

**ICANN MEETING
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA
REGISTRIES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
19 NOVEMBER 2013
AFTERNOON SESSION (PART III)**

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.

Keith Drazek: Welcome gentlemen. Okay let's go ahead and get started, I'm sorry Cherie, did we start the recording already? Okay great, thank you. Okay, hi everybody, Keith Drazek, again this is the afternoon session of the registry stakeholder group meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

We have with us today representatives from ICANN's security and stability advisory committee, SSAC so I would like to first welcome Patriek, Jim and SSAC colleagues here.

And because part of the topic of discussion today is likely to revolve around name collision I wanted to note that we also have Jeff Schmidt from JAS Global Advisors here with us, so if there are specific questions about JAS advisor's work on the name collision occurrence management framework that we could probably hold that until the 15 minutes after the session with SSAC.

So we've got 30 minutes with SSAC and then 15 minutes following that with Jeff. So just to set some groundwork there. So with that Patriek, welcome, thank you.

Patrik Fältström~~Patriek Falstrom~~: Thank you very much. So what we have in front of us is an agenda that takes about half a day to go through and to be able to do this in as efficient way as possible would be 30 minutes.

We are here to talk about whatever you want to talk about. So because we are talking about this all day and we have done that for months, so the agenda in front of us is what you currently see and Keith I would like to from you get some ideas about what you think we should concentrate on.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much Patriek. So again just some background, as we were developing the registry stakeholder group agenda for today, the meeting agenda for today we as a stakeholder group requested that we not have sort of a presentation or an update or any sort of formal presentation from SSAC.

So it is a bit incumbent upon us now to help you know explain what it is that we'd like to hear from and hear about.

So I think I can expect that name collisions and SAC 62 may be one, there are other issues on the screen so I'm going to open this up and ask for input from the registry stakeholder group members. Anyone?

Okay, Reg , please?

Reg Levy: I would - I have some questions for JAS about the name collision, they can be public or they can be private later, but yes, name collisions is my vote.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Reg , anyone else? Any other issues that we'd like to talk about with SSAC? I don't see any. All right, so Patriek over to you, why don't we go ahead and sort of kick off whatever update you have on name collision, SEC 62 being the most recent output on the issue, anything else that you'd certainly like to illuminate on that.

Patrik Fältström~~Patriek Falstrom~~: So thank you, I think that's a good way of moving forward. So the week before - so let's start by doing this, everyone that is a member of SSAC can you please stand up?

Okay, so what we have on the agenda and other issues that we don't have time to talk about, try to catch any of these people and talk with them, from what SSAC is, how you become a member and whatever else procedures, anyone can answer those questions.

So what I will do is there are two reports that were released the previous week and the first one was SAC 62 and the second one SEC 63, but (root key) all over, let's start by talking about this because I think both of them might actually be interesting for you.

Don't forget the root zone key rollover is here. So let's just do a very brief walk through of SEC 62, four please. The first thing I will say (force forward) into the recommendation is that we in this report talk about name collision we refer to a situation where you have two names, where the usage and the meaning of the name is - sorry the collision is when you have multiple - can have multiple implication of the name.

And one of them is delegated in the public DNS. You can of course have a collision where none of the two names are in the public DNS but this report is

specifically about the case when one of them is in the public DNS and the other one is somewhere else or used for some other kind of purpose.

This advice is about high risk strings, trial litigation, root zone monitoring capability and emergency robot capability and in all of these cases what we are doing is that we are telling people how basically how they or give suggestions on how to do the calculations of risk and the benefits and harm and do risk calculation or how to assign the scale that you're using.

But we're not doing those calculations, just so that is clear. Now you can move forward to the slide where it talks about recommendations, I think it's about four or five slides forward.

There, so the recommendations we have is the first one is that ICANN should work with wider internet community at least IB and IETF to identify what strings are appropriate to reserve the product name space use and what type of private name space use is appropriate?

Should it be on the TLD level or should it be on other levels where certain names should not be allowed to be registered? Next slide please.

Recommendation two, in the context of talking about trials it's really important that ICANN explicitly consider the following questions and clearly articulate the choices.

And that has to do with the purpose of the trial, the operation of the trial, emergency roll back which means that the trial has to end prematurely and also when the trial is over what they're going to use the result for, how do you make the decision on what to do.

Next slide please, recommendation three, ICANN shall explicitly consider under what circumstances (umbilication) of TLD is the proper mitigation for secure or stability issue.

And finally ICANN should work in consultation with the community in particular the root zone management partners to create additional processes or update existing processes to accommodate the potential need for the (divershal) of the delegation of a TLD.

So those are the recommendations and I'll open up for questions.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Patriek. Questions? Ray?

Ray Fassett: Hello, Ray Fassett. In relation to the word trial, is the trial relative to the TLD itself or second level domains that may be considered higher risk and trialing those?

I'm not sure which framework you're using the world trial.

Patrik Fältström~~Patriek Falstrom~~: Can you go back one slide please? Thank you. Forward.

It's hard with the delay in these kind of technology systems. We probably use that internet thing, right?

That's a very good question, we are not specifically saying anything about that because we are - because that we feel is part of the purpose of the trial and what you are going to test. What we are looking at regarding trial is that we see that there are specifically two main categories of trials.

The first one is that you actually do add the - sorry the first kind of trial is when you look at what DNS queries you will get. That in turn to the main server, that in turn can be divided in two different kind of sub trials.

One is just by looking at logs for queries for domain names but doesn't exist. The second one is that you actually are adding the domain names to the DNS and you look at what queries you get to the DNS.

The second main category of a trial is that you're actually a mail server, you add the service that actually responds positively to actually connections using those domain names and you evaluate the log strong application layer communication instead.

So we are talking in much more general terms and not specifically about any of the two.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Patriek, Ray did you have any follow up?

Ray Fassett: Yes, Ray Fassett, the last slide, if you can go to the last slide, the very last one. Yes, that one, has your team - I'm sure you have, or maybe haven't, I don't know and apologize for the very basic kind of questions here, but did you consider, would there be a point in time after a year, two years, three years the TLD has been operation where it is past this so called maybe trial period?

And like I couldn't imagine rolling back dot com today for any reason whatsoever, so is there - did you consider a point in time when a TLD would be past that stage of needing a roll back?

Patrik Fältström~~Patrik Falstrom~~: One of the reasons that we wrote this recommendation is that we don't see an agreement of that in the community. Some people have the opinion that as soon as you do the - even if you put the DNS - the domain name that is going to be used in the future as soon as that put in the live DNS that is already too late.

So some people do believe that the only way to really see what's happening is just to do tests in close environments, not in collective internets.

That's one end of the scale. The other end of the scale are people that say well we can never say never, that it might be catastrophic, even as bad so we need to roll back dot com.

That is sort of the other end of the scale. To many people neither of those two are really realistic and we are somewhere in between, okay?

So what we are pointing a little more serious piece of the answer, we think what you just asked is something that is really important to know before you are thinking about using a tool like this as a mitigation method against some kind of incident.

Because whenever you are making a decision to use a mitigation method where on delegation of a TLD is one of them you need to make sure that the result of using the mitigation tool actually have the desired effect.

First of all as we're pointing out in recommendation number four and as all of us working with DNS know even if you remove a domain name from the authoritative servers it takes a while for caches to be empty and all those kind of things.

And that together with the impact which means that you actually are blocking the service for people or parties that actually use the domain name, that means that the harm might actually be quite large.

It might take some time for the domain name to be removed which means that maybe the harm is greater than the benefit and that is exactly what our recommendations say.

That you need to make sure that the on delegation mitigation method is described so well in advance that whoever is to make the decision on doing - using this tool know what they're doing.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Patriek, thanks Ray. Any other questions? Reg did I see your hand, okay so Reg and then Jordyn.

Reg Levy: so as an introductory question, I'd like to ask if you had anything to do with the lists that were just published yesterday, because I have some questions about how they were tabulated.

Patrik Fältström~~Patriek Falstrom~~: No.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Reg , Jordyn and then Jeff.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks, I have sort of a maybe metaphysical question about the role of the SSAC in this conversation and in this set of issues.

I think there's a number of very useful recommendations here. I think you know ICANN should consider under what circumstances undelegation of a TLD is the appropriate mitigation.

I personally was under the impression that SSAC would be a body that would not only recommend that ICANN figure that out but would actually help figure out what the answer should be as well.

So yes, as a first point I'm sort of curious what you guys view the role of SSAC being in helping to answer these questions in addition to posing them.

Patrik Fältström~~Patrik Falstrom~~: Okay, that's actually a good question. Thank you very much, we are looking at things from specifically technical stability and robustness of the internet.

