

**Transcription ICANN London
Registries Stakeholder Group
Tuesday 24 June 2014
Morning Session (Part 1)**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Keith Drazek: Okay. Good morning, everybody. I'm Keith Drazek, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group Meeting on Tuesday, 24th of June, 2014, ICANN 50 in London. We're going to go ahead and get started this morning. We'll just go through a couple of notes. But I want to take this opportunity to see if anybody has any additions or changes or proposals to the agenda, things that we need to address today that have you know may have come up over the course of the week.

So we can make sure that we work that in at the appropriate time. Chuck, I saw your hand.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Keith. And I haven't looked at the latest version of the agenda. So maybe these have already been added. But in case not, one of the things that we need to talk about is a selection of a person from the GNSO, from the Registry Stakeholder Group, that would be on the Steering Group if in fact that Steering Group for the IANA transition happens the way it's mapped by staff.

Secondly, would like to have - David and I and Brett, although we haven't talked to Brett about that. Just two or three minutes just to talk about the GNSO review, 360 review questions that I distributed a day ago. Not to go over them. But just to encourage people to participate and inform people

what's happening so that if anybody has any feedback for David or Brett or I on that GNSO review working party, we can have it.

So - and we've got a (unintelligible) time on that. But I'll talk more about that if we can have that on there. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Chuck. Any other additions, edits or suggestions for today's agenda? Jon, go ahead.

Jon Nevett: Sure. I sent around an email yesterday. Did that make it on it? Must be the final. So I've got it in my notes. But why don't you go ahead and tee that up for those that may not have you know read the email or just in terms of what it is we'd like to discuss.

: Sure. We have an opportunity as new registry agreement signatories, new registries to open up a line of communications and negotiations on the registry agreement with ICANN starting July 1, 2014 which is next week. So I just teed up whether we want to decide to invoke that provision or not. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, (John). And for those that hadn't followed it, there was some exchange on the list yesterday on that topic. So if you need to sort of catch up before we actually have the conversation, please go back to the registry stakeholder group list. Any other suggestions for the agenda? Okay. Seeing none, so we just as you could see probably from the agenda before, at 9:15 so in 10 minutes, we will have ICANN staff from the GDD joining us.

So we have 10 minutes to get through a few items before they do. It's probably worth chatting a little bit before they arrive. I can - I think you know Paul and I and some of the other members of the registry and NTAG ExCom can give a brief update about a meeting that we had with the GDD, Akram, (Cyrus), (Christine Willet), Krista and a few others the night before last. It was

actually a joint session from the Registry, NTAG and Registrar ExCom with those folks.

And it sort of followed up the letter that we sent and was an opportunity for us to sort of exchange views and map out discussions for the week and plans for the future in terms of trying to work together to improve service delivery to the contracted parties and soon to be contracted parties. I think - I think it was a very constructive dialogue that we had. It was 90 minutes.

And I think it actually was good for you know the three ExCom to be in the room. And that was - you know from the (NTAG) that was outgoing ExCom and including ExCom. So we had very good representation. So I just want to say that before we get into the discussions today with Akram and his team, I do feel like there was some you know positive momentum or you know some - maybe it was - maybe it's not yet momentum.

But it was at least a positive engagement with those folks. So I hope we can continue on that and sort of focus on you know constructive ways to engage. I hope that they'll you know come and you know basically you know reiterate to the group here, some of the things that we heard two nights ago. So with that, any comments or questions? Anything that we ought talk about before our colleges from ICANN arrive? (Ken), go right ahead.

Ken Stubbs: I'm curious, just how far - I'm sorry, Keith, 10 steps. We've been somewhat up in the air just how far off we're taking this? Now I mean if we're comfortable with the conversations we've had and the commitments we've gotten from Akram and (Cyrus) and so forth. Do we rehash this whole thing again with the board? Or are we you know I mean the whole idea around these conversations was predicated on trying to create an environment where we can get good cooperation from the GDD.

And if we go too far at this point in time, they may feel we you know put a knife in their back.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thanks, (Ken). I think that's a great question or point. I think my response would be I think that you know GDD service delivery and you know sort of the quest for operational excellence at ICANN in terms of delivery to contracted parties is absolutely something that we should raise with the board. But I think we should do it in the context of you know we have- we've been having ongoing conversations.

We sent the letter. We had you know ICANN staff joined us on one of our calls. We actually had a special call to talk about these issues. We have subsequent conversations. And you know we feel like there's constructive dialogue taking place. But that you know I mean sort of the devils in the details. And we need to you know - we look forward to working through the issues and seeing results.

And we're not quite at that stage yet. But I think you know I think constructive dialogue is the key. (Ken).

Ken Stubbs: Yes. I agree with you, Keith. I guess what I'd like to see would instead of just (unintelligible) sheets, I'd like see us put some markers down. This is something that the GDD needs to know. That we're going to be discussing this topic in Los Angeles with the board. They have an opportunity in the interim to make this discussion a very positive discussion in Los Angeles, filled with compliments about how responsive they've been and stuff like this.

Or it can go the other way. If people send them their bucks and all they got were shallow promises, it's going to be a much more serious discussion with the board in Los Angeles. I don't think we are going to be patient enough to wait 6 months or a year for these changes that they talked about to happen. That's - does that make sense?

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Ken). (Donna), did I see your hand?

(Donna Austin): Yes, you did. (Donna Austin) for the record. During the conversation we had with the guys on whatever day it was, there was a suggestion of reversing the (GDD) advice scorecards. And I think Akram mentioned something similar to that. So my understanding is that the all of the things that we pulled on in the work that (Yasmin) did will actually transfer to a scorecard.

And we will see progress again. So that was my understanding. If I've got it wrong, (Christine) seems to be a little bit - but I think that's what they plan to do.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thanks, (Donna). You're absolutely right. My sense - you know I think there was definitely a reference to sort of a spreadsheet or a scorecard like approach. So I think specifically the - sort of the experience with the Board and GAC was referenced. So I think that would be a very positive development if we were see you know sort of a - you know a documented trackable approach to addressing the issues that we raised.

So, thanks - you know thanks for raising that. Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: I wondered - I wonder - I worry that we're at risk of working very closely and in very find detail on specific issues and sort of losing track of - yes, to channel (Ken) here, to you know totally losing of the forest through the trees. I think what we need to do is work with staff to establish some high level metrics, whether their customer satisfaction or you know what - you know, quality of the GDD as measured by some survey or something like that.

We should figure out what those things are that we care about. The establishment of metrics and make sure we agree on how staff's going to measure them. And then measure the progress over time. Now there may be specific things that we also want to set milestones on.

But I suspect if we work through a like feature set in the GDD portal or we worry about like a specific failure for (CZDS), we'll get really got a reactively

solving problems after they happen and not do very much at all about making sure that we continue to get good solutions before we gripe about them. So I think we really need to focus on high level metrics and agreeing with staff on them and measuring them much more than trying to scorecard through individual complaints about individual things that have gone wrong in the past.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jordyn. That's a very fair point and I agree. I think the - the discussion that we took - you know that took place two nights ago I think was not specific to you know each one of the particular issues. But it was sort of more about structure. More about as you said metrics, the ability to you know sort of have predictability.

So I agree with you. We don't want to get you know particularly in our conversation today, you know drilling down in the, you know, the weeds of each one of these issues that we raised in the lengthy and very detailed letter. But I do think you know we raised issues about predictability. We talked about SLAs for example.

