

Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

Registries Meeting

Tuesday 16 July 2013 at 14:15 local time

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://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Coordinator: This is the audio timestamp for the post-lunch Registries Meeting as it's scheduled to begin at 14, 15 and 1600 in Hall 3B. The recordings are live. You're ready to go.

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you (David). If everybody would like to have a seat and we'll get started. And again, just a housekeeping detail, prior to speaking if you would announce your name and affiliation for purposes of those participating remotely and for the transcript. Thank you.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay, thank you very much Cherie and welcome back everybody. This is Keith [Drazek](#), Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

And I'd like to welcome Patrik Falstrom and Jim Galvin from SSAC and Julia Hedlund. So please, you know, welcome Patrik. We appreciate the time you made for us in your busy schedule, and I'll just hand it over to you and look forward to maybe some Q&A afterwards.

Patrik Falstrom: Thank you very much. So Patrik Falstrom, Chair of SSAC. And to my right, I have Jim Galvin, Vice-Chair. And in this room we also have quite a large number of SSAC members.

And just because I assume that we should try to concentrate on Q&A here, there might be other issues that is part of the material that you all ready have got distribution that we might skip. So to give you the ability to know who actually are the SSAC people, can I ask the SSAC members to stand up please? There, so there you've got at least sort of eight or ten of us, so if it's the case you have follow-up questions you can talk to any of them and you don't have to specifically find me.

So with that - first of all, let me explain - shortly mention SSAC. SSAC is one of the advisory committees of ICANN. Our charter tells us to advise the ICANN community and specifically the Board on the security and stability related issues with the infamous addressing and naming systems.

We were founded in 2001 and began operation in 2002. We operate by creating something that we call work parties or like working groups. And those working groups - in the working groups, that is where we produce the various reports that we offer consensus in SSAC as a whole, do make available for the community.

We have the last couple of years, produced approximately six reports per year - between four and six depending a little bit on what topics we're talking about. Next slide please.

We have today 39 members and they are appointed on three year terms. And so each year we are reviewing one-third of the members. Next slide please. Can I get the next slide? Thank you.

So the - here you see the various activities that we have as current. They cover everything from the ongoing, for example, membership committee that

are looking at our membership to DNS Workshop which is something that we are hosting every Wednesday at the ICANN Meeting at DNSSAC Workshop to work parties that we hope and believe will produce a report for example, comments on various TLDs of report for example or abuse the DNS would heed off attacks, etcetera. Next please.

So hear you see a couple of hosts of publications. First, we have a number of documents that are related to DNS security and abuse. Of course at the moment, a lot of ICANN's work is related to this topic so we have quite a large number of such reports. Next slide please.

We also have specific reports on, for example, IDN, SSAC 52, on (unintelligible) and financial domain name, top-level domains from January 2012, and also a few reports on WHOIS, for example, Number 54 and 55. Next slide please.

So I was not thinking about going into the SSAC specifics more than this, so I'll ask whether there are any questions. Okay, so let's go into a few reports that we would like to mention briefly before we get into questions.

The first one is a response from the Board. We have been asked from SSAC that the Board take into account that when looking at various different kind of risks, to when launching studies, that they should be introducing (unintelligible) study which is a term that we have been using.

We've got a question from the Board, "What actually do you mean by that?" So it's specifically this was around the various studies about root scaling issues. To SSAC 59 provides the SSAC advice on the conversation of such interdisciplinary studies including what broad topics and specific examples the team may wish to consider, and suggestions on how this study should be performed. Next slide please.

And we also talk about, as a recommendation, that the goal of the study should be both to engage with communities that may not have been fully consulted by the previous investigations, in this specific case, of the impact of the new gTLD program, and also other kind of, not earlier, investigated areas of concern. Next please.

So this is one example of a report that is a direct response to a question from the Board which ended up relatively easy, but of course, a rather important document for us to produce.

There are other world quarters that work with a little bit more difficult issues and let me give you a status update of the work party on IDN variance. This is a work party that has not produced a document yet. Next slide please. We are, though, in the last phase of validation of SSAC consensus on the document, so we are very close to hopefully actually reach consensus on this.

So at the moment, the work party is working on a document that is commenting on the following rules that you see here. The Label Generation Rules Procedure for the Root Zone, the LGR's repertoire and variant generation rules, LGR change code (emphasis) and other recommendations that you can see in the Use and Experience Report for LGR.

The (unintelligible) that the trigger of this was an explicit question from the Board for us, for SSAC to have a look at the Use Experience Report. But we found that we cannot only look at the Use Experience Report as that references some other part of the whole LGR architecture. Next slide please.

So we are commenting on the following issues and all of these things are quite natural when you look at a problem from a security and stability standpoint. For example, we're looking at conservative and principle, various processes issues where you have disagreement in the community, compatibility issues for different converging of rules, the potential difference

between LGRs for the Root Zone compared to Top-Level Domains, and operational readiness. So this is sort of quite normal list of things that we're looking into. Next slide please.

So as I said, the work party has produced a document for the full SSAC review and the review time is up until including the 17th of July and that's pretty soon. After that we will...

Merike Kaeo: ...current even today even though they were written ten years ago. And we want to enumerate the responsible behavior because one of the main issues is that we all have to be a part of helping with the overall issues that cause these, you know, DNS security issues. And we want to provide updated recommendations to foster greater DNS infrastructure stability. Next slide please.

So the issues that we're addressing are the increased scale and impacts of the tax. Specifically, I think if you guys have followed some of our news, in March, there was a 300 gigabyte attack right on CloudFlare. And you know, these issues are getting worse.

We want to, you know, describe the factors that make these attacks possible. Absolutely, you know, refer to all of the recommendations, specifically SSAC 04 and 8 that were defined ten years ago to really raise the awareness that we have to follow these best practice recommendations, and also recommend steps to address on the last critical issues. Next slide please.

So the questions that are up for discussion within our work party and that we're addressing is what steps should DNS and network operatives take to resolve the issues that make these large scale attacks possible? You know, how can they prevent them and to help also identify unmanaged open crucial resolvers? And how do you detect networks that deploy crucial networks and run these unmanaged open (unintelligible) dissolvers? Next slide please.

So once the report is done within the work party, we're going to send it to the overall SSAC for review. And once approved and published, we want to absolutely renew the efforts to evangelize and socialize the importance of the security best current practices. And this is for everybody that has anything to do with DNS whether or not you're an operator, or you know, operating a network operator, or whether or not you are operating authoritative or (unintelligible) dissolver, we all have to play the part and follow the best current practices.

And that's it for my report. Thank you.

Patrik Falstrom: Thank you very much. And with that, we presented what we have and would like to move into question-and-answers on these issues that are presented, but also any other things that you would like to ask us.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay, thank you very much Patrik. This is Keith. Appreciate the very comprehensive and efficient slides.

Let's go ahead and open it up for questions, comments. Anything for our SSAC colleagues? Okay, I see Jordyn, I see Chuck.

Jordyn Buchanan: Hi, thanks. Jordyn Buchanan for the record. So two questions about the abuse of DNS report or working groups since we're not to that yet.

I've been hearing this term, abuse of the DNS, abused, in that it's often described - used to describe, you know, content that happened to be pointed out by a domain name or something like that as opposed to the DNS itself being actually involved in doing anything other than providing an identifier.

It sounds like though you are talking specifically about ways that either protocols or implementation allow, for example, amplification attacks. Are there any other types of abuse of DNS that's identified in your work other than amplification attacks?

Merike Kaeo: This is Merike Kaeo. At this point no, and you are correct. We were actually discussing this today that maybe it should have been called anti-abuse. But for now, it's specifically the issues that cause DNS amplification attacks which primarily also deal with the issues of school traffic and open the (crucible) resolvers.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Merike Kaeo: What was that?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Patrik Falstrom: Mark, go to a microphone and you can answer, yes. Because we - Merike explicitly described one work party. We have other work parties as well that work with related issues. So I think this question - I think Mark, please expound this.

Mark Seiden: Mark Seiden for the record.

Patrik Falstrom: Yes, Mark Seiden, also SSAC member.

Mark Seiden: We have another work party called Identifier Abuse Metrics working group which is looking at other forms of abuse related to the use of domain names and IP addresses. And we're particularly concerned about content abuse, and you know, not abuse of the registration system or abuse of the DNS system itself, but abuse using domain names of the Internet. So and that's just started work party and we're trying to figure out how to measure these things and collecting information from the stakeholders on how they respond to these forms of abuse.