There are many other sort of parameters that have to be taken into account, very specifically legal, contractual business, economical, other areas which is not within the purview or charter of SSAC.

So we don't find that - we don't have the expertise and we don't have all the data needed to actually do a complete calculation of the risk and benefits. So what we can do though is we can provide as we are trying to do from a technical and robustness standpoint we know that this is very important to make those sort of plans.

Whether that is dominated by business arguments or what it is, that's sort of part of the calculation so we don't - that is one of the reasons why we are stopping here and not doing the actual calculation ourselves.

Jordyn Buchanan: So that's a fair point, I can understand why you guys would feel that the SSAC is either chartered or capable of fully answering some of these questions, some of which have policy or business implications beyond purely the technical issues.

I guess the question is my reading of the report probably is that it provides sufficient framework in order to help understand, you know these are the steps you should go through in order to think about these questions.

But there are still a number of remaining technical inputs that would be helpful to anyone considering a final decision here and I imagine you guys as security and stability experts and the body that ICANN has in order to get advice on these topics be incredibly helpful to have ongoing engagement with you.

And it seems like the model we have right now is not awesome in that you know some part of ICANN may ask a question of you guys, you guys go off and write a report and the report may or may not be quite the inputs that are needed by that body in order to go on to the next position.

So how do we get a more I guess bilateral ongoing dialogue between the SSAC and the community in order to make sure that we can get just in time information from you guys in addition to periodic reports.

Patrik Fältström~~Patrik Falstrom~~: First of all one of the things that you're pointing out which is completely true is that we in SSAC just because we could use our output in the consensus based process and one thing that is very hard to do in a consensus base process is to have explicit dates for delivery of when you have reached consensus of some kind of wording.

Because of that we believe that we are most powerful when we are helping to sort of design a process that is to be used or evaluate the output of an open process where we can say whether we do believe for example that a consequence and a license is actually cover the whole process.

Whether more or less we feel that we do the best work if we sort of are more like an audit to a running process, and for example if you look at name space, collision issues, we pointed out the first time formerly that these name space collision issues happened in September 2010.

But probably that was - we know that this is partly our fault that we didn't flag that the community ICANN didn't do much about it until spring of 2013.

So to some degree we lost two and a half years before sort of the process started to run. But for example we don't - the way we work at SSAC and the way we are more or less comfortable is when we do not have to participate.

Do you see what I mean, so for example we hope that the policy development process and the PDPs together with ICANN and ICANN staff doing various things like the JAS report, that should be good enough.

And then maybe we can say whether we do believe that was good enough or not. The situation that we are in at the moment that people wait for answers from us, we are extremely uncomfortable for the same reason that you point out.

Jordyn Buchanan: So just to clarify, sounds like you guys, the suggest you would make is that you would be at the start and the end of the process essentially. You would pose an issue, the community would go off and work on it and then you guys would double check the work at the end.

But we wouldn't try to engage you various little checks along the way in order to triangulate on the work.

Patrik Fältström~~Patrik Falstrom~~: Yes, one thing that I as the chair of SSAC don't mind people doing is that we have lots of good technical people both which are member of SSAC, members of RSAC and also active in the whole ICANN community.

So I myself as a strong believer of using the expertise that exists and it should not in the PDPs that we have in ICANN I don't not believe that advisory bodies like SSAC should be used for anything else than when it's really needed as an audit.

But the main process should be separate.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much Patrick, thanks Jordyn. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Jordyn actually asked a bunch of the question I was kind of asking and let me ask in a little different way.

Do you have - you showed us what work you've produced in the last I don't know how many months that was, through 64. Do you have a pipeline or something that you could show the community, things that you're working on?

With the understanding you may or may not come to a consensus position, but just to as an applicant let's say we'd like to know if there's any other issues you're working on that may all the sudden come out, I don't know, now we've got to turn to another issue that may involve security and stability and may involve another delay or may involve something else.

It would be great to know in advance kind of a six month, one year kind of pipeline document of what you're working on.

Patrik Fältström~~Patriek Falstrom~~: So these are the things that we're working on at the moment that you see on the slide. So we have a standing ongoing work on the membership committee, the DNSSAC workshop which is tomorrow.

We have then separate groups working on identified use metrics. We are doing an outreach to law enforcement, work together with them. We had the workshop in Bali at the internet governance forum so that is now concluding because it's off to the IDS.

We have one work party on large scale abuse using the DNS infrastructure, but it's also close to complete - to also finish their report, the report of the large scale abuse using the DNS will most certainly be published before the end of the year.

And then we had two groups that closed the previous week. So at the moment if I look at my own budget and resources I have three open slots. And we are at this meeting and all the other meetings listening on people.

Like we have our idea what we could do but we're not finished our prioritizations. So input from for example all of you this and the next week and during the ICANN meeting is actually helping us to do the prioritization.

So to answer your question whether we have a list of what we're going to do, we don't have that because we are currently reducing it, so we're in a very - we're very lucky at the moment.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Patriek, thanks Jeff. So I think one of the questions that Jeff had, is there sort of a way or a place or a location where the community could see

the ongoing work, what's in the pipeline, what might be coming, to know better when there's sort of slots available?

And then we probably need to wrap up quickly.

Patrik Fältström~~Patriek Falstrom~~: Yeah we have our for example we do have our open meeting after ICANN normally and I think this week it's Thursday morning where we have an open - completely open meeting where people can come with suggestions.

It's also the case that what we are currently doing is also available on the ICANN web page just like other groups, now of course it's as confusing to find data as on my own web page, so not complaining anyone.

One thing that we have been doing though together with ICANN and together with ALAC is that we are now testing a new tool as part of the my ICANN that tracks our recommendations, so you can see exactly what is happening and where they are in the whole ICANN process.

That also gives an indication of what we are going to do or what we might do next. I'm happy to work with (Julie) to try to find more specific pointers, but at the moment the pointers would point to something that is pretty empty.

Comment [A1]: I assume he was referring to Julie Hedlund?

Keith Drazek: Thanks Patriek, you have at the most five minutes left so I think we probably need to wrap up on the name collision issue, we will have 15 minutes with Jeff Schmidt from JAS advisors next.

But Patriek did you want to talk at all or (Russ) you want to talk at all about SEC 63, key role Avri, thanks.

Comment [A2]: I assume this should be Russ Mundy?

Patrik Fältström~~Patrik Falström~~: Can you go forward to SEC 63 please. Not Slide 63.

~~(Russ)~~Russ Mundy: Back up. Back, there. All right, good. Okay, I'll run through these quickly, in fact we did brief it at the last meeting and there were a few interactions. We had not finished so we didn't have the recommendations so next slide please.

And this one is really an overview of what's in the document, I want to go through them quickly here, so next, and there on this slide is the actual URL for the text so I urge anyone to please take a look at it.

The document itself is around 40 pages but there are some concise parts at the beginning and in the conclusions if you want to skip the whole detail. But the details I think are worth reading, especially for this constituency.

Next please. Okay, back one, okay. There, okay, so the first recommendation is the ICANN staff in coordination with the other root zone management partners should immediately undertake the significant worldwide communications effort to publicize that the root zone KSK roll over, the motivation and the process that's going to be use, publicize that as widely as possible.

Because we have seen and in our various discussions with folks, even though it's happening it's almost certainly going to come almost no one outside of the core community knows it's coming.

So publicity and communications is important. Next please. The ICANN staff should lead and coordinate or otherwise encourage the creation of a collaborative representative test bed.

And I won't read the details of it but we believe that having a cooperative testing effort involving as many people as possible and as show interest will be to the benefit of not only ICANN and the root zone operation but of all parties that are participating to identify potential problems that could occur prior to the actual roll over itself.

Third recommendation and again this is ICANN staff recommendation towards the ICANN staff, should lead coordinate, otherwise encourage creation of clear and objective metrics because the identification of what to look for, what to count before you get into the roll over is really important, because you can set up and establishes your counting and your way to describe what you mean by breakage.

Because a lot of people use that term and almost everyone uses it differently. So get it defined ahead of time. Next please, the ICANN staff lead coordinate otherwise encourage the development roll back procedures.

If something should happen to go wrong in the roll over, we need to know in advance how to go backwards and so this is a recommendation to make sure we do the proper planning to know that that is in place.

And then the fifth recommendation is really towards a data collection recommendation and a collection of information that is useful for future KSK roll overs.

Now that's it for the specifics of the report and those that may have been paying attention to the details will notice that I said nothing about algorithm roll over and in the text of the report that is clearly excluded.