We talked about wanting to have you know predictability in terms of the service delivery. And I think that - I think the feedback that we got in that session was positive. But we need to you know keep pushing for that for sure. I agree that you know what we're trying to accomplish here is not just you know ticking off each one of these you know issues that was in the letter. Although we certainly want them addressed.

It's about improving you know sort of you know sort of at a higher structural level. Would anybody else like to jump in on this topic? We should have - I know I saw Krista. I'm not sure if everybody else is here. But anybody else? Anyone else that was in the joint ExCom want to jump in and give some flavor?

Paul Diaz: I'll jump in, Keith. That's Paul Diaz, alternate chair. One thing is important as Keith noted was a three ExCom meeting with staff. And the registrars, there's clearly overlap in some of the issues. But it is not a complete overlap. And it's very important to note that they - the registrars have had an awful lot of recent experience working very closely negotiating, hammering out very hard one terms with GDD staff.

And that mine set still carrier over. I don't want to cast it in a negative tone. But for us as registry operators and our NTAG colleagues, I think we come at it with a different perspective. And maybe not as - sometimes it's well prepared. So to Jordyn's point about not getting lost in the details, losing the forest through the trees, I think the issues that we want to make sure get addressed and how we strategize about working with staff to make sure that the needs are met.

Very important that we work closely together. That we have full and active participation. Otherwise, the proverbial divide and conquer will happen because we will not be speaking with one voice. We won't have a strategy to make sure what we need gets done. So this is a long term, a longer term debate issues. But the things that you all are passionate about, it's going to be very important that you clearly articulate that you make sure that we're all in synch together.

So as we continue to move forward, we are speaking as a group with one voice.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Paul. Okay. So we have Akram and (Christine) with us. Krista, I know you're here. (Ash) as well. Anybody else? If there's anybody else you'd like to join us up here, feel free to invite them. We're having to use handheld microphones because of the setup of the room. So I'll pass one down to you. So welcome. Again, this is the Registry Stakeholder Group Meeting.

And appreciate your willingness to participate and to join us here today. Before you arrived, we had a brief discussion providing an update of the joint ExCom meeting that we had with you and the GDD staff a couple of night ago. And sort of just to set the scene, you know I felt like that we came out of that, it was a very constructive session a very constructive dialogue.

We very much appreciated the 90 minutes that we spent together. And so I sort of gave my sense of the meeting. And maybe it would be helpful for you all to sort of describe your takeaways from the conversation maybe. You know and I think what we want to accomplish this morning in the time that we have together is to you know sort of you know look at the questions of service delivery, of predictability and of trying to find ways at a high level to work together to sort of make sure that we're both - that we're all working together to accomplish you know the ability to serve the end user, the registrars.

Akram Atallah: Thank you, Keith. Thank you for having us here. And that is - no need to keep thanking us for attending these meetings. This is our job. So we are more than happy to be here. And I think that the meeting that we've had with the ExCom was actually very helpful. It sharpened a lot of the issues that you guys are saying and that you'd like us to focus on.

And what we - what came out of that is that we are all in agreement I think that there's a lot of work to be done. That this is exhaustive. But it's actually very important. What I think we decided to do is that we are going to come back to you with a - almost a spreadsheet like we do the GAC where we list each one of these items. We provide maybe our view of priorities of these things, a plan of what we're going to do.

We give you path addressing the prioritization so that we know from your perspective, what - what's more important and the prioritization of that. And then we can - we can start working on these things. We also I think agreed that we would have interessionals so that we don't wait too long to get

updates on the progress there. And our goal to actually - is to actually get these things done as soon as possible.

I think there was also a lot of good progress, a lot of areas. We talked about having people sign emails from the (CSG) so that you know who you're working with. We talked about account management. We talked about agenda planning so that when we do these interessionals, we give you a chance or even here, when we meet here, we give you a chance to set the agenda so we know what's going on.

And then that we could give you some documents ahead of time so that you can read those and be ready so that we can discuss the things and get into the details. Or we discuss the webinars and having the ability to also set an agenda for the webinars so that we talk about the things that are of interest to you.

I think these are some of the things that you talked about that the list is there. And we can actually focus on that. And I think that Mike Palage was making sure we hired enough people. So that's another.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Akram. And just to - just a brief note. This is not our normal room setup. I expect that there's probably a microphone or a roaming mic for those who aren't at the table. If there's not, we have an extra one up here. But I want to make sure. This is needs to be an interactive session. So if anybody has any thoughts or comments or questions, please feel free to take this opportunity to engage with Akram and his team.

Jeff and then (Ken).

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Just we've had a lot meeting where - and I appreciate you're saying, Akram. And I appreciate the response. Can we get maybe a timeline you know of when you expect to respond by? You know one of the things we expect with service delivery, we get no solid time for a

compliance, right to say XYZ is going on. You need to respond no later than 7 days, right.

Can we get some sort of commitment from you all at this meeting of when - exactly when you'll respond to that letter?

Akram Atallah: Sure. Please can I finish (unintelligible). So how about 3 weeks after the longer meetings - within 3 weeks of the longer meetings.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jeff. Thank, Akram. (Ken), go right ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes. This is kind of tying in to some of the ancillary issues that popped up at this meeting. Krista, this refers to you. First to express some concern about the fact that she felt that she's a resource that we're not using as often as we should. So what I'm going to make a proposal and that is that it's almost a given in the future that a certain period of time, Krista will participating on these calls.

And that it doesn't necessarily need to be structured. The most effective thing would be for us to try to prepare a list of issues that we want to talk to you about, Krista. But rather than having a formal presentation as to what, many times we just have this interaction. And a lot of these issues can surface. And Krista needs to be somewhat empowered within the GDD to be able to get timely responses because nothing is more frustrating that to get to one of the classic response as "we'll get back to you."

It isn't necessarily that Krista isn't getting back to us. It's that she may have sent something up the road to get response back if she's not getting them back to give them back. So I hope you understand what I'm saying. And I

think it's just kind of - more free flowing, I think you're going to get more done. If the only thing you're doing is coming on the conference call to give presentations as to what we're doing for you today, we don't get as much interaction there.

So I'm hoping that we can work something out between the ExCom and Krista as to how we'd like to have your participation. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, (Ken). Krista?

Krista Papac: Thanks, Keith. Krista for the transcript, Krista Papac, ICANN staff. So thank you very much, (Ken) and ExCom for that. And you know I welcome the opportunity. It's just you know, I don't - I know your calls, you guys cover a lot of topics. I don't want to crowd you call or be there the whole time. So if you can just specify what time you want. And then, you know if it's every call or every other call, you know we'll plan to be there.

From my perspective, it's - this is a two way dialogue. So it's not just issues which are not always issues. Sometimes it's just conversations. But from my perspective, like the communication is solved - a huge percentage of what we're hearing. And I've talked to a lot of you one off throughout the week about different issues or subjects that you guys have.

And even just that dialogue I think has been helpful. And that's why I you know really do want to participate in these meetings because it's a two way conversation. I have information to share with you guys as well that will hopefully build - continue to build a relationship between you guys and ICANN and improve upon that relationship.

But also give you guys more visibility into what we're doing rather than you know only hearing about it at ICANN meetings. And you know the webinars are great for pushing out information. But they're not - there's a Q&A. But

there not the same type of dialogue as a meeting. And I think all of those formats are important.