Merike Kaeo: This is Merike Kaeo, I must have misunderstood the question because I thought it was just relating to the specific work party that I had discussed. So thanks Mark.

Jordyn Buchanan: And I do have one follow-up question as well. So I'm just trying to understand the role of SSAC and ICANN in the context of - especially problems with like recursive resolvers being most of, you know, ICANN - most of what ICANN's about with managing identifiers is in the authoritative ecosystem as opposed to the recursive ecosystem which are run by, you know, arbitrary (unintelligible) certainly not contracted parties with ICANN a lot of the time.

What is the role of ICANN and SSAC with regards to these sort of like these organizations that aren't necessarily particularly involved in providing identification related services directly?

Patrik Falstrom: (Unintelligible). So our charter asks us to do comments and recommendations, not only to ICANN Board and to sort of the core ICANN organization, the contracted parties, but to the ICANN community as a whole. And also not only about DNS, but as Merike pointed out, also IP addressing kind of naming systems.

So it's both the case that we can give general recommendations, for example, like we did in the report on internal names - internal certificates where we wrote recommendations that were directed at the CAs in the world but give our certificates. But it's also the case that even the trigger, why we are working on, is things can either be, for example, resorted in the variance direct questions from that were requested from ICANN Board, but it can also be issues that are triggered by us internally by SSAC members.

So to clarify, we do have a pretty large degree of freedom to decide what we are doing and to whom we are directing recommendations.

That said, of course, the likelihood for recommendation to the implemented is something different than a completely different discussion. Thank you.

Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks, thanks Patrik. Jordyn, did you have a question specifically about recursive dissolvers or recursive servers?

Jordyn Buchanan: I think Patrik answered it. I was just trying to get a feel - I mean generally speaking, most of the ICANN - the people ICANN have direct influence over I guess, the contracted parties in particular, are generally operating authoritative servers (unintelligible) recursive servers whereas the amplification attacks are channeled through the recursive services. Just trying to understand what the relationship of the work was to ICANN's remit.

Keith [Drazek](#): Got it, thanks. Okay, I've got a queue, so Chuck then (Alex) then (Rubin). Anyone else like to get in the queue? All right Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Keith, Chuck Gomes. [I](#) have three questions related to the naming collisions study that is going on - being done by ICANN and certainly, in large part, in response to SSAC communicated concerns. And I can take one at a time or give you all three, whatever you prefer.

Here's the first one. What does the SSAC believe are the key issues surrounding the naming collisions study, and are [there](#) any preliminary findings or discussion points or findings available that could be shared with the Registry Stakeholder Group at this time? And then a corollary question; this is still part of the first question.

What can we expect from the SSAC related to these studies from a timing and comment perspective?

Patrik Falstrom: Okay, let me - let's take one at a time here.

So no, there is nothing to be shared. And the way the study was created is that, yes, SSAC was off to incorporate if you read the Board Resolution. And yes, the work party inside SSAC is working on the name space coalition has seen preliminary versions of the report. That is correct.

But the areas of - the topic areas that SSAC is concerned about is all ready, one could say, laid out in the various SSAC reports that all ready cover this. For example, SSAC 45 from 2010 that talk about the queries - the large number of queries for non-delegated TLDs to the Root Zone and the internal - and the report related to certificates, SSAC 57 from March 15 2013.

So those issues to you, which one could say are sort of related to search path issues and name space coalitions, that is where SSAC is looking.

Chuck Gomes: And can you talk at all about [that?](#)

Patrik Falstrom: Sorry, timeline - yes; the next steps. What we have got explained which is that what is now happening is that the report is to be finalized. And ICANN staff that is the receiver of this report, SSAC is not the receiver of this study, ICANN is. ICANN is to draw conclusions and we are asked to comment and/or keep an eye on this or like - I don't really remember exactly what word that was used there.

I envision that this will be taken care of. I haven't seen any signs that this will be taken care of different than anything else. I presume that ICANN will have a public comment period and SSAC is, while sitting on the side, looking at this and will certainly come with comments.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks; appreciate that Patrik. Second question.

Patrik Falstrom: Oh, you had one more. It is the question about timeline.

Chuck Gomes: Oh yes, okay.

Patrik Falstrom: Okay, so let me say that I presume that ICANN is trying to - I don't know of any timeline; let me just say that. but we are prepared on trying to deliver as fast as possible, and of course, that the work party has been able to see preliminary versions of this study, will make it easier for us to actually respond quickly.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay, second question. If there are issues, why can't we simply notify potentially impacted parties now and provide them steps to mitigate naming - possible naming collisions in their networks?

And what's the most expeditious way to move forward given the risk of naming collisions? Does SSAC believe that ICANN has a role there or may have a role there?

Patrik Falstrom: I think you are asking questions about things that we don't know anything about yet just because the study is not finalized.

Regarding notification, that is one of the various different kind of things that could happen to minimize the problems that name space collision creates, and also potentially minimize the problem that the deployment of new gTLDs could happen. But we are also talking about discussing many other mechanisms as well.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, and obviously, what I was getting at there is how can we speed this thing up and minimize delays.

A third area. Does SSAC believe that there are any issues with the current structure, reporting instrumentation, organization and other capabilities or the Root Server system including Root Ops and SSAC itself that may pose or prolong SSR issues or hinder the ability to analyze the impact of collisions?

For example, the need to see what number of queries exist for a given applied for string in order to gauge the risk, and what about the need for an early warning capability or the ability to roll back? Are those kinds of things possible and necessary?

Patrik Falstrom: We in SSAC has multiple times said that early warning systems and measuring systems are things that are needed to be able to detect early, if it is the case, that there is a disturbance anywhere in the sort of Root Service System as a whole.

That said, the risks that we're talking about with name space collisions is something slightly different which has to do with risks, which has to do with third parties that might not even be aware of the ICANN process existing. So I don't - there are slightly different things here.

But yes, we have recommended such systems to be in place; yes.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay, thanks. I've got a queue here. (Alex), (Rubin) and then (Paul).

(Alex): Two quick questions. First on the KSK rotation work party. Is SSAC looking at the idea of changing algorithm and moving (EEC) as part of this? Is that part of the discussion?

Man: We have not actually reached that point to make any comment, one way or the other, about an algorithm's change. So it's in the minds of people, it's something that personally I thought about it. We really aren't there in terms of saying anything with the work party.

(Alex): Okay, I have some papers to send to you that I think you might like to read on that.

Man: Please do.

(Alex): And then, second, on the anti-abuse. So to be clear that the anti - the best practices you're talking about, is that rate limiting or to limit DNS amplification attacks in it, so is the expectation that these recommendations will be ready before TLD delegation starts so that the new TLD registries are implementing that as they roll out or is that going to be later?

Merike Kaeo: It's under discussion. So the rate limiting, it wasn't - it's still new and so we're actually looking at whether or not we want to make that a specific recommendation or not. The only positive recommendations that I can say will stay in there is the recommendations that we had all ready done ten years with was SSAC 004 and 008. But all the other ones are still under discussion.

Patrik Falstrom: Let me just step in and say that we need to be in another room at top of the hour shortly. So if you want to prioritize questions, yes.

Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks Patrik. So I've got (Rubin) and then Paul, and if anybody else wants to get in the queue, stick your hand up now.

(Rubin): In the (unintelligible) cab for people relation, they would be doing particularly of possible name collisions with certificates. Have they got back to us or to SSAC or to anyone with numbers on how many certificates were issued for applied new TLDs?

Patrik Falstrom: We - you have to ask them. We cannot answer that. (Unintelligible) to us, so we don't know.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay, thanks (Rubin), thanks Patrik. (Paul), over to you.

(Paul [Stahura](#)): (Paul [Stahura](#)) with (Donuts), a new member of the constituency.

At a top level, we have name collisions, okay, and I think of that as name collisions just on the - like NXD records for the top level domain, and then we

have name collisions at the second level for certificates; that's once at the collision. And then we also have - then NXD at the second level.

And I'm wondering, in your new study, did you guys look at just the top level on the collisions that, you know, or did you look at the second level as well?