And so this is strictly the KSK, the key roll over itself.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much ~~(Russ)~~Russ, that's extremely helpful information and very great sort of brief and effective summary. Just want to open it up, see if anyone has any questions about SAC 63 and the KSK roll over recommendations.

Anyone? Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sorry, just to that last point algorithm roll over, does that mean you think that it's current impossible or that it's just like you need to do more work on it, or like what's the state of the art on algorithm roll over?

~~(Russ)~~Russ Mundy: Right now as we work through this report the conclusion was that we wanted to - and needed to get the report done with respect to the key signing key roll over.

The algorithm roll over was discussed early on and the conclusion of the SSAC work party that carried through to the final report was that it's really a little early to actually address the formalness in a formal sense of what you would do for an algorithm roll over.

There's no belief that there is a mandated time or at any point - particular point that it has to be done, though it is something that as the work party discussions that did get discussed.

And we decided to not include it in the report. And I can't really speak to your specific question about do people think it's possible, impossible, we just don't know at this point, we don't have an opinion.

Keith Drazek: Thank you ~~(Russ)~~Russ, any other questions? And our SSAC colleagues have to scoot to another meeting so I'd just like to thank you all very much for your hard work and your participation with us today. Thank you.

Man: Thank you very much.

Keith Drazek: Okay and I'd like to invite Jeff Schmidt from JAS Global Advisors up to join us here, and we'll have 15 minutes, maybe a little more if he can afford it and if we can, we've got a few other agenda items to get to in our regular business before we move to the registrars at 4:00.

So let's go ahead and Jeff come up here. So again as we switch gears here a little bit, not too much, just want to welcome Jeff Schmidt from JAS Global Advisors up to join us here and we'll have 15 minutes maybe a more if he can afford it and if we can. We've got a few more agenda items to get to in our regular business before we move to the registrars at 4:00. So let's go ahead and Jeff will come up here.

So, again as we switch gears here a little bit, not too much I just want to welcome Jeff Schmidt from JAS Global Advisors. I want to note that there was an SSR briefing conducted by ICANN staff - I'm losing track of days, I think it was yesterday. And Jeff participated in that and his I think key focus is that JAS Global Advisors has been retained by ICANN to conduct or to develop the collision occurrence management framework.

And that's, I think what he's available to talk with us about today and respond to any questions - so Jeff over to you.

Jeff Schmidt: Good afternoon, so I would encourage you if you're interested in the string collision issue to look at the slides from yesterday. I'm not going to defer any

of you that weren't in the session or weren't aware, I won't walk you through 45 minutes worth of material that was adequately covered yesterday.

I just wanted to hit a couple of highlights in this session and then really, you know, make myself available for questions. Briefly the string collision issue has been carved up into a couple of pieces. The, you know, current SLD block-list approach, the temporarily approach is out there and that's not our focus. What we're focused on is developing the long-term solution or the permanent solution.

That has - ICANN has asked us to create a framework for evaluating the string collision issue on an individual per TLD basis. To create a deterministic, repeatable approach so that we can, you know, collectively bring closure to this issue. Our framework, you know, will, you know, effectively break up the, you know, the applied forced strings into groups based on qualitative and quantitative new metrics that I don't know right now and then apply recommended mitigation packages to those.

So you can imagine if you're string is in, you know, bucket Number One, you're going to need mitigation Package C and mitigation Package C may contain this, this on this. That's the general idea so that you know what to, you know, what to expect when we come out of this. The timeline for our report, it will go to public comment in January and I believe it's ICANN's intent to have this issue closed around missing a board meeting in March.

We are working very hard to make our process open and available so that you don't wind up with, you know, a 50-page document and a public comment period, you know, three months from now without visibility into what's going on between now and then. So I would encourage everybody that is interested in the issue to subscribe to the DNS OR collisions list; that was the epic center

of these discussions for the last couple of months. And we've decided to continue using that list - we're active on that list.

We will continue to be active on that list; it's a great place to talk, go look at the archives to see this issue. We are very open and very interested to hearing feedback, ideas, concerns that you have; data if you want us to look at something, please send us a note - post it to the collisions list. Send a smoke signal, carrier pigeon - we want to really be open and give everybody a sense of what's going on.

Also at key points during our study when we have something that we want to float, we're going to blog about it on domain insights and we will then be monitoring and participating in the comment period as well. So this is a mechanism for us to again tighten up the comment period, get involved in better, sooner, faster. And then when we have a, you know, a work product for public comments in January the newness in the turn at that point will be lower.

So we're excited to hear from you, we have a couple of asks of the community. One is we are actively looking for case studies. Anybody that has experience with a DNS name space collision, know somebody that has experience with (AVNS) name space collision, thinks they heard a rumor of somebody who has (AVNS) name space collisions we would like to know about it.

It is incumbent on us to learn more about the consequences, the frequency has been analyzed quite a bit over the last six months but very little is known at this point about the actual consequences. And so, you know, one of the ways that we would like to do that is to get case studies. There have been lots of delegations, lots of, you know, TLD delegations, lots of delegations inside,

you know, delegated name spaces. Lots of opportunities for all sorts of collisions, I'm sure they've happened and we would like to know about it.

The second ask is we will be preparing a survey, the objective of our survey is to broaden feedback solicitation as widely as possible, get as much data from as many different kinds of folks, internationally that we can. And so I would ask for your help in responding to the survey and also passing it around to get as much coverage as we can. Thank you - okay (hey Jim).

[ManKeith Drazek](#): Okay thanks very much Jeff - Jeff go ahead and anyone else that wants to get in the queue show your hands.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Jeff, we can go back and forth. Yes I don't envy the tough task you have in front of you and I'm glad you're doing that work.

But just to kind of clarify in my mind what's going to happen, are you going to go through each string, like each TLD and say, so let's say there's a TLD that's got 20,000 names on this list, you're going to - are you going to specifically say for each string we recommend these 10,000 go in this category to do that with, these 5,000 - or are you establishing a framework for someone on ICANN staff to actually apply that formula to figure out which names within?

Jeff Schmidt: So we have to be careful when we're talking about strings. So the second level strings which I think is what you were talking about right, so those are - I hate to be flip, I actually kind of don't really care about those.

The - what we're concerned about is a repeatable framework that can be applied on a TLD by TLD basis - TLD strings. So the second level strings, that block list is kind of a separate strategy to let things go quickly now, right. But what we're focused on is, you know, your application for dot-Jeff, right.

What do you do as dot-Jeff, not - forgetting about your, you know, 50,000 lists or whatever it is.

We are conscious of the fact that people are going to be coming in to the framework in various states, delegated on delegated, choosing to use the block list, not choosing to use the block list, etc. But our approach is not to refine or augment or leverage the block list, we're kind of starting on a clean slate, like what should we really do for this TLD - does that make sense?

Jeff Neuman: Yes that makes sense but I'm just trying to figure out from a timeline perspective, if you're going to come out and say - let's hypothesize, okay (Diane Wisey) you can launch and you got to take a certain category of names, put it in this class - or a certain number of names, put it in this classification, a certain number of names in this classification.

Is there going to be work for ICANN staff or someone else to do to do the application? And if so we're just trying to figure out how long it's going to delay because we'll have a final report in March but does that mean we can have an expectation if we have been delegated in April we can carry that out?

Jeff Schmidt: All right I understand thanks, so our framework is designed to be a repeatable framework to get applied to the TLDs okay. That, you know, how that happens and when that happens actually the function, you know, of ICANN we will deliver the reports.

And then how, you know, how that gets applied to the specific strings is to be determined. But I apologize when I said earlier bucketing the strings I meant bucketing the TLDs, not the SLDs. So there will be, you know, so home (in core for) fascinating, right. They are very heavily collided but for very different reasons, right - so core, you know, is intentional. People can figure

their networks thinking that they could have that, right because a vendor told them that they could, right.

So that's a very different use case then for example home, home is being appended by a (CPA) - very helpful, right, so people don't know that they're, you know, that these queries are occurring. So, you know, we want to group up the strings, then you can imagine the null bucket, right - an (IDN) that's never, ever been queried or, you know, been queried five times in eight years, right.

So you can imagine seeing some use cases based on some qualitative and quantitative measures requiring different mitigations. That's what I was talking about grouping - does that help?

Jeff Neuman: It does help I just, again I think the community needs to understand that even if this report comes out in March what it sounds like is that things are going to have to be applied most likely by ICANN staff.

And you're not talking about really the end of March; you're talking about in theory months and months after that to actually apply it. And that's I think, I think the community needs to understand that and probably needs to understand it today so that they can comment on it because some people are under the impression that the report will come out that's going to solve all the problems and then April comes and ICANN's just going to go, okay everyone here you go.