And so, anyway, I appreciate the opportunity and look forward to it. And I'd also like to have members of the registry services team participate because it's another place for you guys to get to know them better and what they're working on to support you as well.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Krista. And thanks, (Ken). This is Keith. Yes, I mean I think if we haven't before, I'll say it again. Or I'll say it, I think we ought to have you on every registry stakeholder group call. And we probably ought to just have that as a, you know, a process moving forward. One of our challenges internally is that we've started to have rotating times for our calls to try to accommodate the geographical and time zone diversity now growing within our stakeholder group.

So that might mean that you're joining calls at odd hours, California time. But we certainly want to have you on the calls. And it ought to be a regular thing. It ought just be sort of on the books. So Paul and I will take it - you know take the action item to make sure that you're invited. And that there is communication about the topics that we would like to discuss in advance.

So there's an opportunity to prepare. Thank you. Thanks for that Krista. And thanks, (Ken). Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sure. I'm not talking about today. A few different thoughts. First in regard to this last discussion, I worry a little bit that we're - I keep worrying. I worry a little bit that we're overloading the function of the stakeholder group which I view as part of a policy thinking making organization which is GNSO. How can we do end up with operational issues circulating up here?

But there are many both (TLD) operators and applications who are not active participants in the stakeholder group because they don't feel like they want to

be part of the policy making process which is fine. But they shouldn't also be left out of operational issues as well. So I think ICANN either needs - if the intended path of communication with the registry community is through the stakeholder group, which is fine, I think you need to be very clear elsewhere that that's the case.

And that if people want to get frequent updates on what's going on with you know and that sort of dialogue, that they should be participating actively in the stakeholder group. Or you may want to consider having, you know, like you said, the webinars sort of have Q&A. But they're really not intended for dialogue. I don't why you couldn't have biweekly like, "hey, let's talk about operational stuff with registry community" sort of meeting.

That's not just there to push stuff out. But it's there supposedly to have dialogue with your customers. So that's - it looks like you want to respond before I jump in. Oh, so one thing I was going to mention, in - related to that theme, during the application phase, you guys had a really awesome FAQ section where people would send in questions. And then you would post the answer to the question so everyone could see.

So you wouldn't have to do all these sort of one off interactions with people in order to get information out. So seems like doing something like that again would be really helpful as well. I had two other comments. But I'll wait for you to react to this first.

Krista Papac: Thanks for the - Krista again. Thanks, Jordyn. So I'm - I'm not saying that's the only form of dialogue is just with you guys. We do have the webinars which also pushes out information. Many of you know who are already registry operations some of the other stuff we do like the welcome kit and other things get pushed out to you in forms of communication.

So I think - I don't mean that as that's the only dialogue. You guys just happen to have very specific questions that you do come to us with. People

that are not members of the RYSG also come to us with very specific questions. And we dialogue with one off as well. But I think the webinars also have a very good purpose. That's part of it. Is for the people who aren't members of this to hear information about what ICANN is doing and how they're doing it and what's coming and all of that stuff.

And we'll continue to use those for that piece of the dialogue.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jordyn. Thanks, Krista. (Jonathan), go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Jordyn hasn't finished his points. He wanted to make 3 points. But I just wanted to pick up on his first one. It's (Jonathan) for the recording. The GDD people remember with our ExCom meeting, I'll highlighted this point where I feel in a way like Jordyn that there's a sort of blurring of the lines. We've got a responsibility within the GNSO to do this collective policy making work.

And then separate to that, we've got an entire operational relationship with you. And I think between us both, we have to start to figure out how to treat those as separate tracks of work. Whether or not we have the discussion on them in the same meeting or not. But there's - the one is as I discussed with you when we met, one is a firm near term customer relationship where we have real operational dependency on the work you do.

And the other is more longer term you know where we digest our work through policies. And I just think we've got to make sure we you know in all of our minds, segment these different things that somehow become blurred in ways were we're probably better off crystalizing and separating them. And I think that's why I just wanted to pick up on Jordyn's first point there because it resonates with the point I've made to you when we met. And seems to be something we could work at. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, (Jonathan). This is Keith. I guess my reaction to that is you know clearly there's a difference between service delivery and sort of the customer relationship if you will that you've described and the policy making. But you know this part of our agenda is with the GDD. They - you know, this is our opportunity to talk about sort of the implementation.

And again, you know we start talking about policy and implementation and where - you know where does that sort of come together or where is that line drawn. You know some of what we're talking about here is the implementation of policies that have been developed. And you know making sure that the service delivery is there to support it.

So I completely agree the registry stakeholder group is part of the policy making structure. But it's also the venue for registries as contracted parties. And applications as soon to be contracted parties to engage with the ICANN staff. So I mean I agree that there's a distinction between the two. But at the same time, I think this is the appropriate venue for having this conversation.

Akram Atallah: I think you guys are hitting on an important issue. I think it's a fact that the things are blurring because we have multiple hats. And (unintelligible), you have multiple hats. And it's not really comprehensive as Jordyn said that everybody that is a customer is participating in the registry stakeholder group. And therefore, that is a superset that we need to address when we talk about customer issues and operational issues.

Yet at same time, we need to continue to work with you because you represent probably the largest majority of these customers. So it's an easy venue to come to discuss these operational issues. And I don't know how to separate the two efficiently and make it better. But maybe Jordyn's suggestion of a regular meeting that is customer meeting on operational issues and not call the registry stakeholder group, could you know at least in (unintelligible) differentiate between the two.

Biweekly seems to me that it's very frequent. By the time we collect the questions, prepare the answers and you know we do the meeting, then we have to wrap around and do another one. There's not much time to do work and get updates. So maybe it's a monthly meeting or something like this. We can find a way to resolve that.

But I agree, we need to be more comprehensive in this meeting than just registry stakeholder group. I think typically (unintelligible) is participating here. But I don't know if even that is comprehensive enough to get everybody on the customer side engaged.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Akram. And I know one of the things that's come up a couple of times you know on recent calls or meetings is that we haven't had sort of an intercessional regional registry/registrar meeting like we did in Amsterdam you know a year, a year and a half ago now. That I think that as you know contracted parties, I think that was - those events I think are very useful.

And we - I think we'd like to see those - see those introduced again at some point. I had Ching in the queue and then Krista.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Keith. This is Ching Chiao from DotAsia. And thank you, Akram and the GDD team on the update. And I just want to reemphasize again what's been brought up in the GNSO weekend session about the translation and the services. Thank you for the offering that I think just like to give everybody a heads up here that we potentially would request or I actually sent out a notice to see if anyone in the room that would be interested in the translation services that you might be able to offer.

You mentioned about probably a low level of utilization in the past. I just simply want to respond is that I mean it's low, but if it can help one or two customers potentially. There may be smaller customer at this time, but potentially - I mean, the service is there. I mean if the translation is done right, potentially brings in potentially more business to you.

So I just like to emphasize again, I will send out a list of potentially - if any of us would like the registry agreement or the AGB to be translated into six different UN languages, I think there's a way to kind of to escalate I mean the services. Thank you.

Krista Papac: Thanks, Keith. I'm going - I wanted to respond to the intercessional comment that you made. But I'm actually going to respond to what you just said, Ching. We actually have a project for translations on the teams. Akram I think mentioned I think it was the GNSO session about asking you guys to help us prioritize the documents which was a great suggestion. And I actually took a notice of it in there because we sort of prioritize them internally.