Patrik Falstrom: We have - let me answer this right. We are not only been looking at name space collisions within the DNS. The most tricky part is name space collisions between different systems that use names that looks similar enough - or not similar enough, but the computer is used multiple protocols, not only DNS, to look up things. That is the most tricky part.

(Paul [Stahura](#)): Understood.

Patrik Falstrom: So to answer your question, yes, we have been looking at both levels, but also even further expounded or outside of the DNS.

(Paul [Stahura](#)): Okay, so you did look at the second level in the - like the NXD that Root might be retrying for second level names?

Patrik Falstrom: Okay, we have diverted terminology use here which means that I don't really understand what you are asking for, so I don't see we have time to do that. I'm happy to talk to you afterwards to what you really mean.

(Paul [Stahura](#)): Okay, so what I'm really looking at is I want to know how many, let's say, NXD queries that are given back by unregistered dot core names, a TLD that's not in the root. And then I want to compare that to the same stats for dot com. I was wondering if you guys...

Patrik Falstrom: There are numbers in - there are some numbers for the TLDs in SSAC 45 in that report, but it's looking up the TLDs the number of queries...

(Paul [Stahura](#)): Only at the TLD level.

Patrik Falstrom: Regarding the work that has been studied in the study, we are not the one that is doing the study. That is the external part that is contracted by ICANN and you need to talk to them or look at the report when that is released.

(Paul [Stahura](#)): Okay. Who is doing the study?

Patrik Falstrom: It is commissioned by ICANN staff? You'll have to ask ICANN staff?

(Paul [Stahura](#)): To tell me the name of the people doing the study so I can talk to them.

Patrik Falstrom: Yes.

(Paul [Stahura](#)): Okay.

Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks (Paul), thanks Patrik. Jordyn, did you want to jump in? I think we have to wrap up? Are you sure? Okay, we've got a couple of minutes.

All right, okay. Any final questions? All right, thank you all very much. We appreciate the members of the SSAC being here with us today. Thanks for making the time.

Patrik Falstrom: And thank you very much for inviting us.

Keith [Drazek](#): Thank you.

Okay, we'll start up again in about one minute; one minute call.

Okay everybody, let's go ahead and get started. I think we're doing okay on our agenda as far as timing is concerned, but we do have some more work to do.

Don Blumenthal has to leave shortly and I think he's prepared to give us an update on I think WHOIS. So Don, I'll hand that over to you.

Don Blumenthal: Okay, I appreciate it. I've got to leave to the SSAC there.

Real briefly, we published the Thick WHOIS PP Report about three weeks ago. Three weeks - excuse me - three weeks and two days and I know that because the initial comment to date all ready ended.

Overall, our recommendation was that ICANN should go to Thick WHOIS in the future. That essentially means any subsequent round of new gTLD applications - I think we should not discuss that possibility right now. But also, any existing gTLD registry should move to Thick. Begin our pretty systematically breaking the top in any number of areas accountability WHOIS is about twelve of them.

I chaired the sub-committee on privacy, day protection and privacy.

The report is out there, please take a look. We sell into the trap of tabbing the comment period end right at about ICANN time, so certainly as much as I hate to say it, nobody will object to original comments during the reply period. But really, please, we are looking for comments.

We have three. Two have agreed with us and one said, "Don't do anything because of all the pending political and policy and technical things." You'll see a fourth there that was misfiled, it should be in another comment period.

That's it. I just wanted to bring folks up to date. I'd be happy to answer your questions.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay, thanks very much Don. I appreciate all the work that you've spent on the Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group. Jeff, over to you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I mean maybe I'll turn it back over to Don. Are you good with the recommendations? What's your thoughts as to what the stakeholder group should do?

Don Blumenthal: Yes, I am good with the recommendations. I'm not sure that it's as clear cut, yes, as some people are portraying it. But I think the balance, right down the line, on all the subtopics was that there's no downside and there are potential upsides in terms of consistency if nothing else on having uniform system.

Now to be honest, I think the person who said, "We don't know yet," in their comments, you know, some of the things we talked about are going to be affected by what the EWG does and what comes out of the protocol of IGFs. But in the short run, dealing with what we know now, I think it was a good report; yes.

Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks Don, hold on Jeff. You had a question as to the expert working group coming to talk to us?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I thought originally that maybe it was cancelled or?

Keith [Drazek](#): Yes, we don't have them on our agenda. I don't recall them ever making that request.

Jeff Neuman: And when are comments due to that? I have a ton of problems with the EWG stuff. Does anyone know when that comment period ends?

Don Blumenthal: I don't think EWG has even been posted yet.

(Paul [Stahura](#)): My understanding is - it's (Paul). My understanding for EWG is they will accept comments from the community, it's kind of open ended comments. There's no real deadline. They do mention on their micro site like mid-August because that gives them the ability to start inputting that stuff into whatever

their next steps are, so it's called mid-August, if we want to say something about EWG.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, that's a better way to put it. There's - I've been told there's going to be a place to formally submit, in the traditional ways of posting, sending to the mail box is the current set up. But certainly things are being accepted that way now and that's how we got the wrong post. Somebody put in a comment on EWG and it just got slapped up in our section for some reason.

So if you don't like the term (ARDS), somebody's all ready said that.

Man: And on the ICANN public comment site, it looks like they're expecting to have an actual public comment period in September for EWG stuff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I think, not necessarily for now, but I definitely have comments on the EWG and I think we should be filing comments on it as it - I mean it's going to eventually come through GNSO. At least we need to stress that in our comments and make sure they follow through with their word that this is really just input to a potential policy development process.

But the way that - it's interesting because (Scott Hollenbacker) is on about EWG from our group. The way he described the options is different than what we heard the other day from the EWG when they were presenting to the Council or the GNSO community during Saturday or Sunday. And I want to make sure it's much more clear.

Chuck Gomes: And Jeff, this is Chuck. You know, you're aware that they had a public session yesterday afternoon. I'm sure it conflicted with something else and many other things, but they did have one.

Keith [Drazek](#): So this is Keith. You know, what I would suggest I think is, you know, obviously Jeff, you have some concerns, others may as well, is that we form a little working group or a drafting team for those particular comments. Ask

for volunteers and try to coordinate a little bit better around the Expert Working Group recommendations.

But we also have an opportunity, as Don said, to submit comments on the Thick WHOIS during the reply period. We've done that before, others have done that before. I'm sure there's a comment there that we can reply to if we need to.

So I would also encourage if anybody has concerns or issues or comments on the Thick WHOIS process, then speak up and let's get some comments drafted.

Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I'd actually be - since most of the recommendations are with the Thick WHOIS, in fact is VeriSign. If you guys are comfortable, if not I totally understand. I don't mean to put you on the spot but I'd love to hear your thoughts on that or if you guys are going to file comments.

If again, I don't mean to put you on the spot.

Keith [Drazek](#): No that's fine, not at all. I'm happy to address it and Chuck, feel free to jump in.

But VeriSign did not file comments directly and I don't expect that we will unless there's a comment that we have a real problem with. But you know, VeriSign's, you know, belief was that this process needed to go through the policy development process, so there was adequate opportunity for community input, for registrars to, you know, provide input and all stakeholders to be engaged in the process. And that whatever came out of it is what we would do.

So I mean, Chuck, feel free to jump in with anything.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Keith and thanks Jeff.

Yes, I don't think we're going to submit comments. I have reached out to our operations people and the business folks to see if there was anything.

One of the things we had - a couple of people on the group, one that actively participated and stayed, and so we tried to get our input in. And obviously, one of our biggest concerns was to make sure that they think in terms of implementation ahead of the game because there's so many names involved. And if you look in the report, you'll see that they address that issue.

So it could happen that we submit some, but I'm like Keith; I don't think we are right now. At least they haven't told me.

Keith [Drazek](#): So just to circle back again. We have an opportunity, probably a 20-day opportunity or something like that, maybe less, to file reply comments on the Thick WHOIS initial report. So if anybody cares enough to take the initiative, feel free to do so.

Jeff and then Don.

Jeff Neuman: It sounds like, not hearing any negative comments, I mean don't we have a standard template response when we just agree with the findings of the initial report and just say, "Thank you and we agree." At least something - we have some template that we've done that before.

Keith [Drazek](#): Yes, I'm sure we do if everybody is comfortable with that. Don?

Don Blumenthal: Yes, I meant to add in the beginning, we've got a public session later in the week it gets harder is to strike, but I think the public session is all afternoon where we'll be talking about the report.