But I think what I'm hearing which is what I feared is that the report's going to come out. It's going to recommend an implementation and then ICANN's going to have to figure out exactly how to implement it and we could be talking about many, many, many more months of not being able to delegate

certain second levels within a TLD. So I would actively encourage comments around the implement ability and timelines and latency and such of the mitigation packages for all the reasons that you just said, absolutely yes.

[ManKeith Drazek](#): Okay thanks Jeff - Ray.

Ray Fassett: Hi Ray Fassett, thanks Jeff. Right now probably all of the new applicants are looking at their lists and they're thinking the challenge facing them and their backers and their supporters and those waiting for it to hit the market and excited about it and what have you is how do I get names off of this list?

It doesn't seem to me the work that you are going to be doing which is going to be expensive it sounds to me, but it's not going to look at that question at all. This is not - the work that you're going to be doing is not going to be an exercise of how a TLD that maybe launches in November, December and has been operating for three or four months your output is not going to help that registry answer the question of how to get names that are blocked off the blocked list.

A lot of the names are gibberish, everybody can see that but then of course there are some certain important ones let's say sprinkled in. And that's going to be where the operators are focusing the business people, not necessarily technologist - business people, marketing people, you know, people that actually have to bring the TLD to market in some way that gains adoption.

And they're just going to want to know a simple answer - how do I get this name off the list? And is any of your work going to address that question?

Jeff Schmidt: In a word no, so we are not - the project is not reducing the list, the project is eliminating the list, right. The list is a stop gap so our output is no list, not you want to take off certain things from your list, here's how that is not.

Ray Fassett: That was a good clarification, thank you.

ManKeith Drazek: Okay thanks Ray, thanks Jeff -- ~~(Maxine)~~Maxim Alzoba.

~~(Maxine)~~Maxim Alzoba: Thanks (unintelligible), the important key is probability of reoccurrence of such events, because if we put our business (role) at risk for highly probable events we will have serious damages for business.

We might be sued by big brands for preventing them from conducting business and it's a high risk (needed by monlous). So could you please describe if there is any chance we have estimates of recurrence probability for these trends?

Jeff Schmidt: So the question was (I assume committee) could just again boil it down to that last questions so they can...

~~(Maxine)~~Maxim Alzoba: Your welcome, so is it possible to measure reoccurrence probability for these strings because it's important the way you just can't - you take old (spirit) out of this. I have some experience in physics and we have measurements when you take half of data it just means nothing.

Jeff Schmidt: Yes so the question is if I may broaden it, getting more data about the strings on your list - is that the?

~~(Maxine)~~Maxim Alzoba: No (every) probability of reoccurrence of these rescue situations.

Jeff Schmidt: So with respect to the SLD blocking strategy, that list is what it is and the, you know, there's not a current plan to provide more data - frequency data or anything about that. In the larger project, right in the framework project absolutely the, you know, our intent is to understand why these are happening, right.

So understanding the use case, understanding the source, the source in terms of actor, the source in terms of software or hardware - all of those things are then certainly related to, you know, frequency of reoccurrence and other factors. That's all, you know, certainly within our remit to understand why these are happening and then how to stop them.

~~(Maxine)~~Maxim Alzoba: To be simple language it means that this list is not relevant to (our reality) because without probability we do not know if it ever happens.

Jeff Schmidt: Right, so the block list - is that what you're talking - the block list - so the block list has happened at least once, right. And that's all we know and that's all we - that's it.

~~(Maxine)~~Maxim Alzoba: Yes because if history and history in our case doesn't explain what happens next. So we are starting off and thus it will create dangerous incidents in past, not in future so your measurements are not relevant to our future program.

~~Man~~Keith Drazek: Okay thanks ~~(Maxine)~~Maxim - Francisco did you want to chime in?

Francisco Arias: Thank you (again), I just like to clarify a point regarding the question from Ray before I was talking to Jeff. I think there was a slight misunderstanding on the question. The idea is that once you have - we have the framework we

have applied to each of the proposed (individual) lists and find the mitigation measures that have to be applied.

The (integrity of collision) and therefore when you apply the mitigation measures for a specific (category), the strings that are inside that (category) can be removed from the block, so you can remove the blocking from them. I mean in that sense I think that will answer your question. You will be able to remove strings from the block list. And I believe the only difference in what you were saying and what Jeff was saying is the (category) is what Jeff will be focusing on as opposed to individual strings, correct?

Jeff Schmidt: Yes that's a good clarification. I mean there's an opportunity to get some bonus removals basically right as we understand something.

You know, we're not going to keep it secret if we understand the source of some query. You know, if there is an opportunity to get some information out there that would have helped whittle down the list, than we will. That's not - the focus of our framework is to not have a list, but certainly if information emerges along the way.

Man: I think if I'm understanding correctly, the focus of your efforts is to create different categories, call them buckets of worry.

It could - you may come up with four different buckets or five and then each bucket will have sort of a remedy, a prescription that I think if - and I'm not trying to put words in your mouth now but then you will recommend that the registry operator implement this prescription and upon showing in some capacity that you have done this then you have remedied the ill, that's the plan.

[ManKeith Drazek](#): Okay thanks, so we've got a few others in the queue, we've got Ken - Jeff did you want to get in the queue?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

[ManKeith Drazek](#): Okay so Ken then Jeff then Ching.

Ken Stubbs: Hi my name is Ken Stubbs, going back to this - I'm sorry I'm not a strong (tacky), but it would seem to me that it would be important for us to understand the criteria for the creation of these buckets.

Because if the criteria in fact ties in with what the gentleman here was talking about, is it based on probability of reoccurrence? In other words if we had a string - an obscure string that was tied in ten years ago that's on that day in the life list and nothing's happened in the last ten years we can, you know, assume with a relatively high probability, I assume we could, because we should be able to work it out. That it's got a low - a high probability that it has a low probability of a reoccurrence and we can use mitigation plan that takes that into effect.

You know, knowing that there's always the chance but, you know, what I'm worried about is that somebody's going to say well the only way we can create a probability that we're comfortable with is block it forever. And, you know, I would really have to have - as a business man I would want to have - he'd have to make a very strong case for that. And I think it's important for us to understand the basis for the creation of those buckets so that at least we either have an opportunity - I won't use the word for appeal, but at least we have an opportunity to work this into our business plan.

And if I'm being redundant I apologize because I came in just a couple minutes late, but these mitigation plans, how far behind the initial things are you planning on rolling those out? In other words if we agree to go with the initial block list to, you know, thank you.

Jeff Schmidt: Oh there we are, thank you. So yes I agree what the importance of, you know, understanding and thinking very reasonably about the bucketing.

I would imagine if I were to wager the, you know, bucketing would probably be the most heavily commented on part of the, you know, of our paper before, during and after. So I'm in agreement with you we will, you know, be reasonable, be open to commentary and feedback but it is important obviously on how these are put into the buckets.

The second piece with respect to the timing of the mitigation plans, so the, you know, after the reports, you know, gross public comment and is finalized the, you know, timing of getting of the SLD strategy and onto the, you know, long-term strategy, you know, I think at this point is to be determined pursuant to the earlier conversations (unintelligible) (Jeff Field).

Ken Stubbs: (Unintelligible) hi hopefully get into a situation where the concern becomes so high to get an incredibly high probability rate that we suddenly have to study this for another two and a half years to get some sort of a level. We - let's measure it in terms of a practical.

Jeff Schmidt: Just to follow on there, I mean we were talking a lot about probability and frequency, right and that's been the dimension that's been studied, but I want to emphasize again we're missing, you know, the boat, right we're missing the consequences right.

So we need, you know, before we can talk about what to do and what's on the good list and the bad list we need to have a much, much better understanding of consequences - it's not just probability.

ManKeith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff, so in the queue I've got Jeff Neuman, Ching Chiao and Reg Levy and (Craig). And then we probably need to wrap this up although I'm not going to cut it off in any way. So Jeff, Ching, Reg, (Craig).

Jeff Neuman: So on the timing and we're all realizing things are going to take a lot longer, I would ask (Chris) and ICANN staff, you know, because I can imagine even if we come up with these strategies then the next, you know, the implementation will look like okay you got to wait for an email from the customer support portal to be invited to implement your mitigation strategy.

Then you got to go through legal to have the contract drafted to implement your mitigation strategy. Then you got to wait for a signature, right and week, after week after week I'm not sure there's a better way to do it. But the point is that people need to realize this is not a three month thing, you know, come end of March this is going to be implemented and all of a sudden they're going to come out with a recommendation and bomb, you know.