But we should be coming to you. The registry agreement actually is just about to finish translation with the - I should know, but I don't. It's 5 or 6 UN languages, whatever the number is. And then we'll get that posted. And I think every Fahd talked about the GNSO about considering what some other languages that might be useful. So maybe we can have a dialogue about that well.

But that's the one we started with. And I'll have the team member that's responsible for translations figure out a good way to collaborate with you guys on prioritizing documents that make sense. Some documents I think the usage would be so low, it might not make sense. But we are actually actively working on that. Regarding the intercessional, so I know this came up I think it was the ExCom meeting.

I've heard mixed feedback about what you said, Keith. And so this is not as much about intercessional or not, but more about the format about some of the registry and registry/registrar regional meetings that we used to have. I've heard people say they didn't think they were very useful. And I think maybe that was more of a format thing that the - you know the engagement piece of it.

And so there's a couple of things there. I know Akram talked about interessionals being more like a meeting like we had the other day but with a bigger group of people. And then additionally, and we'll talk about this in tomorrow's session on registry operator engagement. But we're also developing a - program is not the right word, but something like a program.

A workshop that we're calling Registry Roadshow where we're going to go out into the near - in or around the near - the three hub offices to do a registry. It's going to be registry focused. But kind of an effort to help educate new registries about their responsibilities with ongoing operations and startup and all of that.

The reason that's one's not registry/registrar is the registrars actually just did this last year with the 2013 RAA and the workshop stated. So there's a number of efforts underway. One that's already underway. The other came as a result of the conversations we've been having with you guys. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Krista. I have Jeff than Jordyn.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. And I'd love to actually get to the agenda items because I think we're spending a lot of time kind of talking about overall issues. But there's some deep frustrations and concerns. We'd love to get to some of the details on there like auctions and inclusions and stuff. On the intercessional, I agree. Krista, the feedback you got was based on the format.

It was more like let's just repeat and let's just summarize what happened at the previous ICANN meeting as opposed to a working session. So whether we - whatever we all it, I think there's support here. And if anyone disagrees, but I know we talked about it on calls. There's definitely support for a working type meeting of registries and registrars on a number of the operational issues that exist today.

And I'm sure will exist going forward. So I would say at least here to voice our support that yes, we should have a working meeting. Whatever we call it. Different formats that what existed before. But let's get together more often. I'm not sure what the results of the meetings committee and the new structures of the three ICANN meetings are going to do.

But we certainly need regular working sessions.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jeff. Agreed. And agreed that we want to get to the more specific items on our agenda. Jordyn, you're next. But before we I hand it off to you, there's apparently only two microphones in the room. So I'm going to hand this one over to everybody else. And we'll share the one at the front of the room. So if anybody else wants to join in and provide input, feel free. Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Briefly, this will encompass some of the topics later. So we can perhaps come back to these suggestions. But I do think I'd like to suggest two fairly actionable commitments that I hope ICANN to think about or maybe even me today. I think we go along ways to reducing the frustration that was express that you know that Jeff just diluted to that's coming up in the agenda and/or was expressed in the GDD letter, etcetera.

I think first is I think just the commitment to when there are significant operational failures to commit to a prompt response in terms of providing a postmortem within a week or something like that, some sort of committed timeline. Just as compliance expects us to respond to (unintelligible) analysis and so on, I think it's not a hard thing to do.

It makes your customers feel a lot better that you know you're not just sort of papering over the issues as they occur. And from an operational perspective, a really good practice in terms of making sure that we aren't repeating the same sorts of issues over and over again or at least discovering them in different systems about appropriate follow up.

So I think it's just a commitment to timely responses with postmortems to significant operational failures would be one thing that you guys could do that you could just commit to, that would be significant improvement and would probably reduce a lot of frustration from this end. And then my second suggestion is that and I keep saying this.

It's going to probably get really tiring. But I think if we had a commitment for how we were going to work with ICANN in the very short term with the GDD and a very short term to establish some meaningful metrics that both you and we agree measure. Whether you guys are doing a good job or not, at least from our perspective, would be super helpful.

And I think you could rapidly start to - when you come to next meeting and we're yelling at you. And you say, "but wait, we agree these 1-2-3 things are the things that you really care about and were working on and they're high level and they're appropriate you know measure of what you want from us. And "look, we're doing really well. We're measuring them. And there's how we're doing."

Or you know you guys can come to us and say, "We let you down. We're not doing that well in these metrics. Here's why and here's what we're going to do." I think that would help the dialogue at as well. But right now, you guys are left to sort of deal with us getting angry at each individual random thing that happens. And we don't have a common understanding of what we're all trying to achieve together.

So I think a commitment to very quickly working with us to figure out what those metrics should be I think would help this dialogue a lot as well.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Jordyn. I think that's a great suggestion. You know we talked at the joint session two nights ago about SLAs, you know, sort of, you know, measurable sort of this delivery. So I think your point about metrics and

agreed to set of sort of expectations or standards I think is completely reasonable and appropriate. (Christine).

Christine Willett: (Christine) (Unintelligible). I think what we also need to do is begin sharing the metrics and the measurements we already have and - which are in place with you. So we do measure what we do. Not just what metrics are not just about what how you do it, the quality, the responsiveness, the timeliness. So I think we need to begin sharing with you what we already have in place internally.

And then get your feedback on that as well as love to hear from you on other things that you'd like to get visibility to. And I think you got a session later today to talk about some of the metrics at a higher, broader level within ICANN. Thanks for that suggestion.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, (Christine). Okay with that, we probably ought to move to as Jeff recommended to more detailed agenda. So you know we spoke about the issues raised in the GDD feedback letter. And that we - you know, Akram, you referenced the intention to come up with sort of a scorecard and responding within a few weeks to you know to get back to us on details there.

But there are other I think sort of I guess topics that we'd like to discuss. So we have the list here. We included you know CCDS, RSTEP issues, auction, name collision, process developments. So I'm going to open it up to the room and ask people to raise their hands and get in the queue. The roving microphone is over there next to (Jonathan). Jeff, go right ahead.

Jeff Buchanan: Thanks. I want to address the name collision topic on there because I think it you polled at least the NTAG and the registry, the new registries who is the top of the list. And I 'm going to repeat myself from yesterday at the name collision session, but I think it's important enough. So I'm glad that we have a path forward or proposed path forward that was presented yesterday.

And I think that's a good path forward essentially of proposing to the board. I had some feedback. The - within the (unintelligible) report and specifics in there, there were a couple of details I'm sure that'll get brought up. But what I want to talk about is the process actually implemented. And just make a reference to the fact that we've been waiting a very long time to get resolution to this.

And I know that there's a lot of things that need to happen for efficiency sake and processes. But I want to be clear that when this is approved by the (NGPC) as a registry and a backend registry operator for others, we want to implement that day. We don't want to have to go invited by the portal to be asked to submit a form. And that form contains our plan for implementing it and a promise to XYZ and another contract amendment.

Then we have to wait for several weeks to get it signed and go through another process. And then get affirmation that the person who signs it is actually still authorized to sign that type of agreement. I mean this can go on for weeks and months as we've seen with other processes. And it's not to say (unintelligible) there's processes. But we've been waiting a very long time.

This is very important the day that that's approved for all of us to be actually be able to implement it right away. So whatever you can do, just think about how to do that. Make sure when the decision comes down, the next day if you already delegated, you put those names into - the name closing list into the control option or and so on so we don't have to keep doing those forms.