And just to add some things from VeriSign in the state of protection sub team that I ran and was just outstanding as contributions largely to me.

The report - we struggle to keep things in scope. You know, what's really just this issue and what do we see in other areas.

And one area that is clearly just in scope here is if current Thin has to move to Thick without any names. We're going to have a data transfer situation that is just unprecedented in the volumes, and Mark was really helpful in just talking to us and contributing on the security implications of that process. Mark Anderson - so just thought I would give him some credit here.

Keith [Drazek](#): Great, thanks very much Don. We'll pass that along for sure.

Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Super quick comment. Just - I think this was after, and I don't know if it was answered. The draft generation next gTLD Services comment period is closed 12th of August, so it's actually in the firm closing date of 12th of August.

Keith [Drazek](#): Great, thanks. All right, I think we need to wrap up conversation on this unless there's anything else. Don, I understand you have to leave, so thank you very much; thanks again for your work on all that.

Let me flip to the agenda here real quick. At 3:15, we will be joined by Philip Sheppard from the BRG, the DotBrand group. And also during that same half hour, ([Dirk](#)) will be with us from DotBerlin to talk about GO's. So we're going to split the half hour that we had on our calendar between the two and look forward to hearing from them.

So I think - let's see. We've got a couple of minutes here, let me just see if there's anything else we need to - yes. That's more than five minutes though.

You know what? Let's just spend five minutes here and recap the conversation that we had with the Board particularly around the GAC Advice issue and pick the RP if we want to talk about that. Tim.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer, DotGreen. I guess one of the things I came out of there concerned with was the comment at the end as far as next step that we're going to wait to get the GAC community later this week. And that basically to me says it's at least (poinesary) before this gets resolved.

And that, in fact, if anybody on the current GAC Advise list could potentially get to contracting point, they'll be held up I think as long as that's still in limbo. So that's concerning.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay, thanks Tim. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes and I had a conversation with some good sources on the GAC. And when I asked them about the timing, they said that they couldn't choose getting done before seven months. So it's not Buena Aires, it's whatever - Singapore I think.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay, (Adrian).

(Adrian): Jeff, I think the Board knows that. I think the Board is conscience of that that the (unintelligible) will be the timelines they're looking at?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I do. I mean Chris was very clear that a rejection, an outright rejection, would take six months.

Ultimately I think, at least with those strings that are left on the list, they're going to have to at some point, issue a rejection, and then they're going to have to at that point, engage in the consultation process, at least with respect

to those strings. And then at six months, that's what Chris said during the last meeting.

Keith [Drazek](#): Go ahead (Adrian).

(Adrian): It seems to me, at least this was a while ago, that the trade off was that the Board was acting, in order to move things through quickly, you have to accept some, you know, if you want us to get this thing done, then you're going to have to - but it's really at the point now where it's taking so long that that's not the driver for us anymore. I think the driver now has to be what is right.

And so I think, because of what they're suggesting is so erroneous and wrong within the GAC Advice itself, maybe we should take that bullet out of the gun in our approach. And that would be to say to the Board - call it reverse psychology or whatever, and this is just draft, just free thinking. But say, "Take as long as you like to get it right."

And I think that would scare the Board because they then would have to go and actually do something right. "Take as long as you'd like and get it right please." Because what they'll do is they'll tell us is what they're doing is (pasteurized) and "We did it as best we could in order to make sure it was there quickly." (Unintelligible) get that out of the way?

You know what guys? Take your time please, but we want you to get rid of this GAC Advice completely because it's inappropriate.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay, thanks. Thanks (Adrian). I've got Ken and then Jordyn.

Ken Stubbs: thank you. I'm somewhat troubled by some of the comments that I've heard recently, one of them referred to a new representative from India on the GAC. It was suddenly announced that they're going to be expressing - filing expressions of concerns on two more (unintelligible) use strings.

Please give me some guidance here. Number one, is there any deadline on these objections? And number two, at what point in time do they become mute? Do they become mute at the point like (Adrian) because once they sign the contract they can't do a damn thing about it. But all the way up to that point in time is a unique (sachintory) process.

Keith [Drazek](#): Go ahead (Adrian).

(Adrian): My - just because my contract is signed doesn't mean they can't do a damn thing about it. I signed a typical supplementary (crested) supplement because I (unintelligible) - yes, supplement to the Registry Agreement. But then says should there be any GAC Advice coming I have to suck it up.

So I'm no better off than anyone else just because I signed the contract.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks - Jordyn. Great, Jordyn, go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: So first - I mean Chris attempted to - I mean Chris didn't actually respond and said, you know, "Let's wait to see," - I mean it sounded like he didn't expect that. It was - to actually have new (unintelligible) data to it. So let's wait and see I guess - I mean it seems like reasonable advice.

Man: Wait until when?

Jordyn Buchanan: Till Thursday.

But the other point I want to make, to pick up where (Adrian) left off, I think we should think about is there a path that we could - so one path that we can suggest is rejection and then we know what that does for timelines, right. Like that's going to take at least two more meetings to get through that process.

Another approach we could take is, and what the Board has tried to do so far with the other bits of advice other than Category One is say like, "What is the

lightest weight way I can implement this and act like I'm going along with the GAC without actually doing anything that's hard to implement or to erroneous.

And maybe if we could work together - maybe we could think about whether there is such a thing that we could suggest and say, "Hey, here's how we think you could proceed by saying you're," - you know, we don't need to put this in quotes in our thing. But you know, to say, "Yes, we're accepting your advice but it's going to be implemented in a way that registries can deal with it."

It's highly possible that half isn't available to us because we'll never be able to get consensus among applicants as to what that would look like, but it may be worth the mental exercise of seeing if that path is available. And if not, then you fall back to what (Adrian) says and say, you know, "We've given up, we know there's no short path available. You guys should do what's right."

Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks Jordyn. Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I mean in line with what (Adrian) said, the six months is not really a threat anymore because I think even working with the GAC, it's going to be longer than six months. And my fear is they're going to try to quote work with the GAC and we're going to be sitting in Argentina no better off, and then it's going to be another six months.

It's almost to the point where the Board should reject it and we'll see what comes of it. You know, we'll wait six months, you know, just at the intercessional meeting and start your process.

My gut feeling is that we're just delaying the inevitable which is going to delay it even more. So I mean it...

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay Jordyn, and then we're going to need to wrap up.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, I guess is it worth having some group of people spend some time to try to figure out if there's a way that we could suggest that the GAC gets faster? If not, then we should just - if we don't think there's any path available that's fast, then you're absolutely right.

But I guess are we all confident that there's nothing that we could suggestively could implement without a lot more - because in theory, they could just create some more pics and say, "Hey, you're on Category One. These are your pics." If we could live with those in order to proceed, then you know, maybe they're done and they don't need to wait till Buenos Aires to do anything.

Jeff Neuman: So there's eight recommendations with Category One, and I'm trying to just pull it up now. I think there are a couple of those which wouldn't - I mean - I'm not an applicant for - I am actually for one of those. But I'm just trying to go to it.

So there's a couple in there in the eight. Yes, one and two is that you have an acceptable use policy and you include certain provisions. Two is that you require registrars to notify registrants about of that requirement. Three I think is a problem because it basically says that you'll require registrants who collect and maintain sensitive health and financial data to implement reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of those services because - it's just undefined.

Four is establishing a working relationship with a relevant regulatory or industry self-regulatory body which is just, you know, completely difficult.

((Crosstalk))

Jordyn Buchanan: As opposed to going through this right now, maybe we should just take - if there's a few people who are the ones having conversations, see if there is anything we can propose, then let's spend that time. And if not, if everyone

thinks it's impossible, then let's just agree that it's impossible and deal with that new reality.

I think it might be possible, I'd be willing to spend some time working with folks but if I'm the only one then that's not a good investment of anyone's time.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay so I think the action item there because we have to move on is to circulate a, you know, circulate a note to the list, ask for volunteers to participate in that conversation and let's see what we can do. I think it's worth it - it's worth a try, right? It would be a mistake not to at least give that a try, so thanks Jordyn. Tim and then we need to close on this issue.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer, just one quick last I guess question and maybe this is kind of toward (Chris Stiller) or anybody else knows.

