to what Elain has done here today that it'd be an opportunity to inform the registry stakeholder group at each ICANN meeting. Recognizing the second meeting of the year now is the policy forum. It doesn't - our thinking at the time doesn't necessarily makes sense anymore. So, we will be reducing that requirement to at least two per year.

One of the things that - Jonathan was one of the interim chairs of the PTI board and we had a conversation with Jonathan and Lisa and one of the concerns that they raised was that there's no real form - former recognition of the relationship between the CSC and the PTI board. So, one of the things that we will try to capture in the charter is that there'd be - that that'd be explicitly called out. So, we'll be doing that as well.

The charter also doesn't prescribe that the CSC provide months of reports. It says that it has to meet monthly but it doesn't actually prescribe that the reports be done on a monthly basis. But given that CSC is actually doing that now and it seems to be working pretty well, we will actually include that or recommend that that be included in the charter.

That frequency of CSC meeting, currently - it's - they meet monthly and the CSC should, you know, that's been terrific because in the first 12 months, they've been doing a lot of the establishment and their operating procedures and those kinds of foundational documents so they're meeting every month has enabled them to get through that work.

We're not going to suggest any changes to that monthly schedule in this review but it could be something that if the CSC felt that, you know, that should be changed overtime, then there is a mechanism within the charter that CSC itself could suggest that as a change, albeit they'd have to go through a process to do that.

Next slide, please, Sue. Elaine touched a little bit on this. So, one of the documents that the CSC itself has been working on and working with PTI is the remedial action procedures, so there's a requirement within the charter that PTI and CSC work together to develop a remedial action plan and that is to address any performance that becomes in the view of the CSC a systemic issue and there's a - the procedures that they're developing is kind of an escalation path for if they - if their PTI is not being responsive, then it goes to the board - the PTI board.

If the PTI board is not being responsive, then I think it goes to the CEO. And if that doesn't work, then it goes on to the ICANN board.

So, those procedures, I understand will be considered by the PTI board this week and if they're approved, then our intention is that there'll be - we'll reference those in the charter and then there'll be a standalone document.

Elaine also touched on the changing initially procedures and so this - if you want, there's a heavy-handed approach to changing the SLEs. But as Elaine recognized, the system matters, you know, changing a requirement from 5-7 minutes, then what CSC is proposing that we incorporate into the charter is that the - that bailout (unintelligible) identified the process to do that. So, we'll be capturing that in the report as well.

Next. Thanks, Sue. These are observations that as a result of that conversation. So, the potential overlap of the CSC effectiveness in the IANA function review. So, we'll be making a recommendation that, you know, when that happens, the consideration be given to ensuring that there are synergies between those two reviews or even making it one if that makes no sense. It's just that the timing means that there'll be two going on the one time and that didn't seem very efficient in terms of resourcing.

The travel support which is a very topical issue, one of the - one of the, I guess, the tactics that we use when we're developing the - is CSC in the IANA transition work was in order to address - to ensure that the composition of the CSC was a small group rather than a large group, we recommended that there be no travel support and that actually help the cause and they weren't too many people coming forward, so to be - for the CSC membership.

But what we recognize is the CSC itself, use the ICANN meetings for face-to-face meeting, so that they could progress the development of their operating procedures and the other work that we hadn't anticipated.

So, while we not going to codify travel support in the charter, we will be recommending that understanding that there'd be no travel support provided to the CSC be lifted and that the CSC can, you know, of their own accord, request travel funding note through the normal processes.

Next, please, Sue. I think that's all we've got. Keith, do you have anything you wanted to provide in any of that.

Keith Drazek: I do not.

Donna Austin: Okay. All right. So, our next steps, as I've said, we'll have to be publishing the report in about 2X time. That will be open for 40 days then it comes back and we'll review the comments and then submit the final report to the ccNSO and GNSO councils for adoption.

So, there's no requirement for board approval on this. The charter is - any changes to the charter, that's should be improved by the ccNSO and GNSO accounts. And so, hopefully, we'll get to that May-June timeline for that.

So, that's my update, Stéphane. Anyone's got any question?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Donna. Any questions, please?

Okay. Donna, thanks very much. Elaine, thank you. And we'll go to Paul and the RSEP update.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Stéphane. Paul Diaz for the record. As I've noted earlier this morning, I've since posted to the full stakeholder group list the proposal from staff that they sent to the drafting group.

As noted, we had a face-to-face session with them Sunday morning here in Puerto Rico, went through some issues. As I've said, this is a working draft. Absolutely looking for members inputs. Those in the drafting group think this is moving very much in the right direction but I'm sure there are edge cases and other things we still need to work out.

So, I'm asking everybody on the list, please, share your thoughts, concerns, things that we may have missed. If we can get that by the end of this month and I deliberately pushed that far out so that we'll have our next biweekly call pertaining to trash things out on the calls. We don't want to do it just on the list, get back to staff and take it from there. I doubt anybody's gotten into it but if there are immediate questions, happy to answer.

Back to you, Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Paul. So, let's go to Marc for the RDAP pilot.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Stéphane. This is Marc Anderson.

I want to provide a couple updates - a couple things sort of everybody should know about what's going on with the RDAP pilot. We met on Sunday, I believe, it was here at ICANN61 where they - a good meeting of the discussion group. But sort of where we're going from here and that was one of the main, sort of, takeaways, I think, from Sunday's meeting.

So, there was agreement on direction there to move forward. And so, the focus of the group is to take the existing pilot and separate out all of the policy items that are intertwined within the existing profile and focus on a new profile which we're going to come and put the new name for because we don't want it to be confused with the ICANN created profile.

So, we're going to come up with a new name and define a profile replacement that will focus entirely on implementation, removing all the policy aspect that were sort of intertwined with what the stuff developed profile.

And which was also one of our key concerns and complaints with the original (unintelligible) profile.

So, that's going to be our focus moving forward. To accomplish that, the discussion group agreed to start meeting weekly. So, IATFs next week following that though are going to start meeting weekly, focusing on creating a new yet to be named profile replacement which is just about the implementation of RDAP.

One other thing of note, I think, that's worth passing along, make sure everybody's aware. Cyrus was in attendance and has - has communicated, you know, sort of privately and to the group that he's disappointed with the lack of progress.

And so, he's been critical of the progress made so far. I think some of that's warranted. We got off to, admittedly, a slow start. And so I think some of that's warranted but, you know, in my opinion, I think some of that is also underestimating the complexity of the matter.

You know, my two cents on there but I think it's important that numbers of the registry stakeholder group be aware of that criticism out there.