So I'm going to ask ICANN to think about different ways to make it easier and faster to go to the new mitigation strategy. Because if we have to wait, like I said, for someone to get around for support to send an email, us to respond through the customers support portal, wait another week for, you know, all this other stuff. That's even more and more delay. And this is starting to hurt us. So again, a lot of time.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Jeff, Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Keith. Just very simply allow me to use 30 seconds to read some of the block list of the (unintelligible). So let me tell you what's on their block list.

360, one of the largest game sites; 4399, one of the largest game sites; Apple; HTC. I've had single (third to M); NBA, Nokia; QQ, the largest instant message sites.

There's an IDN of Android, IDN of (wife) changing, kind of interesting. It's a game. IDN of - so IDN of Angry Birds. So that's on the list. I'm just using this opportunity to share this.

Man: For the record, we will have no mitigation strategy for wife changing.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Ching, Reg and then Craig.

Reg Levy: Thanks. And thank you Jeff for coming. And thank you for the presentation yesterday. That was extremely informative.

My take away from yesterday is that you were going to categorize the SLD strings into buckets. Today you said you're very intrigued by (Helen Corp) because they're really interesting problems. But that's a TLD string.

So my first question as can we clarify the way were using string? And which buckets are you planning? Or is it both?

Jeff Schmidt: Yes so good. And thanks. That was - and I think there was some confusion about this year as well. So the objective of the framework, right, is to be able to deliver a mitigation package, right, to applicants for (.Jeff) at the TLD basis, right.

So that - there will be bucketing at the TLD basis, absolutely, right because that's how you get to the finish line.

As a part of understanding what's going on we well, you know, necessarily have to bucket up the strings. For example, you know, more than 30% of the data set is comprised of random and algorithmic strings, right.

So we have to understand those. The Chrome 10's are well understood. But there is, you know, six other ones. So as a necessary prerequisite to understanding what we're looking at, we are going to have to bucket SLDs as well.

Reg Levy: Thank you. Okay, so understanding that, I would like to make two requests of the report that you'll eventually issue. Is that when you bucket TLDs that you actually expressly state TLD and I'm going to use XYZ because it's an example. But I don't mean that against whoever applied for that XYZ in the room.

TLD XYZ is in Group A. TLD ABC is in Group B. as opposed to the rules for TLDs that belong in Group AR. So that's my first request. That is my request.

The other thing is slightly going back to what you said to Ray about the fact that you're not removing strings from the block list. But the point is to remove the block list altogether.

The way I understand that is you would like to remove strings from the block list. You just want to remove all of the strings from the block list so that nothing is blocked.

We've figured out, we've understood what the hash keys are. We've understood (from 10's) obviously. And we - things are no longer blocked. Is that a correct understanding?

Jeff Schmidt: Yes, I mean I - that's right. I would characterize it the other way. We are not starting with the block lists, right. We want to actually understand the problem. The block lists are a symptom.

Reg Levy: And do you know how that block list - or were you involved in the compilation of that block list?

Jeff Schmidt: Yes. It's basically the report that we put in the public comment period where we listed everything, yes.

Reg Levy: Okay, so is the block list comprised of every string? Or only of - pardon me, every SLD string? Or is it only comprised of strings that appeared over a certain threshold a number of times?

Jeff Schmidt: So the block list is every string that ever appeared anywhere ever.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you, Craig. It's on now.

Craig Schwartz: Okay so, I understand that - I understand what the report is suppo - what the framework is supposed to do. It that it's the other path away from reserving all these second level domains.

With regard to I've heard this term bucketing now several times. And are you saying that a TLD could have - are the mitigation strategies based upon how on the classification of the second level domain name.

Meaning could there be four mitigation strategies for one TLD and three mitigation strategies for another TLD? Like help me understand what you mean, what bucketing means.

Jeff Schmidt: All right. So yes, when I use the word bucketing. Let me say it differently. Hopefully it will help. The objective is to have a per string plan that is, you know, implementable, reasonable, time definite all, you know, all things to bring closure to the issue.

So the objective is to have a plan. If I applied for (.Jeff), so the per TLD string, thank you. So if I applied for (.Jeff), I have a plan. And that that plan is a, you know, comprised of a series of mitigations.

I don't know exactly what those are going to look like. I don't know exactly how many, right. But one can imagine, you know, a very low risk situation where the mitigation package may be nothing.

You know, where a string has never been queried. And so the mitigation package is vigilance, right. All the way to something that, you know, for whatever reason is more interesting. And may include something like a trial delegation.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff, thanks (Craig). Okay, a couple more questions and then we probably need to wrap up. We do have some other business that we need to get to. So Ray and then Ken.

Ray Fassett: Last quick question, the - your exercise is only going to look at the new TLDs that were applied for. It's not going back and looking at this TLDs that have been in the road and operating for years. Is that correct?

Jeff Schmidt: So no. We are going to look at - we can't go back and retroactively, you know, it's not - it's - there will not be a mitigation plan for a previously delegated string, right.

What they are looking at, you know, .Triple X, .Asia, the four CCs. there's a lot of really great data out there where we can see, you know, what has - what happened in the past.

There's a couple of gTLDs, (word middle) data exists before and after. We have other data sets available. So we're looking at everything. But no, there won't be a plan for (none of them) to do something.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, if this question is out of line, then I'll ask you to just kill it. But years ago, and it's always my understanding, and I'm going to use a word that may bring terror into the minds of some people here.

But if a concept like Site Finder originally designed for exactly this type of approach where somebody were to type in one of the strings you're talking about, being redirected to a page would offer a mitigation strategy. Or something along that line.

Why do we have to go through all of this when we can go through something that's really relatively - my understanding? I'm not a tech. And it's not my technical people. It's the people I talked to who have been involved in architecture for a long time.

Why couldn't we use something as elementary as that? (Is it polite)?

Jeff Schmidt: Yes, I mean I don't have an answer directly. I will say indirectly that, you know, certainly over the years a lot of research has been done on this topic and related topics, right.

So the research that was done around that situation where you mentioned is certainly, you know, on the table for us to review at this point, absolutely.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. Any final questions on - so Chuck has a question.

Chuck Gomes: And it will be real brief. Are you suggesting Ken that we resubmit a Site Finder proposal?

Ken Stubbs: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks everybody. Unless there's any final questions, I'd like to thank Jeff Schmidt for joining us today and (unintelligible) appreciate your time.

Okay, we have just over 30 minutes before we need to - actually probably a little bit less, before we break to go joined the registrars at 4 o'clock. So there's a few things that we probably have to get to on today's agenda. And some other things that may be nice to do what may not get to.

So the microphone is blinking again. So bear with me a second. Okay, so going back to the GNSO and ICANN updates, there's a few things that I think we're able to remove from the agenda that we skipped over earlier.

(Arrows), IRTP, I think we cannot talk about Whois unless there's any reason to. We have ICANN meeting planning working group. (Paul) is there anything that you would like to provide an update there? Or is this something we can skipped over?

All right, so were skipping over the meeting planning working group. We have policy and implementation working group. Chuck is there something that you would like to provide an update on briefly on policy and implementation working group?

Woman: I'm sorry.

Chuck [SchwartzGomes](#): You got the exercise, right Keith. Okay, this is Chuck. Real brief - less than a minute. We have a session tomorrow afternoon, 4:45 I think until 6:15. And were going to ask for feedback on policy implementation issues as we're starting the process.

So it's an opportunity for you to answer some questions we're going to ask. And you can see that on the agenda. So if you can make it, it's an important issue for us. Please come.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks. Sorry everybody. Thanks Chuck. Comments questions for Chuck on policy and implementation? Okay know. I'll hand it over to Jonathan then for an update on GNSO review.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I will be real short, as Jeff told me to be. Power, can you hear me okay? Okay great, sorry. (Had to go and) turn your back on this.

I guess the main message is actually there's not a whole lot to do you right now. But you should be aware of this activity because it has - it can be open to interpretation in different ways.

As the GNSO Council, in our meeting with the board. And some of you may have been there. We got an update from Ray Plzak, who heads the structural

improvements committee of the board and will be leading the GNSO review, or at least initiating GNSO review according to a still to be determined methodology.

I'm going to meet with at least one of the counselors with Ray tomorrow. And we'll get further information of work with them. It will be communicated to the Council. We will keep communicating it with the stakeholder group.

But I just want to flag with this stakeholder group that we need to keep a close eye on that. And inform our counselors of our expectations. And we'll just have to see where it goes. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jonathan. I'll hand that down to Ching because the next item is translation and transliteration, contact information PDP, Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Keith, and this is Ching. Again, I'll also be very brief. As you've heard this morning, the motion of this will be put on the table for the Council tomorrow.