So from what (Adrian) said it sounds like we can sign contracts if we're, you know, if you're still listed on - as one of those strings in GAC advice with the pending, you know, supplement that, you know, whenever it get resolved that, you know, comes into your contract. But worse case if this thing went on for nine more months or whatever would you be (putting it) in from launching while GAC advice is still pending?

[Krista Papac](#): No the supplement doesn't do that - by the way these are posted if you guys want to look at them. The Registry Agreement and the Supplement to the Registry Agreement, so those of you who don't have one of them you can read the language yourselves.

Man: (Unintelligible)?

[Krista Papac](#): That's correct, sorry - I'm sorry. So nobody in cate- excuse me, so nobody in Category 1 is getting a CIR right now.

Man: Okay.

Man: Can you send around the link?

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks everybody, we need to wrap up that issue - we can circle back to it after the meeting if necessary. So right now on the agenda...

Man: I'm sorry, just to reserve we still have to talk about the TRTP stuff or maybe not...

Keith [Drazek](#): We do.

Man: ...but the comments from (Acron) is just - might need to address.

Keith [Drazek](#): We do need to circle back and talk about that. So let's get now to Philip - Philip I know we had you for an extended period of time on the agenda but we've had a very compressed schedule today. So if I could ask you to sort of target about ten minutes - and welcome.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you very much, I'm sure we can do that - (unintelligible) is always a good policy for brands anyway. So thank you for the invitation, I guess I the future we'll be seeing much more of us and this is part of that introduction.

So let me just take you through - I have a few slides here and then we'll have five minutes for Q&A and I do (pass out) I might also segue into the session with the GO's because there's some common elements there. But as you can see I got to talk very quickly about where we are in terms of setting up the (BLG) and then key questions about what is our relationship going to be with you guys. What's the relationship also with other new groupings and then a couple of words on where we are on the customized Registry Agreement.

So by way of (interpretation) you will notice about a third of the total applications have been dot Brand type and we describe that as having a

common vision of unique plans through our registries and furtherance of the business purpose beyond offering registry services to the general public. After some thinking through it we've made a definition of what we think dot Brands are as a criteria for joining the BRG and that's at least one applied for TLD operational error outside the main name industry.

The TLD represents a preexisting trademark, it's in furtherance of a pre-TLD interest and it will have a single entity, single user type with no intention at the time of application to settle the second level. And that means that we are not representing single registrants, single user generics even though some of our applications will have both. So as long as they've got one, they qualify.

What we also thought is we registered just a few weeks ago as a not for profit trade association under Belgium law, so we are now a trade association. We're now soliciting members and I've responded to the earlier interest we've had from around about 80 to 90 of the pool of about what 400 of dot Brands and we're now looking at that and circulating documents we had internally and would like them to join. In a since there's a trade association we're sitting up services which is basically advocacy representation networking and best practice. More detail on each of those is on our Web site.

So moving on to Item 2 and these were a sort of list of questions about our future relationship with yourself and the stakeholder group. And if you look at the existing charter of course than the obvious entry route is an interest group because that can't exist certainly similar status to it is today. I'm looking into the future and obvious thing for us to do in ICANN context in general constituency and that thing gets back to yourself in terms of charter change to accept constituencies.

So that's a Q&A and the second week we can have a feeling in terms of where you're thinking about structural form to engage these changes future relationships with others some good things. I had a very - my productive

breakfast today talking with the dot (Gear) guys who have been here in a second where we saw a range of commonalities there.

And I also had a conversation a few weeks ago with Joe from Google on the domain name association just talking in broad terms about what we could do there to cooperate. We're very keep at the BRG in terms of the basic sort of outward concept of the DNA, we saw that as - site as something that we wish to participate in. And like any good trade association we would seek to do that by corporation and avoiding duplication.

So that's just where we are in principle with that, I look forward to future discussion with them and just where we are on the brand customized Registry Agreements in general we're seeking an addendum to the existing RA, not a new contract and essentially we're trying to reduce irrelevancy for dot Brand sites. And that's where we are so I can understand there's no need for protection measures where there are no registrants and there's no need for failure protection where there are no victims of failure.

And that logic is seen in some of the detail that is taking some time. We had a productive meeting where we're cracking down to it, we made some concessions and sort of accept some irrelevancy and try to persuade our seers back home and that's we're having for some of the other stuff that is clearly more problematic. And that's where we are - so let me finish there and I'm happy to take some questions about that and perhaps talking about future relationship is a key issue really.

Keith [Drazek](#):

Sure thank you very much Philip it was a very clear, very concise and very informative, so thanks for the presentation. And I think we can jump right into the question of, you know, our structure, our charter. You've obviously read it you're familiar with it currently today. Members of the registry stakeholder group are able to form interest groups.

Obviously we had a unique situation with new TLD applicants is that we wanted to, you know, create a home or an opportunity for new TLD applicants to participate through the Registry Stakeholder Group. Yet they - up until signing a contract we're not technically contracted parties so they were not able to vote if you will as full members in the Registry's Group until that contract was signed.

So the process for all of the new TLD applicants that ultimately joined as members and formed an interest group in the NTAG was first they joined individually and then they form an interest group and it was an observer interest group for this particular purpose. But looking ahead, you know, the Registry Stakeholder Group over the last several years, I don't remember the exact dates recognized that there were going to be changes - changes in our membership from, you know, 14 existing to potentially hundreds.

And the concept of an interest group was developed to say, well there will be various parties, net TLD applicants who decide that they want to self-form. And that's really basically all there is to it is a group of like-minded entities registry - registries or applicants in this case coming together and deciding they have common interests and want to form an interest group. Interest groups in our structure don't have a particular vote as an interest group, it's still a number-based voting structure.

But certainly it's the opportunity for groups to sort of self-identify and surround around particular policy positions or, you know, prospectus. As it stands now we have no intention to, you know, create constituencies within our stakeholder group but - and I think certainly recognizing that there is a GNSO review that was scheduled for 2013, now it may be pushed off is that - and I'll speak for myself I think it may be premature to consider creating constituencies within our stakeholder group until it becomes more clear the results of that GNSO review as a whole.

But let me stop there and open it up to other members - anybody else that would like to jump in registry members, NTAG members - anything. I saw Jordyn's hand first then Chuck then (Rubin)'s then Jeff.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes I'd certainly love to see, you know, as, you know, Philip I think we are both a (CNP) applicant and a Brand and intend, you know, have any of the same challenges that the BRG members do and an opportunity as well.

You know, just looking around the table and know, three stars is a Brand applicant and (Fairwins) is a Brand applicant and so I'd certainly like to see the Brand and the BRG as part of the Registry Stakeholder Group as well, I think that would enhance the credibility of the Registry Stakeholder Group and allow us to work I think even more collaboratively with you guys.

And it seems like a injurious group to talk about Brand issues within the Stakeholder Group would be a great way of taking some of these issue formally within the ICANN context. Instead of, you know, what you guys are doing now in letters, you know, sort of ad hoc communication I think it seems like that would be a super productive way to get engaged while we wait to sort of see how some of these longer-term restructuring works.

And to see how it works, maybe we do need to create constituencies but we don't know what the problem we're trying to solve yet is I don't think, so it will be hard to do that without seeing whether it worked or not without that formal structure being created.

Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks Jordyn - next I've got Chuck than (Ruben) then Jeff.

Chuck Gomes: [Regarding the provision for](#) interest groups, it wasn't just so that you could, you know, work together and talk together, it was also to facilitate participation in the stakeholder group. In other words to make it more efficient - you have 50 members, you know, it might not be possible for all of them to individually participate.

But if you had your own interest group where you're coming to positions and so forth, even though each one of those would have their separate [membership](#) I think - and I haven't looked at the chart or we could look at this further and maybe even tweak it further. So it made it easier for the whole group to participate and wouldn't need every one of them being - having to be on list all the time and in everything. So I think - and I'll need to go back and look at that and see, make sure that we cover that adequately.

But one of the intents was to make it easier to participate as a group even [though](#) the number of votes relates to the number of members, not to the group itself. That kind of avoided the problem of okay how much voting power does this constituency get or that one? That's all determined by the number of members [s](#) and the membership criteria. So it's more in my opinion than just having a group that has common interests and they can talk together, you could do that anyway right, but rather to facilitate participation in the broader Stakeholder Group.

Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks Chuck, (Rubin).