So, I think that's my updated. If anybody has any questions, happy to try and fill them.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Marc. I have Keith and Jonathan.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Stéphane. Thanks, Marc. I'll be a little bit less diplomatic than Marc just was and I think, really, this is a call to action for contract to parties broadly, I think, registries in particular at the moment to participate in this pilot to get involved and get engaged.

You know, we pushed back on ICANN last year and said that we didn't want to accept their profile and it's incumbent upon us now to engaged and to get to work and to deliver something that it - suits our interest and our needs.

So, you know, (Cyrus's) criticism, as Marc noted, is probably somewhat warranted but it's also potentially positioning for ICANN to try to continue to drive its previous profile. And so, we need to get involved in this pilot.
Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks for that clear warning, Keith. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Thanks, Marc. Thanks for that update. I guess, I was just wondering if you were able to give some examples or just sort of get a little bit more color in the picture of what the two - what a - what characterizes the ICANN profile and what might characterize an alternative profile.

I don't know how easy it is to do that if that's - how technical that is or if you're able to do that. I think that would be useful. And I guess Keith sort of answered my - dealt with my second question which is really going to be, you know, what were to ICANN's concern, what would they like to see different? What do they - they're sort of pushing for? But it sounds like, perhaps, potentially a - excuse me - a reversion back to the ICANN developed profile.

Thanks, Marc.

Marc Anderson: Sure. Marc Anderson. A couple questions in there. So, stop me if I don't answer them properly.

But, you know, as far as the profile itself goes, I think it's first important to keep in mind that the RDAP specification itself is not specific to the main name registries. So, it's a Registration Data Access Protocol. It was written by the iatf to be much more generic than just something that would be used by domain name registries.

So, the first thing to understand about the profile is that there is a legitimate need to specify how a domain name registry would implement the RDAP profile. The other thing, I think - and again, I mentioned this a little bit but one of our key frustrations with the initial profile that staff developed is that sort of took a look at what are all the existing who is policies. And really, there - there are very few policies so they looked at contracts which is where the existing WHOIS specifications are wrapped in.

And they took all those and wrote their profile to include all of those which creates a very rigid structure. You know, if you're doing sort of a - if you're doing a static one-time implementation of who is using the RDAP profile, that would be a very effective way of accomplishing that and that maybe is what they set out to do is say, Okay, let's take the existing, you know, the existing situation and implement it in RDAP. And that's what we pushed back on. That was what we had concerns about.

So, really, the that was what we had concerns about so really the intertwining of the existing status quo with WHOIS into what really should be just a playbook on how to implement RDAP if you're a domain name registry is what we're trying to accomplish.

Did I get your questions there?

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. That was very clear. I think that's very helpful.

Marc Anderson: Great. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks to you both. Any further questions? Okay, Marc. Thank you very much.

We'll now move on to Maxim and the SSC update.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Short update about SSC. GNSO Standing Selection Committee. It's finished recommendations about SR2 review team because one of the members decided to just stop doing that. Actually, they were not doing anything because of the halt of operations. But, yes, it was what it is.

And the selection was made between two candidates and in your recommendation, it was (unintelligible) been raised as the recommended person but selection committee does only, like, review and the recommendation letter to the GNSO council and it's only up to the GNSO council to decide what to do next.

And it was a suggestion to have something like a hot seat for the next (rating) candidate given the letter from GNSO council which actually suggested that more members required for the review team.

And there is only one thing which is on the table right now Standing Selection Committee. It's required review of the charter. The first initial draft which was composed by the secretarial staff from ICANN had some item we decided not to agree with. It was the shift from the (full consensus) because in SSC, members represent constituencies. And only two contracted - yes, if we go to voting, only two votes from contracted houses - from contracted house and the number of members is nine, so if we decide, for some reason,

to agree to (not full consensus), then registries and registrars will not matter anymore.

So, we decided not to do that as registries and things for consensus was required, no change - this change was denied.

The second thing was small change of text about the member which is assigned by constituencies and it was from constituencies to allow constituencies to send someone on their behalf. Maybe, they trust this particular person to be able to represent their views fully.

And the - one of the additional topics was adding some language about ex-officio member from GNSO council. Actually, liaison-like role, just helping members of (a seat) to understand what does it mean, usually, in GNSO council environment when we have some questions which are not necessarily relevant to the current position but just to understanding of how things are done, what to expect and things like that.

And it was added suggestion because not all SSC members were - how to say, able to vote and to participate in selection fully that the constituency has to provide the replacement in such cases.

A more clear length, which about the term of members, so it's one year and can be two terms in a row. And the current item on which everybody (is stuck) is the process of exchange information where the candidate is for - for example, there is a selection brought to us for something and there were two ideas. One of those two mimic what NomCom does, so information in (and out) until the final selection, but there were concerns about the transparency because all medians are recorded, e-mail exchange is available. I mean, what was on the least is available and when.

And we're commanded to just add disclaimer saying that whatever selection committee is find, it's a preliminary selection and each - it's to be provided to

the GNSO council and only GNSO council makes the final selection (to the station) where the candidates going to be frustrated because by the fact that preliminary selection was indeed favored and suddenly, it was changed, that's it.

So, since there is no pressure in terms of time for the change of charter, the committee meets each two weeks, but in situation where time is of matter, it could be, like, daily. So, that's it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Maxim. Any question? Yes, Keith?

Keith Drazek: So, thanks, Stéphane. Thank you, Maxim.

I don't have a question. I just wanted to thank Maxim for his time and efforts on the standing selection committee. It's an important role. It's influential responsibility.

As coming out of the recommendations associated with the empowered community and the accountability reforms that this is basically the group that appoints members to review teams and a number of different components. And so, thanks, Maxim.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Hear, hear. Thanks, Keith. Donna?

Donna Austin: Yes. Thanks, Stéphane. Donna Austin. And I support with what Keith has said. Maxim has done us proud in this group. He' really protected our turf, if I could put it that way. So, we thank Maxim very much for that.

I just - going back to the conversation we had about reviews earlier, I'll just note that sometime ago, the SSC actually appointed members to the ATRT3 of which Stéphane was one and we're in that unfortunate position where that - where it hasn't kicked off primarily for two reasons. The first was that not all of the SO/ACs were able to fill the slot so I hadn't got around to filling their

slots and then with suspension of the SSR2 work in work in Abu Dhabi, there seems to be a reluctance to move forward with ATRT3 while that is in a pause mode.

So, it's unfortunate. I think the council leadership reached out throughout nominees and said, you know, thank you for your patience for trying to keep you informed on what's going on but this is a - it's a real problem, you know. I don't know how long ago that was done, Stéphane, but it's many months now and we've got people on hold.