And the work itself, actually during the weekend session we just learned that a new EWG, the expert working group on this issue has been formed. And they have I believe met on the past Monday.

And it's led by (June Garban). I would look forward that in the next meeting they will keep us posted on what's happening. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Ching. Any questions or comments for Ching? No. Okay, so I think we're going to skip over the rest of the items that were on the GNSO/ICANN update.

Move down to - I'm going to ask (Paul) to start thinking about anything we need to talk about related to public comments. If there's anything that we need to get to there that's something that's imminent or urgent, then start thinking about that so we can talk about it in a minute.

In the meantime, is Philip Sheppard here?

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Snuck up on me like that, goodness.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Sheri told me you were here. And I was looking around the room. I didn't realize it snuck up on me. Anyway, thank you. So Philip I'm going to hand it over to you for an update to the group on the evolution working group. So thank you. Thanks for joining us.

Philip Sheppard: So thanks very much. We just got some slides coming up in the second. But just to get the background to this. As you'll recall, we had a meeting in Durban.

I was representing BRG, some colleagues also representing the .GEOs group. And it was initiating discussion recognizing that of all the stakeholder groups in ICANN, this one is the most effective in terms of change.

And therefore, a suggestion of Chuck getting a group together of people just to think through what change may mean sounded like a useful idea. So we formed this working group on evolution.

We created some short terms of reference, which in essence was saying let's do it needs analysis, both of the needs of new registries but also looking at the needs of older reg - of the existing registries. And just go from there.

Been in terms of thinking what changes may be needed. So if we move to the next slide, you see them - since Durban, we met five times. Each time just going through Section 1 or sometimes paring some of these terms of reference together just to see where we were.

And the (pay on) just to work fairly and methodically and slowly just to try to understand some of the key underlying things. And to keep stuff as general as possible.

And we've come up now with the draft report, which I hope this is what you are seeing (unintelligible). It's beneficial. It's easy to do. But I'll take you to the key points of that in a second now.

And the data draft report has 11 recommendations. If you move to the next slide, we've divided the recommendations into two categories. In the first were just calling administrative recommendations.

And essentially, the all stem from the recognition that this stakeholder group is going to get bigger. And bigger means we may need to do things in different ways.

And so it's not - so the second set of recommendations is all about change of type of registries and different needs. And therefore, we thought it was helpful to divide those into two categories.

And these first six are all about change because of a change of size. At the first two were some clarifying edits, those particular bits of the charter referred to interest groups and observer groups.

And I think it made - we all agreed it was probably just some editorial issues whereby some of the things that those groups can do was different. And we thought probably that was not intended.

And it's just the way that may be the charter had arranged so that a suggestion of those two things should be (listed as) an exact match. So essentially the ability to discuss, et cetera (or way) what's called an interest group on observer interest group would be vital.

The second recommendation was to look at the quorum and recognition based on experience of larger groups. The larger the group gets (unintelligible) needs to reduce the quorum down to something that's going to be manageable because sure, your typical attendance will be lower.

And the recommendations there was that some - (well as you said at the moment), it should go to a lower amount. And we didn't want to take a judgment to that point. But just to park that as a concept that would it need to be done for practicality in order that you can make decision-making which can go forward and the meaningful.

The third of that was - third recommendation was about definition of an active member, which currently had two criteria to define it. And we also felt that going forward, just having one criteria to reflect the voting pattern of the membership is efficient to fire active member because the second category would be much more challenging in a larger and more diverse organization.

Fourth recommendation was really manpower. And it was mostly want to say well look, if you are going to have so many more people around, then perhaps you'd be able to reduce the burden on your officers, the chair, the ultimate chair in the treasurer.

And therefore, their terms could be reduced to one year because the pool of people able to do those would be larger. And stemming from the reduction becomes an associated change to the consecutive terms that would be allowed. And how you would define the term, that's Recommendation 5.

And finally there was a relatively straightforward suggestion that just a slight mis-synchronization at the moment between the election date cycle and the fiscal year. And maybe synchronizing those in a way that makes it simpler could be helpful idea.

So I can pole for about two seconds to take any questions on those recommendations before I moved to the second set. That might be helpful.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Philip. So thanks for that initial, or that introduction. Any comments or questions, anything to add? Statton.

Statton Hammock: Statton Hammock, (United) TLD. On Item Number 3, the definition of active members should be changed to reflect voting only. That means that if you are - you're an inactive member. If you are not a voting member.

What - if you're not an active member, what other member are you besides observer? Is there another category?

Philip Sheppard: Yes I should (Sheri). (Sheri)'s a way better expert than I am on that. But I think at the moment you have two categories of - an inactive member can

vote. And part of that is determined by the voting pattern and partly is determined by participation.

And we thought that going forward, measuring participation is practical with a group of 10 or 20. Measuring participation of a group of a potentially 1800 is unlikely to be. And therefore, we felt that that should be the change.

Ken Stubbs: Yes can I take (umbridge) with that. I think from a practical standpoint, the perception of an active versus a non-active member, as you describe it here. There are many people that may very well have a situation where they are very active in the constituency.

But because of the nature of the constituency system, they may very well be casting a vote in another constituency. We're going to have a lot of people with that position.

I don't ever want to have a situation where we de-incentivize members in terms of their desire to participate. I think that anyone who participates knowing they can't vote is one thing.

But advertising that these people really don't have any, you know, we pride ourselves - I would say it actions in the future don't stand and consistency with the ones in the past. We may have a problem.

We always pride ourselves on our ability to deal with that kind of issue. And I think most of the members of the MTAG would agree that there's never been any barriers out there for them.

Now I could be wrong. And there may be people who don't feel that way. But I kind of hope that, you know, we encourage people to contribute. And we measure the value of that contribution.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Ken. I've got Chuck, Statton and that's it so far.

Chuck [SchwartzGomes](#): And this is Chuck. I want to respond to Ken. I don't think that this particular recommendation changes that at all. This was just a practical matter in terms of how we define active.

So I think we're okay there. But keep in mind these things will be refined and dealt with before they are finalized. The purpose of now is to get some feedback and see if there's some reactions and certainly questions like you're asking.

Statton Hammock: That's what I was get man when I asked the question. Thanks Ken for picking up on where I was going with that because there will be members here, if not already, that also have representatives in other stakeholder groups.

And we know that the rule is clear on only being able to vote in one. But we don't want to be labeled as an inactive participants merely because were a non-voting member of the stakeholder group.

Chuck [SchwartzGomes](#): Just a second, Chuck again. Yes, again there is no intent of that. Keep in mind the only time when active - the active category comes into play is when we take a vote.

And the idea was because as we grow, you get people that don't participate. And if you have got a quorum, and even if it's low, and you can't reach the quorum, you can't do business.

So the idea was to put something in there to make sure we don't get in that situation.

Philip Sheppard: This discussion has been interesting. And actually although we did discuss the issue about voting in choosing where you place your vote in the constituency is I don't think actually we'd discussed at that in relation to this point when we're there.

So I think the point is taken. And we can move on on that because I think it needs to be looked at (insufication). So I'm not dying on that particular issue at all.

And if we don't have any recommendations, perhaps will just move on to the next page because actually those are much more interesting ones.

So these are called structure recommendations. And the issue here was is it recognizing that that there are going to be different types of members, different sizes, difference motivations, et cetera.

And the first recommendation is a short-term interim fix. And we realize a lot of the stuff we're looking at had implications of either major thinking through as to what you wanted to do as a stakeholder group.

And other sort of implications about (reforming) (in charge), GNSO. And therefore there are some timing issues. But one it needed issue that did come out of our needs analysis was that if it was possible for an existing group representing a certain type of registry could join as the group as opposed to an individual member of that joining. And then forming an interest group, which is sort of the MTAG model.

That would probably be quite a good interim fix. If that could only be a quick interim fix is that group had essentially no votes. And perhaps a rather low fee to recognize that.

But it would allow participation while the much more interesting issue of voting took place. Let me just run through the rest and then we'll take questions on all of them because they do sort of link really.

Recommendation 8 is a rather key one. Further work is needed on the issue of the voting structure of the group to align it to - and here's an interesting phrase, to the economic and operational impacts of diverse registries.

So we also saw the question first, why is it that the - when you go for a - when you - as we understand it, a rather rare occurrence happens. It you might have to have a vote based on sort of the matrix how that happens. That essentially is linked to the number of registrations. And we're saying why was that the case? What is that trying to capture?

And the phrase that we came up with as a group was that that was really a measure or sort of a proxy for the economic and operational impact of policy change that might happen and therefore that was the way that it was done.