(Rubin): (Unintelligible) I'd like to comment there are (modern) Stakeholder Group models like the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group where all members are members of the Stakeholder Group and can be also members of (unintelligible) model and the (conventional) Stakeholder Group which is made of constituencies which should probably go there.

But there are rules that we can make for constituencies to (bring) beside the Stakeholder Group it's not on the charter yet but that includes models that can be used so it could be done.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks (Rubin) I think that's a great point that there's a variety of models that could be used in that range I guess of implementations that should be considered, so yes thank you - Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I mean I think that's right, I would actually love to see members of the Brand Registry Group also become members of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

And actually if - whether they're an interest group or a constancy - well we only have interests groups now contemplated. But if there are interest groups they're also members of the registry stakeholder group or they have to be members of the Registry Stakeholder Group in order to be any interest group. I think the dialog even starting now I've been trying to get some brands to join the Registry Stakeholder Group because I think the exchange of information is extremely valuable.

And frankly there's a lot of issues that are shared and I'm - (at least a RJ) member of the Brand Registry Group and I will tell you the same discussions that we're having on the (big DRP) is the same - are discussions around the (big DRP) are exactly the same that we're having on the - with the Brand Group. So I think there are issues and I think both the Brand and frankly all of us would benefit from having more members feel comfortable in joining the Registry Stakeholder Group and I look forward to when that happens.

Keith [Drazek](#): Yes thanks Jeff and maybe I'll just wrap up on two points, one is the dot Brand applicants and the Brand Registry Group would be welcome in the Registry Stakeholder Group. We would welcome the members individually and we would certainly welcome the Brand Registry Group as an interest group. So yes absolutely.

I think the other point that I think is important to note that you may of picked up from reading our charter is that we have a requirement that if you're going to be a voting member in the Registry Stakeholder Group you can't also be a voting member of another stakeholder group or constituency. Basically you can belong to multiple constituencies or groups but you have to choose where you vote. And this was - this is true for example a vertically integrated

registry that's both registry and registrar or some instance like that where you basically have to choose where you vote.

So that might have implications for your members who participate in the IPC or the BC or other places, so.

Philip Sheppard: Well thank you for that - thank you for all the suggestions and comments, I think they're very helpful. It's very good to feel welcome. It's essentially right I think that we do cooperate in the (shortest) way possible because, you know, we have in common and that commonality of interest will continue.

The very thing you should call as an interesting one because at the moment you're voting model is predicated on second level and I hope this is what was predicated by not having a second level. So there's an interesting sort of discussion to be had there and that might also determine where people wish to place a vote in terms of how meaningful it would be. Or my interest is that if one is a registry of any type being within the Registry Stakeholder Group would appear to be the place that you'd wish to place the influence.

And if influence is part of voting then that's where it should be, so I think that's where the thinking should be and (unintelligible) to (look out) on this - thank you.

Keith [Drazek](#): Excellent thank you Philip so I saw Jeff and then Ken and then we need to move to ([Dirk](#)) and the Dot(GO) discussion.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks and thanks Philip, I think, you know, as part of both groups I mean I've heard the discussions that take place in the Brand Registry Group and one of the things I'd ask Philip is - (what) - sorry, Philip one of the things I would ask is when the Brand Registry Group is comfortable to actually bring those concerns to the Registry Stakeholder Group and I'm sure we can work things out

Because I think you're right there are some aspects of charter that we have right now that may not necessarily fit in with the Brands but until those concerns actually get brought up with the Registry Stakeholder Group we can't really address them. But at least from a NEUSTAR perspective I - we want to address this.

Ken Stubbs: Some I'd like to draw your attention as you take a look at the voting model - please correct me if I'm wrong guys, institutional knowledge our primary vote of model is not based on demands under management rather but as a membership.

In the case of a conflict story dispute it did look great but to the best of my knowledge and the ten years that I've been a member of the constituency I think that dispute - that weighted voted model may have been used once or twice and I really can't even remember for sure. So that's not the way that we generally more - I'll use the word more than generally - yes that's not how we do business, thank you.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks Ken, all right Philip thank you very much - we're going to move to [\(Dirk\)](#) now and to the discussion around the GO's.

[\(Dirk\)](#): Yes thank you Keith for inviting us, I think I can echo a lot of things which Philip already said and would answer some questions as similar to that. So I would like to start with who we are - we are the presentation will be?

Keith [Drazek](#): Yes.

[\(Dirk\)](#): We are currently 50 members let's say or applicants out of 76 GO-related strings with applicants being national governments, local governments, city governments, regional governments, private entities. So what I said in the GAC - the telephone looks like the ccTLDs are which will make up our group then.

And that includes those who have an official due (startles) within ICANN - the (tick box) and the application but also others which are GO-related, I'll come back later on this. Our group has met since its first large meeting in Toronto six times, that's a lot - every two months was a great participation and deep involvement in the whole topic. Presentation will come or?

Woman: (Unintelligible) we're working on it.

(Dirk): Okay I can go further, so the eligibility criteria for the constituency we want to found are very precise, it's a (drop) of course but that should be contracted gTLD registry parties. They should be a connection to a geographic name like London or geographic identifier like (unintelligible) or NYC or a geographic origin, not indication (unintelligible) but origin like (Rue) or Irish.

And all the members should have public support within the relevant government authorities and they should have the purpose of running that UD like a GO top level domain. As you know there are some GOs which have the tick box GO but like to operate in a different model or with a different purpose on that. The mission of our constituency is also very clear of the future constituency - we're aiming for I must say.

We represent the (abuse) and the interest of those who are operating in geographical top level domain, promote network incorporation, monitor and (demand) members stakeholders in ICANN and also giving guidance to future applicants for geographic top level domain. (At least) we're in the state apparently of drafting charter for constituency, it's (all) the same work you need to do as drafting a charter for an interest group I think.

And one or two of the questions, we have in our group there were many topics which (are) the topics to ask like the (picks) on the issue to most of the GOs I think no issue at all. We have practically one contingent set who's in this GOs so that (all amounts) of problems (Jack has asked) hasn't been a problem due to the requirement for governmental support. And (auctions) and

other topics are also not a topic which are big topic within the other stakeholder groups and was in the NTAG.

And I must say in the NTAG Group we worked - we're a member of the NTAG Group along with a lot of GO top level domain names. And we always felt even in the NTAG being very minority which cannot address specific topics since we are very, very different and more like cc communities than the classic open gTLDs at the (unintelligible). That's why we are going to found the constituency - that's the plan - thank you.

| Keith [Drazek](#): Okay than you, I know Jeff is in the queue - anybody else want to get I the queue, stick up your hands - Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes so I have two questions and you could answer either one or both. First question is it's interesting you said that the PICS are not an issue with the GO's - I'm not sure if it's 100% correct. I think - or maybe it's that the PICS may not be the issue but the PIC-DRP may still be an issue.

And as a GO - and for (Don and YC) I could say that the PICs themselves are fine operating in an open and transparent manner but the - having any third party have the ability to enforce is still a problem regardless of the fact that we're a GO. So I think that's what you probably meant to say that the mandatory PICs are okay, that ICANN wants to impose but not necessarily the enforcement mechanism. And the second is just a question as to why you chose a constituency as opposed to the interest group model.

| ([Dirk](#)): So let me start with second one, why constituency - we saw the other models in the other stakeholder groups in the NomCom contracted parties (how) and we found this very good way to represent a different interest.

Let's say we have a Brands group there - Brand constituency or interest group or we have a GO or community or IDN - I don't know what's coming up in the next month there. And we feel that the model was - the constituency

and the wanting and the representation is much, much stronger than just having that interest group like we have at the observers interest group in NTAG right now.

Jeff Neuman: Just a follow-up, I mean the only difference between the constituency and an interest group I believe is just the council reps, I think that's like - because the only thing that a constituency may or may not get is the ability to serve on I guess the Council.

But even then whether your interest group or constituency there is a (RYSG) membership and the membership as individual registries, whether you're Brand, GO or other you get to vote for Council - perhaps it's just a smaller number I guess. So my - the problem that I have with grappling with constituencies is there could be ten of them and which is great as far as interests groups but as far as constituencies then there's a whole bunch of other messes.

You know, with Council reps and voting and who gets - it just becomes a much drawn-out process. My recommendation can - and there's a GNSO review as Keith was alluding to, my recommendation is applying for immediately and interest group where you're still members of the (RYSG) and you can vote and do all that kind of stuff and then have the interest group as well. Anything more just seems really complicated and at this point (wouldn't) - there's going to be a review, so...

