Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
NTAG Meeting
Wednesday 20 November 2013

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

Man: Two, three. And for the recording it's Wednesday, November 20th. It's 8:30 am in (Reterio) B. This is the meeting of GNSO New gTLD Applicants Group NTAG.

Cherie Stubbs: Good morning, we'll be starting in a couple of minutes. If everybody would please get settled, thank you.

    Good morning, my name is Cherie Stubbs and I'm the Secretariat for the Registry Stakeholder Group, and I'm here today to just kind of help facilitate the meeting. We'll get started in a moment. Would you - may we please start the recording? Thank you.

    Is there anyone on dial-in? All right, thank you very much.

    So I will turn it over to the (unintelligible).

Sara Falvey: Thank you so much. Welcome everybody to Wednesday morning's early NTAG Meeting. I'm Sara Falvey; I'm your Interim Chair. And we have - I think you guys have seen we have a really packed agenda, so we're going to try to move through as quickly as possible. So the welcome will be pretty quick.

I just want to remind everybody to make sure that you tell us who you are when you're speaking. And it looks like the microphones are working, but there was a bit of an issue so just make sure whoever else was done speaking before you put yours on.

And with that, we'll go ahead and go over the approvals of prior minutes. I'm assuming that nobody has any concerns. All right, so those will be approved and we'll move on to the NTAG membership update from Josh.

Josh Zetlin: Hi everybody, I'm Josh Zetlin. I'm the Build and Secretary of the NTAG.

The total applicants represented by the NTAG is currently 102 with 77 voting members and 25 non-voting members.

Liz Sweezey: Good morning, I'm Liz Sweezey with FairWinds Partners and Treasurer of the NTAG. For the Treasurer's Report, we have an updated invoice right now $5000 for the Artemis Security Forum in Washington D.C. in October that we are currently working to reconcile, otherwise, no new expenses. Thank you.

Sara Falvey: Does anybody have any questions? Okay, we're going to move - we have ten minutes now for any - it should be for ICANN's new give a presentation.

And a discussion before they came in here about whether or not folks want to see the same presentation as they gave yesterday in RYSG. If there's interest for that, we can do that again or we can just sort of have more of a discussion around what sort of new with ICANN and Cyrus's team and Kristine's team. And we can start there unless people want to see the presentation just let us know.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Sara. Good morning everybody, thank you for giving us the opportunity to be here this morning; always at your service.

We did have a few slides we wanted to show you but I think - I was ill actually yesterday morning, so (Krystal) was kind enough to present them. I think substantially this is the same group of people so we won't bore you with going through that.

My suggestion and if you're okay with it is to just open it up for any discussions, any issues you might have that we need to know about any questions you have that you'd like to ask is what I'd like to suggest that we do.

Does that sound okay? You're very quiet.

Sara Falvey: The other thing we can do is we can start to go through the agenda and if, obviously, some of the issues take more time or we want to talk to ICANN about auctions or anything else that's on the list, we can sort of fold their time into the rest of our agenda. That seems like a more reasonable use of time.

Craig's okay with it so we're good, okay. All right, let's do that. And let's move on to TMCH. Jeff - did I see Jeff? Yes, there you are, sorry.

Jeff Neuman: There we go. I guess we have different mics today so I got confused.

Yes, I mean the update really is - everyone should now be available to or able to go and test if you haven't already had signed agreements. I mean things are going pretty smoothly right now. It's a good update, and so at the last meeting, I mean I haven't noticed too many issues.

You know, there is a checklist that I think everybody, all the operators should be joined up to because new specs or revised specs come out as different bugs and fixes are found. And so that's really the best way to keep on top of it, but really from a policy perspective, there haven't been any known issues and I think people have been testing.

I guess the first Sunrises are starting and we'll wait to hear feedback. So if any of you are in the first Sunrises and starting, it would be great to let the list know how it's going.

Sara Falvey: Jordan?

Jordyn Buchanan: So one question I'm a little bit uncertain about. I talked with the folks from the TMC yesterday. There was a little bit of back-and-forth as to what the final procedure for submitting start-up plans was.

I know in talking with folks from ARI, that process may be a little bit confusing. And I'm wondering if we could get an update on what to expect in terms of once we pass TMC's testing and delegation, how the submission of start up plans will work.

Krista Papac: Thanks for the question Jordyn, this is Krista. We actually just posted a process for this the other day; we're going to cover it in the (unintelligible) session today as well.

Essentially the process is once you pass delegation - sorry, once you are delegated, you can - there's two parallel things going on. So we're building a portal for this where you would, upon delegation, you would get a notification to go in and submit your TLD startup information. That's the TLD startup information that's defined in the RPM's document. You would log in and plug that in.

In the interim, a good portal is not going to be ready until December/January timeframe. In the interim, there's a form that you fill out. It's been posted; you submit that through the CSD. We review it really quickly just make sure the dates are compliant with the requirements, make sure that you've attached the proper policies and SDRP, and then we would write back to you and confirm your dates.