So, in terms of the reviews and other things that are going on, this is a real problem, I think, for as we can expect Stéphane to hang around for the next two years waiting to start a review team. So, it's a bit of a problem. Thanks.

Yes. Thanks, Donna. That's a good point.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Just an update on that, what I've been told at this meeting is that we should expect, at least, another year of waiting. That's a nonofficial update that was given to me. I don't know if it has any basis. In fact, but - it is slightly uncomfortable as someone who's volunteered for something that was supposed to happen a few months ago to - as you say, have to sit around.

Sam told me earlier on that none of us are getting any prettier. So, I guess that should apply to me. Thanks, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Stéphane. So, yes, Donna's comments reminded me of the RDS review team and that I understand there. We saw some recent communication, I think, and somebody correct me if I'm off-base here that - from the ccNSO who had the initial stage had decided to hold off on appointing anybody until they saw the charter to determine whether they wanted to appoint any members and they have now decided having reviewed

the charter that they don't that presents a situation where that rds review team is not fully complimented up to them - potential of 21.

And so, I guess, it's an open question whether it's for us on council or whether it's the standing selection committee, you know, do we want to try to do something about that? Do we want to try to augment that team with folks from the GNSO or just sort of an open question we probably need to follow up on. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Keith. I see Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think we could suggest not mentioning those review teams they scrutinize as active during the financial discussions when they say we have none of them coming. I think we need to start correcting them saying if you are going to spend money on working review team, what, in particular, you are doing with those money when nothing is done?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Maxim. Good question. Anyone else on this? Maxim thanks very much. Let's move on to David and the cross community working group on accountability.

David McAuley: Thank you, Stéphane. Hello, everyone. My name is David McAuley, the registry stakeholder group appointed member to ccwg and Accountability. And I just want to point out - I'm a little bit sheepish to make this presentation because in the other side of the room, there's Thomas Rickert who has been co-chair of CCWG accountability since the beginning. And so, hat off to Thomas for his excellent work in this respect.

So, I thought it would be a good idea to come to the group and give a brief update as to what happened last Friday. We had a plenary meeting last Friday here in San Juan. And you probably saw my e-mail that was on list just before that meeting, setting up what was going to happen and it pretty much happened the way I thought it might.

There are now eight subgroups in CCWG and they have all finished their work on their sub - their subgroup reports and all of those reports have gotten through two readings. Previously, we didn't address this Friday. Previously, we did SO/AC accountability that was done. And one important principle that came out of that is that SO/AC accountability, the principle of accountability is to whom it is recognized that the accountability as to that constituent groups constituency which is good thing.

The good faith, what is called the good faith groups, did their subreport, their subgroup report. That group had to deal with the requirements to qualify for indemnity if somebody within the empowered community gets involved in the process as trying to remove a board member. Suffice to say that if someone acts in bad faith in that respect, they may not look for indemnity very successfully.

The human rights group finished and they did what's called a framework of interpretation for interpreting the new bylaw on human rights and they maintained as they should the rubric in the bylaw that the requirement for ICANN and the respect of human rights is with respect to internationally recognize human rights as required by applicable law, so that's good result.

And the transparency group subgroup report was done and there, they'd have a series of some 20 recommendations, many of which deal with making DIDP request actions more transparent, more open which is also a good thing.

Friday, we finished off the ombudsman subgroup report diversity. Good news is there will not be an office of diversity. I'm sorry, that's good news in my perspective. There are diversity standards but suffice to say, I was happy that there was not be a new office.

Staff accountability. We finished. And then jurisdiction, we finish with two readings on Friday. The jurisdiction group, the outcome of that is that there is - the report suggests, and that's the verb that's used, we suggest that there'd be further discussions within the ICANN community surrounding issues of jurisdiction that certain participants were unhappy with.

And four government participants objected to the report. Brazil, France, Iran, and Portugal. And those further discussions would be outside the purview of the ccwg for accountability.

Now, what's happening is staff is taking those eight reports and they're going to put them in the pot and stir them together and come up with one report. And that report will be then issued for public comment and the public comment will really be focused on, and this will be the direction, really focused on internal consistency and coherence of bolting these together. It won't be a substantive request for comments because that's been done over the last year and a half.

The group also approved a statement that it is plenary that even though CCWG for accountability will end at ICANN62 and there is no funding in the next fiscal year for his activities, there will be a standing committee that will continue on of the leadership which is the co-chairs of the group and the rapporteurs and their mission in a sense, will be to help the ICANN community and the ICANN staff and board implement the recommendations coming out of Work Stream 2.

And that's going to be quite an undertaking. I was just in the ccNSO meeting with the board and (Shereen) commented on this. Working on implementing the outcomes of Work Stream 2 is something that's going to hit the board and the community and the ccwg for accountability will not be there to do that.

And I think I've covered everything. If anyone has any questions, I'd be happy to take them. But that's a high-level summary of what happened last

Friday. We're really done, but we have to get through the next round of public comments on does our report put everything together correctly and then we'll blast is and send it off to the chartering organizations and the board in June.

Stéphane Van Gelder: David, thanks, very much. I should also recognize Thomas is in the room. Thomas, if you want to say a few words, your welcome.

Thomas Rickert: (Unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Perfect. Thank you, David. Any questions, for David, on this matter? Donna, please?

Donna Austin: Thanks, David, for the update. So, I don't want to - I have a question for you as it relates to the independent review team panel and setting that up. So, I think it was about six or eight weeks ago, I attended a call for SO - well, I had to use this term now - the SO/AC data (where we can also utilize the) header.

There is a requirement that the community has to come together to establish the independent review panel and there's no process to do that. There is a session on this on Wednesday afternoon but I wondered if you could just give us a little bit more background to that and the reason I think it's important for this group is setting out the independent review panel is going to be really important. It will require that the panelist themselves, in my mind, requires specific expertise.

I am hesitant to see this go down the path of SO/AC leaders sitting around, just looking at CVs to work out, you know, who's qualified to do this job. I think we need outside expertise on this one but I'd be interested to see what or he - what other folks think in relation to that but you didn't give us some background.

David McAuley: Thank you, Donna. I'm happy to do that. Apologies for not mentioning it. The IRP has since sort of decoupled from the cross-community working group but we are the IRP implementation oversight team is a team that I lead and we are still working under - we've now been adopted by a bylaw, basically.

But it's a good point that you raised, both the importance of the standing panel and the hesitancy of - or the concern about it's not well-organized right now. So, what's happening is under the bylaw, the new IRP which I think is extremely important because this new body which is the top formal rest - dispute resolution body within ICANN before you go to court, this is the end of the road.