So we thought well, if that's the case, and you're now having different types of registries that may join for whom second level registrations may be very small. They might have high impacts in other ways, or, in the case of the lot that I represent, they've got brand, second level registrations are irrelevant.

Then the measure of the concept of economic and operational impact as a way of measuring vote seemed to be a good way forward, but we did no further

work on exactly what that would mean. So I hope that's clear in terms of what we're trying to say by recommendation 8.

Nine then is a fairly simple recommendation to say that restructuring needs to be looked at to find the new structure based on - only came up with five options, which I'll take you through in a second on the next chart. Also recognized some of what we were doing was duplicating a little bit the discussions elsewhere, mostly informal.

We had quite an interesting meeting yesterday that Paul had helped coordinate with some of those guys and just recognizing that if there are different groups working on structure it might help to have separate discussions where they're looking at sort of commonality of interests. And the moment there's commonality of interests, they reflect a set of needs that would reflect structural change, then it would be very helpful for them to integrate it into our group so that we don't lose that.

And Recommendation 11 is what we're doing today, which is taking forward this draft report to you guys to say here it is to you as a stakeholder group and to you as the leadership. So counsel, just take the last slide which linked into Recommendation 9 there.

And this was our thinking through what the five options were without making any judgment call as to the merit of the options. And Option 1 is the status quo, where we are today. One member joining as they choose under existing charter. That naturally has simplicity as a pro. As a con it doesn't meet the needs of a whole bunch of new guys. And it reflects a certain historic view of the DNS.

Option 2 would be a move to the sort of the constituency model for which we saw there were potentially sort of two existing, and maybe three altogether, just so they're not complicated. And so you've got the consistency model as in the commercial stakeholder group where it's a constituency that is the main driver, if you like, of what happens there. The fees are paid to the constituency. There's a deal then in terms of how the voting is shared amongst constituencies.

There's a board approval necessary for both the constituency and the stakeholder group charters, and that option, like in fact any of the other options, would need to sort out exactly how voting would change.

A variation of that - and that reflects a little bit of new thinking - and that was sort of came about because we as the brand registry group made a choice to form ourselves initially as a trade association. So we exist as a not-for-profit registered in Belgium. Some other groups are looking at doing similar things. So these groups are registering as trade associations and looking at ways in terms of after their mission, which would be interaction with everything ICANN.

So one model may be a sort of a hybrid version of a pure constituency model where there's some sort of direct involvement of the trade association. And we didn't go into any further detail as to how on earth that might be done. We recognized it as a possibility.

Model 4 is a non-commercial stakeholder group modeled - was genuinely a bit more complex where you have a bit of a mix of a stakeholder group and constituencies which seem to be slightly unsatisfactory in our immediate view without getting into too much detail as to how they feel it works.

And Model 5 is a sort of completely ripping it up and starting again model whereby you might have multiple stakeholder groups participating, all those stakeholder groups of registries and that would clearly need, maybe GNSO reform and look at how all those overlapping interests are best accommodated.

A good example in the brand registry group having a brand registry group, and Internet property group, and a business constituency, all with the same companies, may be seen to be an (unintelligible) stakeholder group model.

And that's what our structural options are. So what we came out with is fine. I was thinking there would probably be good templates to think about - as I said, with no particular favoritism for any of those, merely open for discussion - blue sky thinking. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Philip. That's very constructive and it's clear that a lot of thought and energy and work has gone into this. So thank you for that. Any questions, comments, thoughts, next steps? All right. Thanks very much for the presentation, appreciate it. I look forward to the continued work of the group. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Keith. I'm just wondering Philip if you've documented - it's Jonathan speaking - I'm wondering if you've documented or is it recorded anywhere why option 1 does not meet the (LG) and/or (GO) need. Is that something... ?

Philip Sheppard: Yes, in the full report was a needs analysis, which is sort of a chart (unintelligible) together, really, and that sort of pulls out those issues. And it reflects certainly discussions that we've had with our members who you'd recognize for the most part.

The founders group are ICANN savvy. The other 95% are new to ICANN, and their feeling is - as any organization would be in joining a new group or an association - would like to join one set of guides that could look after our needs.

We pay a certain set of fees for them and they manage it for us. That's what they expect to get from joining a group or an association. And so the duplication of the roles is seen as a necessary use of their scarce resources and they were looking at us to provide some of the expertise to say we would help being a filter for you in terms of what's necessary and therefore group participation is seen as to what they want.

And I think it was a similar discussion I think is taking place amongst the colleagues in the (DotGeo) group, although I think they're not quite ready yet to make that case explicitly. That was the main thing really was resources and duplication.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much. Any other questions or comments? Okay, thanks. So thank you very much Philip. Appreciate it. So we have less than ten minutes left on our agenda. I have sent a note to the registrars letting them know that we're running ten to fifteen minutes behind.

There are a few things that we need to deal with right now, and probably most pressing, and we want to make sure that we have plenty of time for discussion - is to discuss Jeff's replacement on the council. Sorry - Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: There's another one that's pressing too, and that's the (ATRT 2) comments. I have a work around - (Paul's) probably way ahead of me on this. In fact, they gave us a way out in the session this morning. So maybe we can handle that

one in just a few minutes. But go ahead with the issue, the other issue if you'd like.

Man: (Unintelligible) (ATRT), it's just - yeah go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, they actually suggested today that if someone was to submit some personal comments recognizing that the registries haven't had time to fully do this, it would really help them if they got those and then the registries could chime in later in terms of the broader support.

So if we're okay with that, I'm one of those that would be willing to submit the comments personally. If there's someone else that has reviewed them and would like to join me and tweak them so that whoever we are, we're at least comfortable with them from personal points of view, not representing our companies or the registries, I would be happy for us to do that.

So I guess my question is has anybody else reviewed them at least personally and willing to join me in doing that if the group is okay with that? They're about nine pages long I think right now. The biggest reason for that is the recommendations are printed there, so it's real - because there are so many.

It's real clear then. It's easy to go through. You don't have to flip back and forth with the report unless you want to get more detail on the recommendation. And in most cases there's not that much more.

So that would be my recommendation. And if we want to do that we obviously have to do that by Friday.

(Paul)Paul Diaz: It's ~~(Paul)Paul Diaz~~. Two things, Chuck. Thank you for the offer. That is absolutely a way forward. I will join you on the comments. I would also note

the staff lead that's helping us - ~~(Larissa)~~Larisa - has just (unintelligible) out that they are, I think as they said previously, they will accept comments during the reply period. So Friday's date is basically kind of artificial. But I'd rather do it while we're here and I'll work with you on that. Anybody else please join us.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Yes, ~~(Sherry)~~Cherie, go ahead.

~~(Sherry)~~Cherie Stubbs: Just so I'm clear, are we going to call for a vote? No?

Chuck Gomes: We will in the next couple weeks, so by our next meeting, we're going to need it. So let - and if somebody else wants to join us, please let us know, just as a practical way forward, ~~(Paul)~~Paul, if you would let me know if you want to edit anything. And then we can decide who - I don't care which one of us submits it this week. But then we should put them into format for the constituency format, stakeholder group so that there can be.

And we probably ought to maybe distribute them for a few days for any comments and then do that as far as the voting. But within probably a week before our next meeting, we should get them out there for the vote. Does that make sense?

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Chuck. So ~~(Sherry)~~Cherie, to answer your question, we're not going to be calling for a vote this week. Anything submitted this week will be personal comments with input from whomever would like to participate or contribute. And then we would call for a vote before the deadline. The deadline would be the reply period. Okay, any other comments, questions on the ~~(ATRT 2)~~ATRT2 comments?

Okay, so next item and probably the last item we'll get to before we have to run down to the registrar's which I think is actually right next door, right?

Woman: Yes.

Keith Drazek: Okay, so it's not too far. We're going to be running anyway. So Jeff -- as we talked about at the beginning of the session -- is because he's taken on a new role at Neustar and has a lot more responsibility right now, simply just doesn't have the bandwidth to be able to continue as a counselor.

And I think as we all know based on what we've seen from Jeff, being a counsellor is a lot of work. And so Jeff, I guess I'm going to hand it over to you in terms of your expectations of timing, how much time you have left on your term, you know, just a little bit of background that can tee up the conversation for us.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. So tomorrow is a meeting of the council. It's actually two meetings of the council. There's one that's the general session for the annual meeting. The first one is basically just the business, the motions, everything we talked about. And then there's a shorter session. So that's the last meeting of the current council as it exists.

The next meeting which follows that one is the meeting of the new council, which are the new members of the - the old members that are done with their term step off and the new members come on. And then there's a wrap-up session on Thursday followed by a workshop on Friday that Jonathan could probably talk a little bit about.