And the more specific issue is on the new thing that was brought up by Francisco yesterday about requiring registries to take down names within two hours of ICANN telling you to for the life of the rest of the - for basically infinity. I think we do need to talk about that because that's not something I think that was contemplated by the report.

Akram Atallah: Thank you, Jeff. Let me just address this very quickly. So we have the - we have been thinking about that even a month back on how we're going to implement this immediately. We would call it the Jeff implementation plan. So we actually - we actually have been monitoring all the lists on a daily basis in the collision list. So we already have the ability to collect.

When you put the - look back in - on your - so if you're doing the strings one by one, you'd be able to monitor that. And if you do the wild card because you're a new registry, then we'll be able to monitor that immediately. We'll see when you - actually how long you've done it. And when you take it out and register it. And if everything is okay, it should work. If there are any issues, we will know.

So I think the implementation from that perspective will enable you to take these collision names from the list and implement the mitigation fairly rapidly. So we have that in mind. As soon as we get it satisfied, we want to be able to let you know that you can actually implement. And on the other issue, I think the reason for the tight requirement is also because of the high threshold that we're putting on them.

So if there is a threat to human life, I think that you and (Avri actually) wants to move quickly anyway. So I don't think it's an issue of, you know, it's not an issue of do we want to do that, I think we have to do that.

I think that when - once we identify a threshold this high then we cannot be slacking off and say well I can't, you know, you can't reach me therefore, you know, it's going to take a day for this to happen, so it's a dilemma that we have to deal with.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, just to follow-up and this may be against my interest as an existing registry as well, but wouldn't that logic apply to an existing registry as it would for new ones? And I'll put it out there because I think it's fair if we're going to

expect it of the new registries it's probably an expectation of the existing ones as well.

Akram Atallah: I wanted to differentiate between the two a little bit just because of collisions. Although collisions do happen every day and even after you launch your new registry they'll be new collisions that would be created, there is the difference between the two.

The difference is that you, you know, the - a new - a collision that has been happening for a long time is our concern. When you introduce a new system and that new system introduces new collisions it's - it should be the responsibility of the person introducing the system to fix that collision. So I think that there's a difference between the two cases. Although we want to make sure that over the long-term that collision I think that they are two difference things.

Jeff Neuman: Yes and I - but the example that was brought up yesterday at that session was I can have a name in a new TLD that's registered to today.

And then someone 20 years down the road can then say well that may now is causing a collision 20 years from now which may not have actually caused that collision today or tomorrow or next year or the year after and the same threshold applies. So if the rule was that there's a collision that was provable to have started prior to the introduction of that name when it's first registered I think I would agree with you.

But the rule as it says is that 20 years from now someone can report a collision from someone that was just registered or that has been registered for 20 years and the collision didn't exist when the name was originally registered. So that makes sense and that's why everyone said the two year period was fine that has that rule, but now you extended that (instant item). So I hope that made sense, I know I'm talking around in a circle here.

But the example that was brought up yesterday was a name's registered tomorrow, there's no collision for a period of 20 years. And all of a sudden someone manufactures a collision or some developer's not paying attention that causes a collision that maybe it's a heart monitor that causes a threat to life, but it's not really - it doesn't make sense to us to apply it.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff; I saw a bunch of hands just go up. I had (John) in the queue - (John) did you to...

Jordyn Buchanan: Keith could I just make a specific point on that last point (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Okay hold on, I'm going to get right to you, I just want to make sure that - okay so you weren't going to talk about any collisions? Okay got it Jordyn then I saw (Ken) - who else's hand went up? Okay.

Jordyn Buchanan: So the point I was going to make which is very recently is the one like really visible name collision instance that we've seen in the past which was when Apple accidentally showed a bunch of porn in their store because they - oh sorry because the one visible - really visible collision that we've seen in the past, this is when Apple displayed a bunch of porn in their Russian (iTunes) store.

When they accidentally started showing that XXX content because an Apple developer used dot-XXX as meaning like a, you know, something like random as opposed to, you know, an actual delegated TLD with porn on it. That happened well after XXX was delegated and due to a bug introduced by that developer, so that's a really good example of what Jeff is talking about.

And it ought not to be the responsibility of TLDs that are well launched and well into their lifecycle to have to try to cover up for bugs that are introduced much later into the lifecycle. And those are the only really visible instances we've seen so far.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jordyn - (Ken) then (Andrew).

Ken Stubbs: Yes my big concern is that so much of this is a grey area. I think you're going to have to codify and be much more specific.

And I would ask anyone who was there at this collision (steel) to correct me if I'm wrong. But I actually was left with the impression that if ICANN deemed these collisions to be serious enough far enough down the road that they could actually take the entire registry down for an indeterminate period of time.

And I don't think that that is something that could be done without some very serious guidelines that are very strictly codified because I don't think that - you should invest somebody with the ability to make qualitative decisions like that off the top of their head.

You know, just because one person or a few people feel that this may do this or this might do this, there has to be some sort of a process to ensure that this doesn't end up creating a bigger tragedy than the one that you're trying to mitigate.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Ken), so if anybody else would like to get on - get in on the name collision discussion feel free to raise your hand.

I see Donna, (John)'s in the queue also - (Jonathan) okay and Akram or (Cyrus) or anybody wants to respond or engage on this I'll hand the microphone happily over to you. So - okay so (Andrew) then (John) then - I lost track - oh Donna and (Jonathan).

Andrew Merriam: Yes I just wanted to quickly reiterate that it is a very high threshold but it's a very vague threshold, that's like a huge problem.

Jon Nevett: Sure thanks, (John) for the record; I just want to raise one issue.

Now that we have a proposal that says there's no alternate path for new registries that are delegated after the approval of this and that we have to wait 90 days to roll out the TLD that part of the name collision report or proposal should include a fee waiver for that 90 day period so that we're not - if we're not getting paid you shouldn't get paid as far as ICANN. So the ICANN fee should be waived during that 90 day period and I would ask that you include that in the proposal, thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (John) - Donna.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin, so Akram yesterday Francisco said that the decision yesterday was part of the public feedback that would go back to the Board.

So I guess the question that's outstanding is, "How will you package the feedback that you got today to go back to the NGPC?" So the discussion around the Internet timeframe, what kind of information will you take back to the Board? And the other question I had is what's the trigger? So we know that the NGPC still needs considered, but at what point in time will the trigger data we can move forward? And how will you notify the applicants or the registries?

Akram Atallah: Sure, so we've actually shared the proposal - the NGPC on Saturday and they recommended that they want - they didn't want to commit to - they decided they didn't want to commit to a date in London to meet the - because they wanted to review this before they make a decision and they wanted to hear all the feedback from the community.

The meeting - the session yesterday on collision was only one of the ways we would collect the feedback from the community but all of your feedback is going to be gathered whether through the session or in other - for others as well. We will collect all of that feedback, put it together and come back to NGPC. The NGPC is doing a (due to fall), they want to meet on - have their

next meeting before the end of July. So our goal is to make a decision before the end of July on moving forward with this.

So it shouldn't take longer than this I hope, so if everything goes well we should decide before the end of July. And then on how this would be communicated, it will be - we will post it, we will send it to all the registries as an update. And we - maybe we should even have a webinar on that and do a Q&A if that's interesting we can do that as well.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Akram, I had (Jonathan) in the queue then Jordyn.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Keith, it's (Jonathan). I (spoke to) three quick points. One I'm supportive of many of the points that have been made already so there's no point in repeating those, but I'd like to just put some weight - further weight behind them.