These people will have the power to issue decisions that have binding - set binding precedence. It's a big deal and the fact that their binding the early decisions will be more important than later decisions. And so, the first standing panel is that much more important.

Under the bylaws, the implementation oversight team is not formally involved in setting up the standing panel. The SOs and the ACs are together with ICANN, meaning board and staff. And it's an important process. The meeting that Donna mentioned is tomorrow at 5 o'clock in the afternoon in Room 202.

It's very important for SO/AC leaders to be there. It's beginning the process of understanding what's involved and how will we organize around picking members for the standing panel. It will be somewhat unformed. I think it's an ICANN session, the ICANN legal and ICANN policy are leading it. I will be there.

It's going to be extremely important. It's the beginning of the process of organizing ourselves around getting a standing panel. There will be some

pressure to get the panel soon which is really going to be quite an intensive process.

So, it is important. It is complex. They will be helped and it will be needed. And I have encouraged members of the IOT team to help their communities and help anyone that asks, really. We should all be involved in giving advice.

As I've said, we're not formally involved but we certainly know what's going on and we are developing some expertise around the bylaw.

By the way, if you want to know about standing panel, just go to bylaw 4.3 and the standing panel's in 4.3(j), I believe, and it's not that long. It tells you what's going on and there's a lot left to initiate - to develop, if that's helpful.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Stéphane, and thanks, David and Donna, for the question or the - raising that - flagging that concern.

As Donna noted and as David, the bylaws are a little bit vague in terms of process and procedure around how the standing panel is to be appointed. But it's clear that the SOs and the ACs, through its leaders, have a role and an important role. And ICANN staff and board will be involved in that discussion but I think it's very, very important as we move forward to ensure that the SOs and ACs retain that role and don't give it away, you know, if it's a question of finding a facilitator or some - someone that can help work through the process, that's one thing. But I think it's critically important that we, as the SOs and the ACs, you know, as registry stakeholder group through the GNSO, that we pay attention to this, that we contribute and that we make sure that, you know, that this very, very important standing panel has done - is established appropriately. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Keith. I see Jim, Donna and then we need to move on, I think.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, thanks. Jim Prendergast. David, just really quick. Process of identifying potential panels. I believe there was only an expressions of interest and that was a year or so ago. Has it progressed beyond that or...

David McAuley: That brings up a good point, Jim. And Keith and Donna mentioned, actually, I'll be a little bit more crisp.

The SO and AC's job is to nominate the panelist. ICANN has no role in nominating panelists. ICANN's role is to help the SOs and ACs gather the applicants. And you're right. There is an expression of interest mechanism. The expression of interest has not yet been released and I think that - I personally think that makes sense because the process to vet the applicants is not in place. It would not, in my opinion, would not be a good idea to go and ask people to apply and then leave them in limbo for a long period of time. And so, I think that makes sense.

When the expression of interest which is basically ready, when it's released, it will be a public doctrine around the world and you'll have applicants submitting their CVs and their statements of interest and will request, you know, - there'll be some questions to answer. And those will start coming in and that pile of documents will be handed to ICANN and the SOs and the ACs.

Jim Prendergast: So, just a quick followup. So, then it's probably incumbent upon the stakeholder group to do what we can to publicize that call for expressions of interest amongst we - parties that we may...

David McAuley: Absolutely.

Jim Prendergast: ...identify.

David McAuley: It's critical. You're right. Absolutely.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Let's - so, Keith, on this.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thank you, Stéphane. Just one quick followup, David, and you help me understand this when we discussed this in more detail, you know, I guess last week is that the standing panel is it seven or is it nine?

David McAuley: Bylaws say at least seven. It could be 77 or is it at least seven?

Keith Drazek: Okay. So, at least seven members up to another number and that as in the IRP today that from that group of seven or more, the panel, for any particular IRP, would still be three, is that correct? So, just maybe it would help everybody to better understand exactly that process.

David McAuley: Okay. Again, you know, very good point. The standing panel, this body of panelists will be at least seven, it could be more and they will have terms of office of at least five years.

And an IRP case will be heard by three panelists. The claimant will choose one ICANN that will choose one of those two who will choose the third from the standing panel.

And it is - at this point I should note that there is a mechanism to appeal a decision from an individual IRP panel and then appeal would go to the full standing panel.

Stéphane Van Gelder: All right. Donna, quickly please and then...

Donna Austin: Yes. Thanks, Stéphane. Very quickly. One of my concerns with this scenario, I know that we - within agreement of this organization. I don't dispute that.

My concern is that conversations we had within the GNSO leadership is maybe this is something for our standing selection committee. I don't think that's the case. I think this is more important than that.

Not to discount any of the work that the SSC does but I think this is a completely different role in identifying and understanding what the expertise that is required. And that's why I think we need actually some kind of expert help in that regard in selecting these panelists because my concern is that, you know, if it CSO isolated and I don't actually subscribe to that view.

But those that actually do that selection, it's going to be really important that they actually have the expertise to understand what their reviewing and have them selecting.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Donna. We'll close this off, Maxim. We need to move on and say thanks to David for highlighting some very important points we need to keep watch on.

Just on the time, we have roughly 50 bit less minutes to go through the rest of this section and then we need to be in Room 104, which is the registrar room, for the 2 o'clock part of this agenda, which is the CPH meeting.

Just so that everyone keeps that in mind, we will need to move rooms at 2 p.m. when we go and join the registries. So, let's now turn back to March. I believe Paul sent the letter that the TechOps drafted on transfers and the GDPR this morning.

So, if you've not had a chance to look at that yet, it is on the list. It's a short document that makes two main points which I'm sure are of interest to everyone in this room. But, Marc, let me turn it over to you.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Stéphane, and being cognizant of time, I'll give the short version of the update. But a good lead-in, I think the hot topic really in the tech ops group has been that letter.

Transfers under GDPR particularly the concern from registrars that they'll have a reduced amount of data to work from has been, you know, a hot topic for them for a while and, you know, certainly very concerning to registrars. And so, the purpose of this letter was two folds. First is to sort of raise awareness with ICANN and their GDPR interim policy of this issue around transfers and the second was sort of proposed potential solutions that could be incorporated into the interim model.

I think nobody anticipates that these would be final solutions but they're intended to be a starting point for the discussion. So, this came together rather quickly but I think it was a really good effort. A lot of collaboration occurred on this and then I saw a letter that went out. Akram has acknowledged it and said it will be posted to the GDPR correspondence page.