So my hope would be to step down tomorrow with the other outgoing counselors and obviously that's a very short amount of time, and just pick

someone as a temporary alternate for the second session. That second session's important because they have to elect a new chair. Jonathan's the only one running, so hopefully the new person who would vote for Jonathan or I guess none of the above.

But that's really the only main business of the second meeting is to vote for the chair and to say some thank-yous to so many of the outgoing counselors. So I would - my goal would be I would love for somebody to step in as kind of a temporary alternate to the second meeting to help elect a new chair, and then if they had time, to go on Thursday to the wrap-up and Friday to the other session. That would be ultimately my goal.

So let's see what happens. Let's start discussions. So it's up to you all.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jeff. I saw David and Jonathan and Ken and Reg .

David Maher: Our charter provides for election of a new counselor in the event of a vacancy. And is your term within 90 days of expiring, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

David Maher: Then we have to just go ahead and elect a new counselor. The temporary alternate only applies if it's a very short, less than 90 days.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much David. I appreciate you doing that research. So then I think Jonathan, did you want to jump in?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, so a couple of comments I think. First of all, notwithstanding what the registry stakeholder group charter is, we also have the council, what's available at the council level. And should Jeff be not available for

whatever reason, the council rules provide for a temporary alternative. So we can - that's an option from the council's perspective.

ManKen Stubbs: Two choices.

Jonathan Robinson: There is a, yes, temporary alternative option. So having said that, my preference from a stakeholder group point of view would be ideally we didn't go through a two-step process. If it was possible, practically, I'd love to see - for more than one reason that I've already expanded on that because of the shortage of time -- to go straight to our chosen counselor.

Second point, just a couple of remarks over the quality for the required picture, obviously more than by Jeff. Time commitment, diligence, ability to really focus on some of the key issues, especially from the stakeholder group perspective to advocate - I mean, one of the key things that we face with one of our stakeholder group counseled as chair is that we don't have - I'm less able to advocate.

Although technically I can say, "Well, I'm taking off my chair hat," it's ultimately -- the practical reality -- it's a compromised position from a point of view of our stakeholder group. So those are some of the qualities. It's not all encompassing. But we really need someone with strong sort of institutional and structural knowledge of some of the history of the issues as well as where we're headed. So that's my two cents' worth.

ManKen Stubbs: I'm going to ask a couple questions and make some statements and see if I'm correct. First of all, at this point in time, as far as geographical diversity, we have representatives from Europe, North America, and Asia, okay. And we would be replacing the North American (unintelligible).

Secondly, the term that would be taken by the new council-elect - I am assuming would be a regular term. No? So it is only the balance of your term. Would that person be subject to the term limitations, or would he be entitled - or she be entitled (unintelligible) let Jeff finish.

Jeff Neuman: So this is actually what happened with Jonathan as well because Jonathan replaced I think ~~(Caroline)~~Caroline (Greer). So the one year that you would be finishing out my term, whoever it is - and that wouldn't count towards your term limits. You would be able to serve two additional two-year terms if you wanted.

~~Man~~Ken Stubbs: And that's a (sic) ICAAN by-laws issue there, not our charter.

Keith Drazek: Okay, so I think that sets the stage. Ching, go ahead, thank you.

Ching Chiao: I'm going to quickly offer - maybe it's not good idea to jump into a suggestion, but then this suggestion sounds a little bit weird - but also just to show -- actually Jeff can stay, maybe one hour longer or 30 minutes longer on the council. You can actually be a temporary candidate for yourself actually, and then just for the election purposes that because you know the procedures, you know with us.

One quick suggestion popping out of my mind is that you can still stay for just that 30 minutes to help Jonathan at least to finish the election part. I think that would be actually helpful. I understand that word is out.

Jeff Neuman: I would prefer another, just to make kind of a clean break if possible.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. So I've got Chuck and then Ken. And then I think what we need to start talking about - I'm sorry, was there somebody - oh, Reg, I'm sorry. So Reg then Chuck then Ken. (Reg?)

Reg Levy: I was just wondering if we could hear from Jeff an estimate of what his time commitment was on a weekly basis.

Jeff Neuman: So I think - what do they say - on the normal week that's not an ICANN week they say it's about five to ten hours a week just to keep up with everything. And then the week before ICANN there's a lot of things that come in. And obviously the week of ICANN there are a lot of meetings.

There's the full weekend sessions. There's usually a Monday meeting with the cons. There's a Tuesday - obviously this day - so you have to be at the entire registry session so you can understand the registry view on everything.

Wednesday's the council meeting which can range anywhere from two to four hours. Thursday's a wrap-up session which is about two hours. So I think the hardest - the most time commitment - is just keeping on top of everything and reading everything that comes out. So it can get pretty long, but for the most part every week, it's not that huge I think.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again, and I was just going to say, if Jeff was willing to do the meeting, the second meeting tomorrow, we don't necessarily need a temporary alternate. I think his resignation was effective when we have a replacement, right? And we could start an initiation process now.

If you'd rather have an alternate we can do that. That's an easy thing to do. So I think we defer to (Jeff's) wishes there. But we probably should initiate an election process right away to honor his wishes.

ManKen Stubbs: Yeah, I'm not trying to rush this thing but from a practical standpoint, I don't think you get much more coy than you do in an ICANN meeting. Is this something that we want to stretch out over an extended period of time? Is there a desire for that? Or is it possible for us to arrive at some sort of a consensus while everyone is here? Or do we need a deliberative process?

Keith Drazek: So my views on that as chair is that I am a little bit concerned about trying to rush a decision like this. It's an important decision. We need to make sure that we have somebody who is as described available to commit the time and energy and focus and somebody - also there's a lot of people who aren't here who may not be participating the conversation today, so respecting (Jeff's) wish to sort of move this forward quickly, but also taking the time to deliberate and make sure that we arrive at I guess a decision or conduct an election process that may have more than one nominee, right?

I mean, we have a lot of new participants in the stakeholder group now, voting members. So that's just my sense, but I want to hear what others have to think.

Jonathan Robinson: That's fine Keith. That makes sense. That's fine. I understand your point. So the question is what do we do in the short term? And my suggestion is maybe that we think about one of either two of you as sort of leadership of the stakeholder group eventually stepping into the breach in the short term as temporary alternatives, yeah.

ManKen Stubbs: So is that - let me ask a question though. Is that possible, because I didn't think that chair or alternate chair could be counselors? Sorry? Sorry David, go ahead.

David Maher: You can't be an officer and a counsel rep at the same time under the charter. The charter provides that you cannot serve both as an officer and counselor at the same time.

Keith Drazek: Thanks David. That was my recollection. And I assume acting as an alternate on the council would be considered being a counselor for the purposes of our charter. Yeah, yeah. So, look, we need to get down to our meeting with the registrars. Sorry Chuck, did you have something else?

Chuck Gomes: Could we - is there any reason why we - we obviously need to answer that question - but is there any reason why we can't start the nomination process today? It doesn't have to be right now. We don't have time right now, but initiate it today and allow a week.

Does anybody think that's too short? Because I think that point's right. We shouldn't rush it. But is that rushing it too much is my question? So I would suggest that. And then we need to make the decision, okay.

Keith Drazek: No, I think that makes sense Chuck. And the other thing is we need to identify a temporary alternate for Jeff to honor his wishes. So I guess maybe I'll just ask for a volunteer of somebody who would be willing to step in for Jeff so we can have the clean break that he's looking for.

ManKen Stubbs: I guess I'm having a hard time understanding - maybe you said it before and I missed it. Is there a reason why you just can't do it for the rest of this meeting? We found out this morning that you're leaving. So obviously we're going to rush and get it done. And we did give you a standing ovation this morning, so Jeff you don't want us to take that away.

Jonathan Robinson: The one issue for me from a council point of view is we've - and I suspect this might be at least partly on (Jeff's) mind as well - we've set up Friday as an induction for new counselors and a kind of getting together and bonding session, a development session.

Now actually, as it turns out, it doesn't sound like we're going to have a registry stakeholder group counselor for that anyway, which is kind of disappointing from a council point of view because the whole point is to try and set things up, tee things up for the year ahead while we're all together. So that would be a main driver from my point of view.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks. So I'm asking again for a volunteer for an alternate.

Man: Chuck.

Woman: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I'll do it. I'm welcome for somebody else to do it. And I think I've been off for two years, which is another requirement.

Keith Drazek: All right, very good. So thanks for that. And then (Sherry) we will need to begin the process for nominations. Let's do that today or tomorrow at the latest. Okay, so let's break and then move next door to our meetings with the registrars. Thanks everybody for your time and attention today, thought it was a good session. Let's go ahead and move on down the road.

END