Two it strikes me that occasionally of the use fund and maybe this is something, Akram I don't know how realistic it is from NGPC to attend this kind of - the kind of meeting that - the public meeting. And I think it's something that came up with the GNSO Council with the Board that actually to the extent that it's possible and doesn't clash with their own meetings it would be very useful to have the Board immersed in community sessions.

And I don't mean to in any way impinge your ability to absorb community feedback packages and present it. I think that's your job and I fully appreciate that you can do that and do it well, but nevertheless sometimes the sentiment, the perspective could be used for the - so to the extent that they could be I think that would be helpful.

And finally a specific question on I may have missed this and maybe others have a clearer view on this, but what's happening to that 25 names that - I'm not sure if they're called (high risk) names, but there seems to be separate

names in some sort of suspended animation that aren't being dealt with here, so it would be very good to get an update on that - thanks.

Akram Atallah: So I think that actually (JS Report) came out with a - basically three names that are very high on the collision list and everything else.

So there was no differentiation between different levels of collisions because the mitigation plan takes care of all of these the same way. So that was the differentiation between the (JS Report) and the previous study. There were no tiering of these things, so either too high or this litigation will work on all of these (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: (Jonathan) did you have a - was there a second part to your question about those that are sort of like the top three? The high risk and sort of the (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: I think - I believe that's been clarified - in the original list there was sort of high, medium and low and it appears that medium and low are now merged and essentially subject to the same mitigation activity. So that's great, thank you for clarifying that.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Jonathan) - Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes I'm curious how this interacts with the auction timelines in particular, is there a date by which the Board needs - the NGPC needs to make a decision in order for the majority of the August auctions to proceed?

And is it likely that the decision is going to be made before that? Because if there's not going to be August auctions it would be good to know that sooner rather than later.

(Christine): Thanks Jordyn, this is (Christine). With the - in light of the fact that the NGPC is not going to take action this week and we don't have a date we are - we will

be posting this weeks, next week (the 19th) - next week a revised auction schedule.

So we have several contingents that where applicant's requested postponement until after the name collision framework is finalized that are scheduled to be August auctions. Given the timing for them to schedule them, to have their third party agreement the agreement - it's a (bitter) agreement, (bitter) agreement signed and to start submitting the deposits. It - we may not have the name collision framework finalized in time for all of that to happen before the August auction.

So we intend to reschedule I believe its 16 contentions that from August spread over September and October. However we will also give all of those contention sets the opportunity to move and stay in the August auction if so desired if main collision finalization is no longer critical to you and everyone in the contention that agrees then we're happy to honor the August auction date. So we'll be managing all of that when we get back from London.

Jordyn Buchanan: Right, this is Jordyn again, just to reiterate that - I know you've heard this from us before but as the intentions that the number of simultaneous auctions in whatever - August, September actually as they stack up, the fact that the rounds are really short become increasingly problematic.

And I know like the design made perfect sense back when there weren't that many auctions per applicant happening at the same time, but it become really hard to imagine in a very small number of minutes getting through, you know, 20-plus auction or solutions. So it may be worth re-listening elements of the design as we continue to stack these up.

Christine Willett: So absolutely we appreciate that. We are not intending to schedule more at this moment more than 20 contentions per auction so we're keeping that in mind, although we understand that there are some applicants that will have a large number of contention sets in those auctions, so we are aware of that.

So we'll need to - if this continues to go on we're going to need to think about that as well.

Man: And can you just clarify the two conditions for moving - if you reschedule from August to later and then you can be brought back providing you're all in the contention and agree and to do a (name) collision, what's the other condition?

Christine Willett: So the - if the contention that wants to keep their August auction date then all of the members of the auction with their agreement they submit - and we published the form a week or two ago that allows you to bring forward your auction, do it sooner rather than later. So say you have a January auction and you want to do it in August you could submit that form and we would do that.

Jon Nevett: Thanks (John), one thing about that form it's only going one way. When the NTAG sent its letter on auctions it requested that the - when the applicants have unanimity that we should be able to pull forward or postpone and that's only to pull forward.

The postponement happens when we fill out the paperwork months and months and months in advance. So for example we filled out paperwork in April of 2014 for an auction that will occur in 2015. We have no idea a year in advance that maybe the applicants are getting together and want a postpone it. So we would strongly encourage you - or at least I would strongly encourage you to have that form go both ways.

So if all the applicants agree that they could get a short postponement that we should do that. If all the applicants agree to an advancement we should be able to do that as well, thank you.

Christine Willett: Thanks (John).

(Russ Weinstein): Hi this is (Russ Weinstein) from staff, so for the auctions that have - are scheduled for August and were request - and have already requested postponement to a name collision, the idea was in addition to posting the schedule we'll send targeted messages to each of those applicants that - notifying them their auctions is being postponed into auction either September or October.

Then also notifying them that if they respond by a certain date we can still get them into the August - keep them in the August auction if everyone agrees within that set, so it will be real clear and real targeted.

Jon Nevett: This is (John) again, quick question (Russ), so just so I understand the August ones will be split amongst September and October, so the September ones that are currently scheduled for September will stay there.

So the auction - the August auction ones with a better or higher draw number will be going after the ones that are currently scheduled for September?

(Russ Weinstein): Right, so rather than - we try to keep as much stability in the process and predictability as possible.

So rather than disrupt the entire schedule for all the auctions we're just trying to disrupt I guess the schedule for the August auctions and spread those so that we don't have a 30 contention auction in September and get that feedback.

Jon Nevett: Got it, thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (John), thanks (Russ). Okay so just a time check, it's - we have about 20 minutes left. We have a few other items on the agenda, I don't want to short circuit name collision or auction on the interrelation between the two.

But if there's anybody else that wants to jump in on auctions or name collision feel free to at this point. And if not let's open it up to other topics, whether we want to talk about, you know, the RSTEP process I understand that that's, you know, been discussed and a concern for several folks, so anybody want to jump in for RSTEP? Okay (Ray).

Ray Fassett: Okay so my clarifying question about the RSTEP is the focus of when does the 15-day start? Which is across the, you know, to bring certainty to the registry operators, to bring new project services to the market.

The idea is that, you know, ICANN would have some level of accountability to make decisions within a certain period of time without going back to the entire community to rehash whatever this new service is about. That was kind of the crux of the purpose of the RSTEP. So embedded in the policy is the - this 15-day period where staff would make the preliminary determination as to whether the new product or service raised significant competition issues or significant issues related to security and stability.

So now the question becomes as we've asked for today is when does that 15-day period start? Does it start at the time of submission? Now that's been my understanding through the years of, you know, when does that 15-day start for staff? It's when the registry operator clicks submit of the RSTEP.

And then my recollection of the explanation that I was kind of around when the RSTEP came into existence was staff would encourage the operators before you click submit, you know, work with your registry operator person in ICANN staff liaison by providing a copy of what you plan to submit.

Go through it with staff before you submit it so there's no surprises and staff will work with you to get it all complete. And then at that point you would click submit and then the 15 days would start. That would be the cooperative approach that I've been familiar with in working with the RSTEP. So but as we look today I think there's a question now as to, you know, when does this

15-day period start up? So that's the clarifying point I, you know, I want to kind of understand.

Krista Papac: This is Krista Papac, thanks for the question (Ray). So the 15-day starts when the RSTEP is moved to ICANN review, what that means is when you submit the - I'm going to address the first part of your question first and the second part after that.