A couple - two items I'll also mention about the TechOps group. These are both items that have come up around GDPR. The first is something that's come up a lot in discussion and it's around the email contact field, the email registrant contact field and alternatives. So, that being anonymized email or a web form.

And this has come up on and off in the TechOps group and, you know, I think probably everybody in this room is aware but, you know, it's the overwhelming opinion of everybody in the TechOps group that the web form approach is the preferred approach for contracted parties.

I haven't heard anybody in the contracted parties in favor of the anonymized email approach. So, I just sort of throw that out there in case there's any

disagreement or any question about that. Certainly, from a TechOps perspective, the web form approach is preferred.

The other item is there's something that's come up a little bit but it hasn't really been - it hasn't been or really been explored in a lot of detail. But in the interim model, there's a provision for registrants who want to publish more than the minimum data set.

And so, there's acknowledgment that there has to be a way to support that and that's fine except there isn't really a mechanism to do that within the existing framework of registries and registrars. There's no way under, you know, the existing EPP implementations for registrar to specify, Okay, this is data that a registrant wants to have disclosed as opposed to data that falls under the minimum data set that wouldn't be disclosed under the interim model.

And so, this is a topic that maybe make sense for a TechOps group to consider and something we discussed a little bit with the other members of the TechOps group. But I thought that was germane considering the state of things for GDPR.

So, I think those are sort of the main points of interest on TechOps right now. Again, maybe the short version but I'll leave at that for now.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Many thanks, Marc, for being brief on that update. I have just a small question. Understanding the TechOps as a registry and registrar group. Has there been discussion or have the registrars alluded to the fact that if you're looking at the mechanisms for transfer that are compliant with GDPR we're obviously looking at gTLD space, but there are various methods currently in use and the ccTLD space of the registrars will no doubt have to contend with. Is that something that's been discussed at all?

Marc Anderson: Absolutely. It's Marc Garrison again. Yes. That's certainly been mentioned and there's a wide range of implementations in the ccTLD space. Some of them good, some of them not as good. But certainly, looking at existing implementations in the ccTLD space is something that's come up.

If you look to the letter though, registrars are proposing an approach that is intended to be an interim approach that changes the existing IRTP as little as possible and trying to comply with the spirit of the policy but still be workable under GDPR. But they also recognize that a long-term solution is going to be needed which probably involves revisiting the IRTP.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Marc. Any further questions? Marc - sorry. Go ahead.

Woman: Hi, this is (inaudible) security registry. I have a question about the last point that had been raised about the interim model provision for registrants that want to publish more than the minimum data set.

It wasn't clear to me from reading ICANN's interim model as to whether there's actually requirement for registries to publish that information or if it's only on the registrars to provide that option and then some means of doing so. Was it clear to everyone else that there needs to be publication by the registries if there's option because registries wouldn't control the disclosure to the end registrant?

Samantha Demetriou: My impression is - sorry, this is Sam for the transcripts. My impression from reading it was because there was also - the interim model has the requirement that full FIC data be transferred up from the registrar to the registry that the data would be transferred and the consent would also have to be transferred.

However, the way that content would be, you know, codified between the registrar and the registry and what would happen in the event that content

was withdrawn, our implementation issues are still a big question mark at this point.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. So, Rubens, sorry.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. On the disclosure part, just to remind us of that protocol already specifies a disclosure clause. So, it's not that something that was not foreseen. It was actually added the specification to European ccTLDs - business European ccTLD registries a long time ago.

It's just that nobody ever implemented that. So, registrars don't implement that. Registries don't implement that. But it is foreseen in the IT - EPP specification and our contract say that we abide by that specification.

So, we might not go too far saying that we don't implement because that's actually requirement of a tech offer in ISC. So, we might not look to use that as an excuse.

Marc Anderson: This is Marc. So, I guess the - in giving the short version, I cut out the part where I said the discussions are around the EPP disclosure attribute. It's an optional element under EPP and as you pointed out, no registries or registrars to date have implemented that optional feature.

But the discussions within the TechOps group are around how you would implement it in a way that makes sense for GDPR. So, yes, you're hitting the nail on that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. So, thanks again, Marc. We'll move on, Kristina, on the Naming Services portal terms of use.

Kristina Rosette: I don't know that there's anything really new to report since our last registry call. We've been waiting to hear back from ICANN. I think that's really about

it. I mean, I didn't - you know, personally, I didn't think (Cyrus') intervention this morning was particularly helpful.

So, I'm going to be curious to see what happens when we do have an opportunity to sit down with (Russ) and the others. I know that I don't know if Beatrice Su from VeriSign is on or if any of the folks from VeriSign is present with her but I know that she had some particular views on some of the limitation of liability, excuse me, language that that ICANN is now pushing hard for.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you.

Crystal Ondo: Thanks, Stéphane. Crystal Ondo. I just wanted to bring up in the registrar's stakeholder group, (Jeff) brought this up as well because ICANN is launching their version of the NSP soon and it sounded like from (Graham McCauley) that they're just going to pop on the registry train. So, whatever we decide, they will accept as their terms as well. So, we're fighting the fight for both parties.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. Okay. So, GDPR, Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Stéphane. Paul Diaz for the record. There's an awful lot of oxygen being consumed by GDPR now. I'm not going to try and summarize to bring everybody up to date. I hope you attended the cross-communication session and all of the other discussion around GDPR.

But I did invite Thomas Rickert to join us today because, you know, obviously, one of the key experts working very closely with contracted parties and Thomas needs to help us focus on sort of expected next steps on prioritizing what is we need to do, where we need to go. So, Thomas, please.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Paul. Hi, everyone. Now you've heard (Gerand) speak to the Calzone Model as well as Cherine who spoke about it and (JJ) offered

additional information during another meeting that I attended yesterday in the Middle East forum.

From what I understood, ICANN's leadership say is that they said we've done this as much as we could with the production of the Cookbook and we're now waiting for guidance from the Article 29 group. And I think that this expectation that the Article 29 group will come up with advice that can be implemented will probably be disappointed.

So, the question is what do we do with that because the Cookbook, despite all the progress that has been made with that document, is very patchy. It does not offer too much legal explanations that can be assessed by the contracted parties.

Let me illustrate that with two examples. ICANN proposes to have a retention period of two years beyond the registration period of a domain name and they justify that by saying that this is in compliance with European data protection laws.

Well, I'm not aware of any such law that would say it needs to be two years, right? I'm not saying either that it's not possible to accept those two years beyond the registration of the domain name.

So, you could, for example, say that during that period, most disputes occur or that after two years, the claims against the contracted parties will be bought by statute. But you have to explain why it's two years and not six months or five years or 10 years, right?