The one thing that we ask is that you just give us a little bit of a timeframe in there to that so you have the option of picking a specific date. You can put a couple of preferred dates in there and/or you can select first available. So if we process it, you know, really quick and you get - you want the first available date or somebody who's targeted a specific point in time like Dot Christmas might want December 25th or something along those lines.

So there's quite a few options. I would encourage you to go review what we've posted and then as you have questions just let us know.

Sara Falvey: Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: So just a very quick follow-up on that Krista. Can you give us any guidance as to how long - you just said give us time from submission to a reasonable date to pick if we weren't going to say as fast as possible. Like what should we expect for that?

Krista Papac: Yes, there's actually a timeframe I think in what we posted. I can't remember if it's five or seven days - seven days. We ask for seven days.

So I like to use the example that if it's the first of the month, you know, pick the 8th or pick first available or you can pick the 8th and first available. So it explains what sort of the options are in there.

I was going to make a wise crack but I refrained; I just want you to know.

Sara Falvey: Does anybody else have any questions? Okay. Thanks Jeff for doing (unintelligible).

Next, we have Alex who's going to go over some of the security issues and specifically what's going on with the main name collisions.

Alex Stamos: Thank you - Alex Stamos. So I think as everybody knows, we're in a time during which ICANN Staff is still formulating all the details of the response to the SSR issue. Personally I feel, and it seems that most of the folks who are working on this issue on behalf of the NTAG are reasonably happy with where we are.

What we have this alternate path to delegation right now which I think we all consider a little bit of a joke, but a joke that lasts a short period of time. So that's not a horrible thing.

You know, we could - we had discussed writing a letter and complaining about it. But honestly at this point, it seems that the best path is through the tunnel, not trying to turn things around. The JAS Report is due in January, and the timeline apparently is for that report to be turned into a more detailed plan by March after a public comment period.

So I met with Jeff yesterday, a number of NTAG members have met with Jeff. He has been extremely open about, you know, doing this in a transparent manner and taking everybody's feedback.

So if you want to help make sure that report comes out in the same manner, I would strongly suggest scheduling some time with JAS to talk to them, send them whatever data you have. There's still an opportunity to join OR and get on the collisions list, so there's a lot of technical discussion going on in the collisions list. And JAS has promised to keep a lot of the technical discussion on that list.

We also - one of the questions I asked, he promised to publish the source code, to continue to publish the source code, what they're doing, right, because in the source code is truth. We've also asked ICANN to do the same with the eventual code that's used to generate the final assumed SLD block lists.

So you know, hopefully I think right now the job of the NTAG should be to facilitate JAS's work, and then to comment during that comment period. Hopefully everything looks good and we'll ask them just to implement as quickly as possible.

There was one interesting thing that we had discussed before that I have discussed with Cyrus, and he can correct me if I paraphrase him wrong. We had an open question about registries launching out that now have an alternate path to delegation as block lists. As much of us know, most of the major brands in the world are on the block list somewhere. I've got (MacAfee) misspelled three ways on mine.

And so the question is if you go into Sunrise now, what do you do? And apparently the answer is you can allocate names per the Sunrise period even if they are on the SLD block list, but they go into a half state where they don't get turned on in the DNS. So operate your Sunrise as expected, but don't give those out; just make sure they're allocated so you don't have to do another Sunrise again or some other kind of complicated thing when the SLD block list window closes in March.

Sara Falvey: Yesterday during the RYSG, I know there was a lot of JAS presented and I'm not sure if everybody was there. And there was a lot of questions of what the purpose of the JAS was for, what it was going to solve. Do you mind just going into that a little bit just for those who weren't there?

Alex Stamos: Yes, so the metaphor I used, and we had a meeting just about SSR issues. The metaphor I use is that we keep them playing tennis here, right, so the SX said, "We think there's a problem, the Board should do something." They hit the ball to the Board.

And then the Board said, "Okay, we need an independent consultant." So they hit the board (in our isle). (In our isle) said, "Oh, there might be a

problem here but we don't want to make any decisions." So they hit the ball back to the Board.

The Board hit it to the public and said, "Please give us public comment." And so us and lots of other people gave I think very reasonable mitigation plans. And the theory at that point was the Board would pick one and move forward. The Board didn't, they said, "Oh yes, this looks like a problem. We're going to send it to another consultant."

So I asked Jeff if his intention is to hit the ball back to the Board with like, "Hey, we think there's a problem. You should do something about it. Where's our check please?" And Jeff very specifically said that he sees this to the end of the process.

JAS is doing a lot of quantitative risk analysis of all the different risks to come out of SSR. He's comparing them to existing risk which I think is a fantastic thing and something we discussed at our two TLD security forums because I think many of us feel that beyond a handful of TLDs, the actual quantifiable risk from delegation is ridiculously low compared to the risk you just connecting up to the Internet as a small business especially.