So when you submit an RSTEP and you have not done this cooperative engagement thing that you're talking about that has not occurred, you submit the RSTEP, it goes in to - through the RRS system. It goes into - automatically into a pending completeness stage or status. Then ICANN reviews it looks at it, so I believe better language, ICANN looks at it to see if it's complete and if it's not complete we'll come back to the registry and say, hey, you know, your IDN tables are not complete, you forgot the policies for them, something or other.

The 15-day clock has not started, this is a back and forth and trying to get the RSTEP complete to get all the information in it. Once it is considered complete ICANN then moves it to the ICANN review stage and that is where the 15-day starts. That's also when we post it on the RSTEP page of the icann.org Web site.

There is a - I forget if it's in the policy or in the implementation notes or if it's somewhere in the RSTEP section of the Registry Agreement page, it does talk about encouraging the registry operator to engage with ICANN in advance and, you know, sort of plan this out. I like the way you just phrased it frankly and I haven't even thought of it so much myself that way which is before you even go into the RRS maybe we can figure out a mechanism to work through that back and forth.

Because we do find a couple things prior to this year or prior to the last eight or nine months I think we got eight or ten or twelve RSEPS a year. We're

getting that a month right now so and they're mostly coming from new registry operators. So you've got new entrants, you've got new - there's new things going on and people who haven't really used the policy at all before are in a long time because they only used it once a year at the time.

So potentially even before submitting it in the RRS with that pending completeness stage is effectively the same thing you're talking about, it's just being done through the RRS system rather than through informal engagement.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, this is Jeff Neuman, part of the reason you're getting more requests now obviously there's more registries, so that's an obvious reason.

But another reason is that every single change has to go through that process. So whereas when the existing registry (stop is) as an example, if we wanted to introduce another language we could just do it because we had a commitment to follow the IDN guidelines. We never had to get ICANN approval to introduce any new language; it was never through the RSTEP process. I think you should consider something - and a lot of your RSTEP's are to introduce new languages or for something else that's already been approved.

If you take back the notion of coming up with a different way. For example if I want to add a language there's no reason it has to get posted for 30 days if it's an existing - if it's a language that people have implemented to the IDN tables are approved, there's no reason it has to go through all that. It seems a little just bureaucratic to make it go through a public comment period if I just, you know, want to add (Italian) tomorrow.

So to the extent you can make it - make something like that less of an RSTEP and more of, you know, you've agreed to all these principles in your contract and you've agreed to the guidelines and you submit an approved table you should pretty much just be allowed to go.

Akram Atallah: Thank you Jeff, this is Akram so we're looking at all the ways that we can actually simplify this process and accelerate it like you said.

Maybe there are ways where we say this is approved if you use all these things like that it's approve and therefore the RSTEP - if we can - even if we can not have (this submit for RSEP), it becomes just a mechanical exercise of just stamping it and moving on. But also if we can set some guidelines we will look into that as well. Our interest is not doing these processes and making your life miserable and our life miserable, I mean that's not the goal.

We are actively looking at this I think Allen Grogan was here, he's looking at that and the - from the contractual perspective what we can do to simplify those - thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay anybody else want to jump in the queue on this? Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes so I guess I'm confused about this 15-day period. I mean it seems like the point of the 15-day period is to give registry operators predictability through the process.

If there is an intake into that that's totally open-ended with no timeline around it at all which seems to be the case at the moment, sorry. It seems like the registry operator loses all sense of predictability unless we have some better clarification around how the completeness check works. In particular when the completeness process takes an order of magnitude longer than the actual review process I think this is something that is broken.

I don't think ICANN's like actually filling the intent, the spirit of that policy even if you've managed to figure out a mechanism that you think actually does fulfill the letter of that policy. So it seems like either that completeness check seems to be much better defined and have it's own set of rigor around it or it should just go away and should have the option of rejecting things that aren't

complete during the 15 day period and then that would be at least the decision and then applicants would know what to do and maybe learn how to behave.

But there needs to be some better process than it goes into a black hole for a long time but without being even posted. And, you know, for potentially much, much, much longer than the review process and then finally we get to this fairly rapid review process. Because that's just not serving the intent of the policy or the customers in any meaningful way.

Krista Papac: Thanks Jordyn, this is Krista again. So to start I've already said this to you guys, I'll say it again.

The review process - not review, the completeness check process was broken and we have fixed it. So that, you know, taking exponentially - whatever the word was that you used, that that was taking longer has been fixed. And we're endeavoring to fix it, you know, it's not - we're not done fixing it we're working through getting it more and more streamlined and there's a number of efforts underway, but it is significantly improved.

The one option is as far as completeness goes we get a lot of incomplete RSTEP's and once people have done one or two they've added two languages, they add a third whatever, they get the hang of it and it goes a lot smoother. One option is to leave it in completeness and do the back and forth there, another option is to reject it. I mean I appreciate what you're saying, we could certainly consider it. People don't like when they get something that says reject on it.

And I realize they're not happy with having to do what I would call like a go-back as well, so it is effectually the same thing it's just we're not calling it rejection. We put it back to them and say we're pending more information they, you know, hopefully resolve it on the first go-back. It comes back and then it goes into the ICANN review stage.

Akram Atallah: So (Jonathan) really quickly I think that the problem with RSTEP is there is this completeness check that needs to happen. The problem with tightening this up and making it more predictable is RSTEP is not predictable.

We - we're not just talking about one set of requests, it's (twelve) on the IDN request, for example you could say, you know, it's chopping up the form get like tables here, you know, it's line up every request we want so that everybody knows that they completed the form or not. So RSTEP is a general - we don't know what is going to be requested, what's going to be requested of us so that we can make the completeness more predictable. So that's - I think that's the one that I would struggle with.

But maybe we can do some things on the thing - on the processes we know. So maybe we can tighten up the request that, you know, like IDN request maybe can be - the form can be more tailored to that so that the completeness becomes more predictable, that's what you had in mind.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes I think I'm just looking for predictability mostly in terms of timeliness. So I think it seems obvious to me that it should be faster to check whether something is complete than whether - than to do a substantive review of it.

So to say that the completeness check should take less than 15 days and you guys commit to that, just like you commit to doing the actual review in 15 days. Like that would be a great start and you can - it can just be saying like hey this isn't complete and then the person can resubmit and they're still not complete, you can go back a few times if you need to. But just saying like put some tie box on that process and make sure that it should be shorter than the actual review because it should be a simpler review than the actual review.

Keith Drazek: Okay so I've got a queue building and Krista wants to respond, so I'm going to have Krista respond then I've got (Ray), Chuck and (Rubin).

Krista Papac: I just - Jordyn thanks, that is what we're doing with the new RSTEPS. Again we have that period of time where it was broken and they took embarrassingly long.

And they - the completeness check, you know, it just wasn't following the path that it needed to be following. So but that's exactly what we're doing, 15 days and I actually want to get down way below that but that's exactly what's happening.

Keith Drazek: Okay (Ray).

Ray Fassett: Thank you, Jordyn articulated my thoughts perfectly so I'm going to hand it over to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes thanks (Ray), Chuck Gomes - just a little history first. Probably well over half of the people in this room weren't even involved when this issue came to a forefront in a very contentious time in ICANN - it happened to involve a - so the predictability is a real important issues.

And so I'm really glad that we're focusing on this because it's a critical issue for registry operators. And I understand in that clarification phase that you have no control over how quickly we will fix the thing that was missing or incorrect. You have no control there, so I can't really expect you to commit to a specific turnaround time, part of that's depending on us.