(Dirk): If there isn't much difference between interest group and constituency as you said practically why shouldn't we put them together?

Jeff Neuman: Because the constituency will now cause structural issues that we have to address with the Board with changing our charter as the Registry Stakeholder Group and would cause unnecessary complexities when I believe you can accomplish the same things as an interest group.

So I guess my question is if you guys could lay out the goals that you're trying to accomplish. Instead of focusing on we want to be a constituency for the sake of being a constituency why don't you bring forth, you know, I think it would be helpful to bring forth the goals of what you hope to accomplish. And if that fits in the interest group model great because then we don't have to touch our bylaws, our charter or anything or the ICANN bylaws, right. That's another thing that would need to be changed.

If you can't accomplish everything that you want to accomplish as just an interest group then we need to have a discussion to figure out a way that you can. So I would focus on what you want to achieve as opposed to how you're going to achieve it is my recommendation.

| ([Dirk](#)): Yes I will be happy to work with you on this topic, so yes.

| Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks, I say Ken's hand up - Ken go ahead).

Ken Stubbs: Yes, reality check here - if the proposed deferral of the review of the GNSO goes through it will probably be somewhere between three and five years before there would be any restructuring anyway because you were - correct me if I'm wrong, we were talking about deferring it for another eighteen months right - somewhere along that line.

And based on the way ICANN works it's going to take a year to a year and a half to review it and report it out and get Board action. So for the next three to five years hypothetically you could be in limbo or you could be much more proactive with the model Keith was...

| Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks Ken, (Romadant).

(Romadant): I would like to make some recommendation with this issue came on the new - or when the GNSO review was (introduced- and nobody wants improvement)

there was a (charge of the Board). Either that or we had a lot of us custom was (charter) at the moment in the other stakeholder groups.

In fact we see the - what happened is that the - from the four stakeholder groups there only one (constitution) has been made (UN) which is the (NPPOP) in the new commercial and it has not been issued word for word. And my recollection is that the interest group has some - for the people of (camby) study it's very (different) because you can be in there the one interest group. And it could be that the - there could be a (internal) group of (culture) and then that (some) geography and, you know, (witnessing) may apply to be both and there's no problem there.

The constitutions have to be approved - as a charter approved by the Board and that takes a long time and maybe the review of the (unintelligible). So my recommendation should be more than to build the interest group and as to what the issue to make a split in the stakeholder group and it splits in two or three or (unintelligible). I think it's easy to split than to (make) a new ones - that my (question).

Keith [Drazek](#): Thank you very much, I have a queue here and we have to be with the registrars in less than ten minutes - we got to make this quick. I've got Vladimir, Jordyn, Jeff and I'm going to put myself in the queue at the end and we'll make some final comments - Vladimir.

Vladimir Shadrnov: Thanks, Vladimir Shadrnov, I'm just guess but you are not registries yet right or most of you.

So you might be afraid or worried that once you join this group as a full member that GO Group or similarly the Brand Group may come in conflict with the position of the larger stakeholder group.

Some time ago I used to represent the smaller register being a member of (RYSG) where I represent the first smaller registry and I have to say that from

- my initial reaction was to that kind of our voice may not be heard well. And so but from the practice I can say that this group is very - always been very respectful to the minority voice and I do not remember a single issue where we really had - our voice wasn't properly heard - that's just a observation from the practice.

Keith [Drazek](#): Vladimir thank you very much for those comments, very much appreciate it. We try to be as inclusive as possible, respectful and, you know, even, you know, if somebody doesn't have a vote they're more than welcome to speak up and engage. So right now I've got Jordyn, Jeff and then I'll speak and then we'll have to wrap and run to the registrars.

Jordyn Buchanan: All right I'll try to keep this quick and so two points, number one is that I do think someone earlier today talked about the box of Pandora and I would rather - I worry a little bit that we're starring at one here as well.

I think if the way we sort of say like oh there's a class of registry that has a certain set of issues we're going to make constituencies for each of them, we're going to end up with a lot of constituencies as a stack. Because, you know, we'll start with Brand and GOs, we'll have communities - people will start to say, oh everyone that, you know, uses NEUSTAR at the backend they have some common issues that will make it easier to negotiate with ICANN so let's make that a constituency.

And, you know, it's hard to figure out where that ends and so I really think we should try to keep the current structure in tact until we're sure it's not working. And my second point is I am a little frustrated I guess to hear that you don't think that the current structure is working for you and the interests aren't aligned. I mean I've spent a sort of ridiculous amount of time this week arguing with ICANN for acceptions to RPM requirements document on behalf of GOs I don't (vent) it in any way from this.

And it's purely because I do think we are trying to hear your interests and make sure that they are channeled correctly. And, you know, we're not going to all agree on everything - there's tons of stuff I don't agree with, you know, (doughnuts on) or NEUSTAR or VeriSign on but in general I think we have way more in common than we do separate. And I think we should embrace that commonality by joining in the Registry Stakeholder Group which I think has been incredibly inclusive.

Keith [Drazek](#): Thanks Jordyn, Jeff than Jon I saw his hand and then me and then we're done.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I mean I second what Jordyn has said I mean most of our time with the - on the RPM negotiating team with Amadeo and even myself as a GO and (Rubin) having spent a lot on - almost more than the other issues has been spent on the GO issues.

So I do think that there is that ability to represent the GOs. My recommendation because building a constituency takes so long and that not only - again that not only requires getting the Board to approve your charter but it will also require the Board to approve our charter - the RYSG because we would have to completely amend that into two different ones. My recommendation, come in as an interest group - it's much easier, much quicker.

See how it is, if you still feel like you are not being heard or your interests are not being represented than at least you've tried and we can - we'll organize the other structure.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks Jeff, Jon and then...

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, I would also recommend you look to the registrars as an instructed group - they are really a wide variety of registrars. You have Brand registrars and only a part of the corporate market, you have Domain

registrars, you have registrars in different geographic markets. You have big retail ones, wholesale ones and they're structured similarly to this group where they have one stakeholder group.

But if they want to get together and form interests groups based on those different vehicles they could choose to do that and they really haven't because they didn't have - I guess they haven't felt that they needed to. But I would also echo Jeff's recommendation that through the interest group because it took us maybe a week to file the charter for NTAG and didn't have to get a whole bunch of approvals or anything. These guys were pretty welcoming about it - very welcoming about it and see how that works out.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks Jon and ([Dirk](#)) I want to give you an opportunity to have any last comments or response, but similar to Jeff's comments I think that, you know, we as a Registry Stakeholder Group and, you know, in conversations with the NTAG have certainly envisioned the possibility someday that the Registry Stakeholder Group could have constituencies.

It's, you know, right now we have interest groups, that's the mechanism by which we are, you know, allow groups to self-form and to self-identify and to come and participate in the process. I think - my feeling is that it would be premature right now facing a GNSO review, facing, you know, we don't know what the Registry Stakeholder Group is going to look like 12 months from now, just in terms of its composition, in terms of its membership.

So I would encourage the GOs - the GO applicants soon to be registries to join the Registry Stakeholder Group, form our interest group and then influence that conversation and that discussion about whether we move to a constituency structure from inside. So that would be my recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: I've got a second suggestion, why don't we form a group of a half a dozen, a couple from the Brands, a couple from the GOs and a couple of us that are familiar with the current structure and just vet the issues. Make sure there's

good understanding and see if there's some tweaks that could be made in our infrastructure. Because I just found one myself in looking at it that might help them a little but that I thought maybe was already in there and it's not - but I'll leave it at that.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks Chuck that's a very constructive suggestion, so ([Dirk](#)) anything else you'd like to say?

([Dirk](#)): Yes but thank you Chuck that was a very good suggestion made to us and I think with Philip and you and others from our group we're happy to work with you on this topic.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, great - and as I said to Philip about the Brands and the Brand Registry Group the [GEOs](#) and the [GEO](#) Group would be more than welcome as members and we look forward to you joining and participating.

([Dirk](#)): Thank you.