So, obviously, there's some information missing there. Same would be true for the required collection of all - of the (sick leave) data. Just saying that you want to leave that to the community process and that you keep collecting it because you've done that for the last couple of decade is not good enough for justification for data processing.

So, the question is what do we do with that and my proposal is, and I have discussed with the registrars a little bit earlier today, that we would take what's in the Calzone Model or in the Cookbook for that matter and that we would fill in the blanks.

That we would come up with what we think is an Okay way forward hoping that the contracted parties can reach consensus on that and then we would go back to - and say, well, we do not think it's realistic for ICANN or the Article 29 group or the government to come up with responses early enough for the contracted parties to implement any such solutions but that we're going to say, this is going to happen and this is what we're going to implement.

That might be quite restricted model but it can be loosened up if and when the government or the Article 29 group gives us a legal basis for being it more - for it being more loose, right? So, as you know, we've done a lot of consultation before we issued the data model which we called the playbook and we're not going to dwell on the playbook any further because obviously ICANN is not inclined to work on the basis.

But we've asked members of the public safety working group, we've asked law enforcement representatives, we've asked government representatives if you want your - if you want what you've asked for in your letters, how can we make this legally work and there was actually no response, right?

So, I think chances for the government to miraculously come up with a comprehensive model and explanation that are quite slim. So, my suggestion to you is let's try to come up with something that very soon maybe within the next 10 days and if we reached consensus amongst the contracted parties present this to ICANN and say, Okay, this is what's going to be implemented until such time when tangible results from the public sector that can be taken on board in order to change the model.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Thomas. I'm fearful of the amount of discussion this might generate in the short time that we've got left. But nonetheless, I will fearlessly ask the question, any further questions on this?

Liz Finberg: Hi, Liz of PIR. So, I guess I have two questions. One to Thomas' last point which is the chance of the Article 29 group actually giving us some real actual answers are slim to none, is it possible that it's - that we won't get answers at all and the reason why I'm asking that is it seems to me we're sort of asking them for an advisory opinion, right?

Like if we did this, would it be Okay, right? If you asked that at least to a judicial body in the states, they'd say, we're not going to tell you. So, that's one question.

The other has to do with this something very specific in the Cookbook itself and I just want to make sure that I read it and understood it correctly. It has to do with in the interim model, you know, a tiered access regime, I read it to say that during the interim if contracted parties wanted to take the risk and grant tiered access again at their own risk to third parties, they could come up with their own method for doing so but that they would be equally within their rights to insist on a court order.

And I'm wondering if I read that correctly and if that's the way you interpret it. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Yes. So, your first question I think that the chances for the Article 29 group to give you answers on the basis of what's in the Cookbook now are quite slim because the Cookbook doesn't offer any legal rationale despite ICANN saying so but I think it's too patchy. It's too little information for DPA to actually go in and say, Okay, this is Okay or this sounds wrong.

And this is why I think the contracted parties should step up and offer those explanations and then probably chances are higher for the DPAs to say yes or no to it. You know, since (Johan) had said that everyone should be reaching out to Article 29 by themselves.

I think should we succeed in coming up with something with the consensus position amongst the contracted parties then we should reach out proactively to the Article 29 group and ask for advice. You know, I guess that can increase chances for us to get information. And I don't - I would need to read the Cookbook again but from memory, my read is exactly as you described it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Guys, I know there's a queue but I'm actually going to cut this off now because there's no way we'll make the rest of our agenda and I want to be fair to everyone that we've outlined the speakers. There is an admin method that Paul wants to get to and then we'll resume.

Paul Diaz: Just to everyone and, Thomas, I'm not even sure you're aware of this, they've all just noted, I pushed the list. There will be an additional GDPR session tomorrow morning just to stay for the agenda. Yes. Can't get enough, right? From 9:30 to 10:30 up in Ballroom A and I'm not - there are no further details, just a session.

Hopefully, it's more in depth, drilling down on some of these issues that we're discussing now but further opportunity to engage. So, tomorrow morning, please. I've realized last minute notice but try to attend if you can.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Paul. So, thanks to you both, and Thomas for that update and obviously, this is an ongoing topic that we did spend all day on. Unfortunately, I'm going to have to cut it off here.

I don't see Jeff in the room on subpro. So, I will move on to, I don't know if it's Marc or Chuck that's doing the RDS PDP update.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Stéphane. Let me start with two things. Thanks for lunch and thanks for nominating Marc on the working group list. I asked if there are any objections. There were absolutely no objections to adding Marc to the leadership team.

In fact, there are several people who went out of their way to express their appreciation for that action because from the beginning of the working group, Marc has been a very active and constructive contributor. So, he's already active on the leadership team and I for one as the chair really appreciate that. So, thank you for that.

I'd like to be able to tell you that we've made a lot of progress since the last ICANN meeting in Abu Dhabi. We haven't - we've met some, Okay? We're now up to 49 rough consensus agreements that will help us moving forward but it's slow.

And what's the reason for that is not our charter, it's not the huge task, it's the same thing that has haunted WHOIS decisions since almost the beginning of ICANN and that is people who are entrenched in their positions and their main function in the working group is to advocate their positions.

And so, I still have to get approval from the leadership team, including Marc, Okay, but we're going to try something that came out of GNSO session Sunday morning that Donna referred to earlier with regard to improving the PDP process and it revolves around the concept of a commitment to work towards consensus, not just advocate your position.

So, we're going to try that. There are several active working group members that are here today and you know who you are and I know you are and I thank you for your active and constructive participation.

But we have a lot of members that aren't active at all and some of you are probably here today, too. But we're going to probably ask for a commitment

to working towards consensus and not just advocating one position without listening to others in doing that.

So, we'll be trying that, again, assuming support from the leadership team and we're having a meeting on that tomorrow morning and see if we can turn a corner and start making a little more steady progress. Just as a quick update, the two areas - good areas where we made progress in the last couple of months is that we reached rough consensus on two purposes, for collecting some RDS data and those two purposes are domain name management and technical services resolution, which probably are - don't come with any surprise to you.

They're pretty straightforward and so we did reach agreement on that. When we try to get beyond those is where we got stuck again. And so, hopefully, in the next few weeks, we can do some things that may be help us start to make a little more steady progress then I'll stop right there.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Chuck. Any questions for Chuck? Okay.
Chuck, thanks again for your work on this and thanks, Marc, for also picking this up.

I don't see Dennis in the room so - he is.

Dennis Tan: Hello, everyone. Dennis Tan for the record. So, on the IDN guidelines working group, so just as a way of quick context, IDN guidelines are it's our obligations up on registry operators who offer IDNs at the second level.