But I wonder whether there could be a maximum target for a response. I don't know if it's five working days or something when we do submit the information - the additional information that you requested. Something like that I think goes long with what Jordyn's saying in terms of tightening it up. Again I understand you have no control of how quickly I will respond to fix what was missing or incorrect, but if we could get that tightened up that might be a way to help and maybe you're already doing that, I don't know.

Krista Papac: Yes thanks Chuck that's - Krista again, that's exactly what I was trying to say. So just to give an example because I think a picture is worth 1000 RSTEPS.

You submitted to us its (intending) completeness. We will do our completeness check and either move it to ICANN review or send you a go-back which moves it to the pending more information stage within 15 days or less. You respond to us so again, you know, we are waiting for you to get back to us to your point. Sometimes it's immediate, sometimes it takes months frankly but eventually you get back to us. It goes back to pending completeness, we endeavor again 15 days or less to respond to that.

It goes to ICANN review or we come back to you for more information. So we will when we get either more inform - new requests or more information we are coming back to you within 15 days or less - or moving it forward.

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck again, thanks Krista. Fifteen days seems like a long period of time assuming it - because now you've already done the overall review and it's just focusing on whether the register responded to your - to the correction that you specifically asked.

In other words it should be a narrower scope at that time, so it seems to me that 15 days - I mean you're talking 15 calendar days or that, you know, still seems like a long time since the scope is narrow. I'll turn it to you.

Krista Papac: Frankly the team is pushing for a much shorter time period than that but because we are just working through the kinks, we have a lot of new team members, etc.

I'm more closely - we're doing a lot about (defenders) and what we're doing and so again I say I'm committing to 15 days or less but really the targets are much lower than that. And once we are, you know, operating and everybody's, you know, sort of up to speed and more confident we'll get you some improved timeline.

Chuck Gomes: And just one last comment from Chuck, okay. And that is I feel like my odds are a lot better here now than they were in the elevator earlier this morning.

Rubens Kuhl: Hi Krista, (Rubin Skew) for the record. I would like to comment we're not only seeing lack of predictability in the completeness review check, we are seeing like a predictability after ICANN review.

When ICANN rolls the dice and says, oh these - for this one you want another public comment period or not because there's already one public comment period already happening. So that is not only issues before ICANN review, we are some issues after ICANN review as well. So there is like a predictability on both ends of the problem, not only just one.

Krista Papac: Thanks (Rubin), yes I understand that and it's - I'll go back to Akram's comment earlier.

There's a lot of things about the RSTEPS that are not predictable. There are certain types of requests - many of the requests - sorry, certain type of requests that require Board review and public comment periods and there's not necessarily a way to know that. And I - that's a challenge for all of us, how do we, you know, figure that out because we don't know what we're getting until we get it.

And the stuff that is newer is not sort of an established well documented, well reason precedence for oftentimes rule requires additional work that you're referring to which is public comment periods and Board reviews and things like that. So I appreciate the challenge, I, you know, I'm not sure - I'm not quite sure how we solve that quite yet, but I understand, I hear what you're saying.

Ray Fassett: Yes first I just want to make a comment, this is very healthy exchange, this is a very important topic I think for the registry group, I really appreciate this dialog.

One thing I might suggest is just try not to make this too complicated because the focus here is really on two matters. No matter what it is ICANN receives, is there significant competition issues? Is there significant security and stability issues? If both of those questions are no it should be a very agnostic, mutual approach to just move forward.

We - I think - my suggestion too is to let's, we need to continue to have these discussions. I think there are still issues with regards to what, you know, the question of is the contract needed based on whatever the request is. Is that, you know, how is it determined whether the proposed amendment is material or not material. How is that decision made? What triggers what type of request - trigger a Board review versus staff being able to process autonomously without having the Board.

So continuing this discussion I just wanted to say I really appreciate that you're willing to have this discussion as we move forward and get this nailed down, very appreciative.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much (Ray), we probably need to wrap that discussion up and we're running up on our break at this point. There's a couple of other things on our agenda though.

One there was a question in the Adobe Chat that I want to read, it may be more of a compliance question than a GDD question, but it was from (Demark Steppus) asking will the group look into the matter of XYZ registrations and network solutions pushing domains to accounts without permission? So that was the question in the chat.

Akram Atallah: So yes we are aware that compliance is looking into the matter and compliance will actually talk more - can talk more about it.

But we investigate almost any claims or issues that we hear about as - that we see that we get informed about as well as complaints that come to us, so we are looking into this, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Akram and then the last item I think on our agenda for now is Carol Cornell is going to give us an overview on the operational excellence dashboard.

With that I just want to thank - I think Akram has to leave, so I just want to thank you all very much for participating today. This has been extremely helpful and constructive. I'd like to suggest maybe that we formalize this and invite you all like this to our regular meetings, you know, in-person meetings, so thank you very much.

Akram Atallah: Thanks everyone, thank you.

Carol Cornell: Good morning everyone, I'm only going to spend about five or ten minutes and just give you an update on some of the progress we're making on dashboards and metrics and the processes we're taking.

There is a presentation that's not today but we just thought we would cover a few topics so that you guys are aware of where we are in progression in this effort. And can you just - yes, so tomorrow at 8:30 in the morning we're going to give a whole kind of an introductory session on the processes we're developing for developing dashboards specifically. You mentioned in the meeting that I sat here and listened to about having some agreed upon metrics that you're looking at from a performance perspective.

We also are working on metrics internally to help us manage our efforts. So one of the things that I'd like to say is some of the discussion we're having

here we are also having internally at finding the right key performance indicators for the key success factors that each group is looking at. That - sorry, could you go back two slides? So the - this one, as you know we are organizing a lot of our reporting mechanisms by the four objectives 16 goals.

And this format of these four objectives and how they break out is one of the ways that we are going to be structuring a lot of the data and information. So I just think it's an awareness piece. In this case this particular slide we took from the FY-15 operating plan and budget draft that's out for public comment. So you can see that we are trying to align structurally all the information in the comments format.

I'm doing this in the spirit of time, I'm just hitting (sub here). This is an important component of what we are doing and this has to do with what dashboards or charts or metrics you're going to see. We're trying to make the point and what we'd like to share a little bit is there is a lot of day-to-day data being gathered at the operational level and we're using it for our management purposes.

But we are going to try to find the right if you will chart to share where we're dealing with the strategic issues versus the directional issues and operational and which ones that would show outward publicly and which ones we do to deal with our day-to-day managed play. Currently if you were to go to ICANN's Web site there is a dashboard page there but we're actually in the process of updating and refining that and putting out a more effective dashboard effort.

And the data of that is going to be available in Los Angeles, so you will be seeing that over the next couple months rollout and developed. If there are particular key performance indicators that you think are important there's an opportunity to give that feedback to us and we will take that and make sure that gets tied into the overall plan that we're building. And in the spirit of just sharing and getting that I would just thought that was it and if you have any

particular questions or comments you'd like to provide here's an opportunity to do so.

Woman: Thanks Carol, I'll send to the record. Is this stuff based on the current strategic plan and what's the progress in 2016, 2020?

Carol Cornell: We are actually looking ahead and 4 by 16 which is commonly known is - was based on the strategic plan as we have and will be incorporating into the five year strategic plan which has additional elements we will change this structure to ensure that it matches those two. Okay thank you very...

END