Keith [Drazek](#): So thank you all. All right before the Registry Group breaks up we're going to - we've sent a note to the Registrar saying that we're going to be ten minutes late. We need to talk about the GNSO Council issues and if we have time we need to circle back on the PD - sorry the PIC-DRP, so Jonathan, you know, if you could hit the high level issues, particularly anything that you need guidance from on the registrar - from the Stakeholder Group.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank Keith, well clearly the three issues are - the primary issues are the three motions we've got on the table. We've got them in the order of first of all considering that of approving the charter and the Policy Implementation Working Group.

The second one we've got is on Jeff's proposed motion on the ICANN bylaw recommendation and the third is one which was in effect produced - well at least technically late but on the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP.

My sense is that we should be generally happy to approve the charter on the Policy Implementation Working Group and I don't believe that the final report and - on the locking of a domain name is subject to UDRP should be controversial.

So we should be okay on both those motions, I'll pause for a moment and then perhaps we should discuss a little more on the ICANN bylaw recommendation. So looking for comments as to whether or not you are (hap)
- Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes, I'll defer to Jeff to confirm this but I got the sense that we probably accomplished what we want and what you were trying to accomplish with the motion but I don't know if you got that same sense.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry Chuck can you just be clear, are you talking about on the bylaw recommendation?

Chuck Gomes: Yes I'm sorry - yes I agree with you on the other too, at least from my point of view .

Jonathan Robinson: So hearing no objections we're going to vote in the affirmative for Item 4 on the Policy Implementation Working Group and Item 6 on the UDRP locking of a domain name. So let's get that one then, Item 5 which is the motion on the ICANN bylaw recommendations and there's really two issues I guess, the principle and the substance.

Jeff Neuman: Yes so Chuck on the - so there's a motion that I put forth which basically says to amend the bylaws to (out of sentence) to the definition of the GNSO to make it clear that the GNSO also provides advice on implementation issues.

And then to add a requirement for the Board if it wants to act in a manner that's inconsistent with a GNSO with GNSO advice that is not necessarily subject to a PDP that it should come back to the GNSO. Give some reasons

why it is going to take an action that's inconsistent and given an opp- basically give an opportunity to work it out with the GNSO. And then the Board could always do what it was going to do in the first place.

You know, but just kind of that fairness argument that you should, you know, just come back to us. If you disagree come back to us, let's talk about it and you could do what you want anyway. The reason I did a bylaw amendment was not necessarily that I had to have a bylaw amendment. There was - what I wanted to do is get the attention focused by the people that needed to focus on it and by putting it as a bylaw amendment it certainly got the attention.

It got the attention of the Board, it got the attention of the stakeholder groups, it got everyone's attention - positive and negative. The - whether this ends up as a bylaw amendment or some sort of commitment or some sort of affirmation to me and to NEUSTAR is not important. I would be just as happy with the Board coming out with a resolution saying that in the future, you know, we've heard the GNSO and we affirm to - or we commit to coming back to the GNSO if we're going to take an action that we think is consistent with the GNSO action.

I mean even loser language than that and so I know that the Commercial Stakeholder Group is we vote it down immediately if it were a - because it's a bylaw amendment so I fully expect them to vote it down. We've actually challenged the Commercial Stakeholder Group because they've come back to us and said, we support the principle but this whole notion of a bylaw amendment scares us.

And so I said that's great, in fact I had some very good exchanges with some individual members about the principle - I said that's fantastic. And they said well how about if we just do this new thing about a commitment? I said that's great - propose it in a friendly amendment. (Unintelligible) and then they went back to their groups and their groups are like (do it). Boiling it down to what it

really is threatening to the Commercial Stakeholder Group is that they now have a direct channel to the Board.

Under the existing rules and bylaws there's nothing preventing them from going to the Board, lobbying directly and then avoiding the possibility of it coming back to the GNSO. That's how they've gotten a lot of what they've gotten. They see now a little bit of a threat in the fact that if the Board makes a commitment to come back to the GNSO that may dwindle some of their ability to have the same effect.

And so they keep coming back now with, well I'm not sure we can even buy off on the principle now so I'm really putting - and my intention tomorrow is just to put the owners back on them and just say, hey guys do you agree with the principle of, you know, just having something where it would be nice if the Board came to the GNSO if it was going to take an action and we could talk about it and that's it.

And it will be interesting to see the dynamic - I'm not going to push for the bylaw amendment, I'm pretty much going to accept almost any friendly amendments that embodies the principle and basically I'd like your support to have the flexibility to do that, you know, because I think it's really a principle and not so much a bylaw amendment.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks very much Jeff, so I see Chuck with your hand and then let's try and wrap this up and indicate support or not - Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Jeff when you say you're okay if it was amended to just support the principle, would that not then be a suggested bylaws change? Because one of the things I sensed that the Board didn't receive this very positively at all.

And I think one thing that would be bad for us on this is to put forth a bylaws change and even if we pass it and the Board rejects it or we don't even pass it we're probably worse off than where we are right now. But you answered

my question so in principle - a think a principle would be good and I'd be fully supportive. I don't have a problem with the bylaws amendment but I think we're going to lose - if not at the Council level at the Board level.

Jonathan Robinson: So it's Jonathan, I'm just following up from Chuck, I agree with you I think we could be lose, lose if we modify it we could be win and my sense is that the Board will be very receptive to a point in principle.

And I hope that point in principle would encompass the issues with the stock and the Board. So, you know, that's what we should seek to achieve is that neither can go against our recommendations without referral - further referral.

Jeff Neuman: And to that (answer) there is for whatever reason no discussion and I just have a feeling it's going to get voted down. Because if there's no discussion on it and there's no proposal for a friendly amendment it's going to stay as is and Chuck's right, if it fails at the GNSO that's not a good sign either, right.

Because they could just decide to vote it down and have no discussion or not propose anything. So I may on my own, depending on how the conversation is going withdraw or in some way modify my own motion knowing or understanding that it will be deferred at that point in time. So we're just going to kind of play, I'm hoping that there's some sort of friendly amendment and I would prefer us not going around saying that, you know, we're willing to pull it because then there's not incentive for them to try to work on something. So in the end I mean we just want the principle.

Keith [Drazek](#): Okay thanks Jeff, so let's - does anybody not agree or not think that this is the right approach? All right Jeff I think you've got your marching orders, thanks. Jonathan do you need anything else for the Council meeting from the Stakeholder Group?

Jonathan Robinson: I think we can live without anything - any further discussion.

Keith [Drazek](#): All right very good.

Edmon Chung: Jonathan, there is one on the (geek) matter that I don't know whether we could bring it up quickly and what the plan to do on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks Edmon, thanks for bringing that up, I mean essentially at the moment it's a proposal to send the letter. We don't have it as a motion, we - the idea is that we said I have heard, you know, maybe you could help me here, the ccNSO is unlikely to send that letter for the next few weeks, that's my latest update - I kind of got it by the grapevine.

I can't even tell you where I got that from, it was - and it's not to be secretive, it's just that I don't recall. So I wonder whether - so the action is for us to - the question is we have a letter on those variants that we could send and we'll - would the Stakeholder Group support us sending that letter if we're in a position to do so? I think that's essential the question.

Keith [Drazek](#): So I think Edmon good luck to you for your recommendation in terms of whether to support or whether to...

Edmon Chung: Well since I helped draft it I obviously (unintelligible) is to send it.

Keith [Drazek](#): All right very good, so I think...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Keith [Drazek](#): There you have it - okay so I think we need to defer the discussion on the PIC-DRP, we've got to get to the Registrar, we're already ten minutes late. Just a few issues, we have - all right let me turn to my notes, they're inside - we have to finalize our vote for our NomCom representative to replace Ken, Ken thank you for your service. Don Blumenthal is the only one who has volunteered, Chuck seconded that so on the list I think we're going to move to a vote. So voting members please keep an eye on the list and that has to be

done I think like today or tomorrow I think time is very short so please respond promptly to that. What was the other thing?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Keith [Drazek](#): Yes we need to focus everybody on the budget, we circulated a draft budget for the Registry Stakeholder Group with various assumptions and projections and all of that several weeks ago now. And please everybody take a look at that, we need to be able to take a vote to finalize that in short order because we need to be able to start billing - invoicing the new registry members.

Man: (All members).

Keith [Drazek](#): That's right - all member yes thank you and we're starting that billing cycle on the fiscal year cycle now so it's time, yes. Okay thanks everybody for participating today in the Stakeholder Group Meeting and let's move to the Registrar's - thank you.

Woman: We can stop the recording now and thank you everybody for joining.

END