So, any registry operator that offers IDNs by way of the registry agreements, Exhibit A for those that are new TLD registry agreements have to follow IDN guidelines. So, the current version is number three and the working draft is carrying over many of those obligations on the working draft.

But there are new ones, new obligations and the most notable ones are without going much into thing or detail but it's harmonization of variant rules across same-script IDN tables. An example is that in the Arabic script is - Arabic script is using many Arabic languages.

And so, if your registries are implementing language-based tables, you are required to harmonize, have the same variant rules across this table so that you don't have variant labels going to different registrants. And when I speak about labels, that means that two domain names that are deemed the same.

The other obligation - new obligation is the implementation of RFC 7940 which is basically the XML format of IDN table. So, the working draft if approved by the board will require registry operators to use these new RFC XML format to publish IDN tables.

And the other one as of yesterday, the working group wants to increase or require action from registry operators to mitigate computable labels. That personally I find it troublesome because that is an open door to making variance of zero and Os, the Ls and ones variants of each other and to manage that is just a, well, slippery slope as they say.

So, those are the things that are now open on discussion. We provided comments to the first public comment period for the second one and this is still in flux. So, I'm here to gather feedback, take it back to the working group and implement things that are reasonable and we are, you know, we can actually implement it without getting these things out of control.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Dennis. Any feedback for Dennis? Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. I think the suggestion could be before implementing pie chart themes like saying that L and one or O and zero are (bad) things and we should remove it from Internet.

They should be just an estimation of damage done to the current registrants in the (world). Maybe medians would suffer, who knows. So, the cure shouldn't be worse than the disease. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Maxim. It's Paul Diaz for the record. I just want to note that Edmon put in the chat, the label generation rules required only for new tables. The existing ones can stay as is.

Dennis Tan: That's correct. Yes. So, the requirement will be up on new tables and the existing one is going to be up to the registry operators to migrate to. But for the new tables, their requirement will be to publish those in the RFC 7940 format.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Thank you very much. Thanks, Dennis. Let's move on to or not, I don't see David. Okay. So, we'll move on to the public comments part of our agenda. I sent an updated matrix yesterday to the list. I hope some of you have time to see it and I've asked Wim to go through some of the comments that we have ongoing or some of those comments that we need more participation on. So, Wim, over to you. Thanks.

Wim Degezelle: Thank you, Stéphane, and hi, all. Happy to be here. Let me quick go through the list. The first on top is the proposal for Korean Root Zone Generation Rules.

I didn't receive any or didn't see any interest in the comment. So, for that line is on Saturday. So, most of us will be probably still on the plane or traveling. If no further input or nobody sense that that is important I think that's when we'll close.

Marc Anderson:: This is Marc. Just to jump in real quick. Dennis walked out of the room I guess but...

Dennis Tan: Yes?

Marc Anderson: You're still here. Dennis, you looked at it and you don't have any concerns or need for comment on the Korean Root Zone Label Generation Rules for you?

Dennis Tan: Yes. I reviewed the Korean table. Yes. We don't have any concerns.

Marc Anderson: Okay.

Dennis Tan Or I don't have any concerns.

Wim Degezelle: Okay. Thank you. The next on the list is the plan that was submitted to restart the root zone rollover. The document is relatively brief. It says they want to go back with the plan from last year and do it again and spend a lead - sorry, take the plan of last year and spend some more time on - some more efforts on outreach.

I don't know if there are any particular issues. If not, I'm happy to start - draft the brief comments saying that the registry stakeholder group is supporting the plan. Should there be any issues, please flag them to me or jump in direct on the comment. If not, I will draft something very, very short like that.

The next comment on the list or the draft, procedure for community gTLD change requests. There and I looked to create - I found in my notes of registry stakeholder group call. I think it was one from 7th of February that there was some discussion and some agreement that the registry stakeholder group should put in the comment where their central points that the change request should be considered as a contact issue and not a policy issue.

I'm looking around and this is - I noted that correct and looking forward it there are other issues, please.

Craig Schwartz: Hi, Craig Schwartz for the record. So, I don't recall the conversation on that date about the registry stakeholder group submitting a comment. So, if maybe someone could refresh on that, that would be helpful.

We as FTLD have already submitted comments and I think some other community-based registry operators will. It sounds like the nature of the comment that might come from the stakeholder group is slightly different and putting out what you just said about being more of a contract matter than one related to policy.

The comment period is open until April 2nd as you noted. I'm happy to help with this provided the stakeholder group feels that it's important to do.

Paul Diaz: Yes. It's Paul Diaz to jump in. I forget the specifics. I'll take your word for it, Wim. The present or the history is that the stakeholder group usually will not comment on a period when it involves individual members.

We encouraged the members that you've already said. But we will comment on the overall process around it. And so, maybe that's where we came up with this idea.

A question I have for you, Craig, is given how long this was taken and all the blood, sweat, and tears, (kind oh have) - kind of negative towards staff about how they handle this and I think since you're hopefully getting close to the finish line, we don't necessarily want to, you know, throw rocks at staff now.

I'm not sure if you would - what your recommendation might be be whether or not we should talk about the process around how we got to this place this point in time or not.

Craig Schwartz: That's a fair point. I think that something view this substantially negative at this point would mock up the process. That's not to say that if there are

significant concerns that we shouldn't do the right thing and make your position known.

Yes. It's kind of - it's a little bit of a tossup and I'd be curious to know what other people have to say about it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: This is Stéphane. Is that the way forward where - a possible way forward one where, Craig, you might draft something generic that you'd suggest to us and then we can perhaps put that on the list and see if it elicits any further comments on that just to get the ball rolling?

Craig Schwartz: I think that's fair and in our - in FTLD's public comment, we did basically say there's already provision in our contract that should enable us to do this. So, reiterating something to that effect would not be inconsistent and would still get your point across.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Just to point out, you have to turn off your mike when someone else speaks. Otherwise, the camera gets lost. Wim, back to you, sorry.

Wim Degezelle: Okay. Thank you. So, looking for further input on this one, the next one is the uniform board member integrity screening process. So, as the question if anybody has input issues or would like to lead on this, please let me know.

It is due this 17th of April. So, there is some time. Just a quick - I already mentioned at the last call a quick reaction on the previous comment, the due date is the 2nd of April. Don't forget. It's the day after Easter. So, I would say take three to four days from the deadline to be sure.

Paul Diaz: Excuse me, Stéphane. Jumping again, it's Paul Diaz. On this uniform board member, look, this particular process, the paper that is put out was a direct result of the board seat 14 nominee this time around. It does apply to the full board and it's an attempt by ICANN to make more consistent the way that they pre-screen or vet incoming directors.

Our director one could argue is she could have been in the same boat. Becky could have been in the same boat as (Sarah). But the criticism so erase the way the process went.

I chat with Becky very briefly about it. She's very supportive of this. In fact, she'd be perfectly happy if anybody has to go through this new screening process.

I might encourage everybody to take a quick look at it just to make sure that we're comfortable. It could be very short. We support this process, efforts by ICANN to be more transparent and accountable and just to make sure there nothing in there.

We have some time to figure. It's not due until mid-April. But just understand the background and that, you know, but for one year, it's different. It might be our candidate that we put on the board that was the focus of this attempt, this initiative.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Paul. Stéphane. Just to add some more context to that that this process is actually - the word uniform comes from the lack of uniformity on screening for board members that are chosen by the NomCom and screening for board members that are chosen by the community.

So, up until the incident that Paul referred to, no one had apparently realized that whilst the NomCom board select this offscreen and due diligence, that does not happen for the rest of the board.

So, there's also that context that we might want to add to it although I'm not volunteering myself to add to this comment. I'll happily work with you, Wim, if you need that context. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Stéphane Van Gelder. So, I agree with everything you just said. I just want to back up a couple and say that I'll volunteer to provide some input on the case KSK rollover comment, Okay? Thanks.

Wim Degezelle: Thank you. The next on the list is the project for the name collision study. Yesterday, I think there was a cross-community session and I note - took notes from I think Maxim, Ruben and (Jeff) that had made some remarks there.

So, I hope I can turn to the three of you to help me with the draft and thanks.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl here. Definitely yes.

Wim Degezelle: Thank you. And then the last comment is the one on the reserve fund and the proposed strategy to replenish. Discussion already started on the list and I talked to Jonathan who want - is happy to take the lead on this comment and I don't know if you want to say few words.

Jonathan Robinson: I mean, I think it would be great to get some other contributions. I'm happy to make sort of initial skeleton draft. I mean, it seemed to ne there's some pretty obvious points we would want to make there.

So, either happy to put an initial pen and papers to make a strawman comment then get people's feedback or take input immediately. I mean, we've essentially already got the thread going and please, you know, just contribute and let myself and/or Wim know if you are interested in, you know, participating and contributing.

I expected maybe similar contributors to the budget group but, you know, anyone is welcome if you had the opportunity to read it and form a few.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Thanks very much, Wim, for that update. Thank you to Keith, Rubens and Jonathan for volunteering. Please, everyone, do continue

to look at the matrix that we send at regular intervals. It is updated on the -
by Sue on the members section of our website as well. Every time I send a
new version, that goes up on the website.

And we are always looking for people to try and help Wim and I fill in the gaps
in that matrix and provide drafts.

Kristina Rosette: Thanks. This is Kristina from Amazon Registry Services. I noticed that the -
there was no role for the CCTRT's new recommendations. They're (deferred)
the new recommendations and they've got their initial sort of report out and
there's an opportunity right now for public comment.

And I was just wondering if or if we were thinking or if anyone else has had a
chance to review the CCT initial report and we're planning to submit anything
or if you want to just submit anything as a group.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. I probably lead the question standing. It's not currently
on the open comment page that ICANN has which is why is not on the matrix,
but it's good to single that out and draw attention to it.

Kristina Rosette: Thanks. This is Kristina. So, I've done a little summary and I'm happy to
send one around to the group and see if people can agree because I think
there's some things that we want to be really concerned about.

For specifically and I think everybody knows here, you know, DAAR is a
really big concern and sort of like the problems with that and the other groups
that really want to push amendments to the registry agreements, you know,
places where the GAC and the BC and the (FEC) have all come in and really
want us to proactively sort of take responsibility for monitoring and really take
responsibility for the activities of registrants.

So, I think we might want to come back and, you know, circle back around
and maybe respond to some of those.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes. Thanks, Kristina. That would be great if you could send something to the list. Thank you very much.

Great. So, let's - we've got about five minutes left to cover some administration stuff. Well, start with travel support. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes. Very quick and in fact, let me add before we even get into that, I mean, this trade issue, welcoming new member. Interlink joined last month. So, we welcome them and also looking forward to next month, TLD (box) out of Germany will be joining as well. So, welcome to the two new members.

As far as travel support, please remember everybody, already, we're looking at to ICANN 62. The deadline for submitting travel supported candidates is 23rd of March. So, for a week after this.

We have had a couple of expressed interest but we have slots that remains. So, members in a good standing, quite welcome. Very, very basic request.

We post an email who made to the list and encourage anybody who's planning to go who needs travel support to please raise your hand and ask for it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Paul. Karen?

Karen Day: Hi, this is Karen Day for the record. With regard to Item B, in corporation and taxes, we are steadily working along and making good progress.

We - I won't take up anytime going in detail. Now, we will schedule that for a fuller discussion on one of our calls in a couple of weeks after Puerto Rico.

Then moving on to C, budget planning, we will get to work in earnest on that after Puerto Rico as well and get together our numbers and once again,

reconstitute a little group to help us look at it and because that will have to be presented and we call for adoption of the budget in June, by the end of June. So, again, that will be - what will take up after we send one.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Karen. So, we just close with the elections and then remind everyone that we will be relocating to 10 for the registrar room for the next part of today's agenda.

So, Paul, can we close with the elections? Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Stéphane. Paul Diaz. And very quick, folks, we will have - if you remember last year, voting is always something of an issue for the group. So, we try to vote as infrequently as possible.

Of course, each year that includes approval of our budget and what we try to do is synch that up timing wise with the elections for officers, counselors. So, just looking ahead, we're going to try and do what we did last year so that we only have one ballot that goes around to folks.

Ballot would have to take place in the second half of June. So, that means as we start preparing for the election looking for candidates, nominations, seconds, statement of interest, all of that good stuff probably in the early part of June.

And just kind of sensitize people and to remember the chairmanship, the vice chair policy, and two of counsel seats. Donna is term limited. So, she must step down. Keith is eligible for another term. So, that seat and wants to run again. So, I love to have Keith.

And, yes, those are slots that are up this time around. So, if there's any interest, I'm very happy to talk to folks about what's really involved, time, commitments, things like that, and just kind of keep in mind that we get serious about it in late May or early June timeframe.

Okay. With that, while we break, we'll see you guys over in Room 104 with our registrar colleagues.

Sue Schuler: Okay. We can end the recording now. Will the ex-coms please take their table tents with them to the next meeting, so I don't have to collect them?
Thank you.

END