And so he's going to be doing some measurement against other risks that these small businesses have, he's going to be working with small businesses, especially to figure out what delegation - what fixing the problem looks like as well as large ones, and then doing some testing with a subset or examples of companies that will have problems. And then specifically provide a menu - but when he says menu it's not like the in-or-out report where it's a list of things that are kind of fuzzy.

His thought at this point is that for each TLD, he will have - he will suggest one of five different mitigation packages for example. And so if it's Dot Corp and it's really bad, then there might be mitigation package one which is, you know, don't give it out for awhile. If it's Dot Toyota, it doesn't look like it's a big

deal, there might be mitigation package number 5 which is block this small number of extremely dangerous terms and then don't worry about it.

And that the goal would be that report would be either accepted or not accepted by JAS. I also just suggested to him in our breakfast yesterday that he makes sure that source code is included in his report so that we don't have a 90 day period during which English text in his report is then converted to code by ICANN staff. It would be great if he just handed over - "Here's our code, go to this get hub account. You can download it and run it against and go, you know, deterministically determine any SLD block lists." And he thinks that's a fantastic idea and he's definitely going to try that, so that should hopefully lower the timeline - shorten the timeline for us.

Sara Falvey: Thanks so much. Jeff.

Jeff Neumann: Thanks, Jeff Neumann, and thanks Alex for that update. I think, you know, I'm impressed with the way that JAS is going about doing this and how open they are, and second Alex's notion of you should join at the NSO Arc Lists if you really want up-to-date because he is being very transparent about it.

The one other topic that came up during the Registry Stakeholder Group Meeting yesterday was that, you know, even with this framework of implementation is done for each TLD, the tennis ball, if you will, is going to be hit back to the Board. The Board does need to accept it. And then it's going to be hit to Staff to implement.

And then Staff is going to have to put it into their processes, right. There's going to be invitations to come in and do whatever it is you're going to have to do. There's going to be contract language around it, there's going to be signing contracts around it; amended language. And so that could take a lot of time, especially by then, you know, hopefully many more TLDs are going to be - have signed their contracts. Many more are going to be delegated.

So the one note for ICANN Staff is please do whatever you can to make it as quick, as quick, as possible. Please don't make us like wait for an invitation from the sales force database, have to wait a week or two weeks just for the invitation, and then have to have us submit something back and then have us wait a couple weeks until someone can get back to us with contract language. And then have us wait a couple of weeks in order to get it signed. And then have us, you know, you know what I'm saying? The ball kind of rolls down.

So anything you guys could do from the implementation path, once this plan is developed, because otherwise even if a final report comes out in March, we're still not able to do anything about it until, you know, July, August, September, depending on priority numbers.

So all of that is going to be crucial, we need to watch for it. To the extent you all have any kind of insight as to the report and the way they're going, you can prepare that contract language early, get the NGPC set up to have a meeting, to have it finally approved, that would be great.

The other thing I heard from JAS which was good, and strongly encourage you to reach out to Jeff or JAS because, like I said, a number of us have met with them this week. He will continually meet with people.

It is that he's looking to see if there are ways that certain - I don't want to say he's going to whittle down those lists, right, because that's not really a fair assessment, but to the extent that there are findings where certain names that were on the list or certain categories really aren't concern - causes for concern, and that's, you know, comes out approvable in this process, then his goal would be to maybe put if through piece meal as opposed to wait till a final report for everything to come out.

So I would access ICANN Staff to open to that, to maybe brief the Board and let them know that they may get things in piece meal. So if a critique

complete hypothetical, if there's been one query to something in eight years, and you know, the report finds that that is really not a risk of collision at all, and they come out in December and say, you know, "Look, you can release these," that there's some mechanism for staff and the board to act quickly on it and whittle down whatever lists exists. Thanks.

Sara Falvey: Thanks and then Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Yes, thank you Sara, thank you Jeff.

I just wanted to highlight the fact that we're totally on board with what you're saying Jeff. You have my commitment and I'm sure you've got (Christine's) commitment, (unintelligible) commitment, the entire staff, that we're very, very sensitive to the timing and timed line that it takes for us to execute and deliver the services that we deliver to you.

So to the extent that we can, we will be doing things in parallel so that they're not keyed up one after another to add more time to what it needs to be. To the extent that we can preplan things so that when pieces are ready to go, NGPC can meet and get it done.

You have a bunch of, I think, people who are very dedicated to the program. They're very sensitive to the fact that every day that we actually push things out from the date that we committed to, impacts your business. We're very committed to that.

On the flipside of it, I'll ask you for your patience because the program of this magnitude has many moving parts. And a lot of these parts are coming together as we roll these out. So have some patience with us.

We're going to hit some speed bumps along the way, and for that, you know, we apologize in advance. But if it happens, have patience with us, talk to us. Don't start yelling and screaming at us, we're very sensitive to it. We really

are working hard, we really are sensitive to what your needs are and we're committed to deliver as fast and as best as we can.

Just to echo basically what you say. We're on board with it 100%

Sara Falvey: Jim.

Jim Prendergast: They were talking? No, okay, there we go. Jim Prendergast, the Galway Strategy Group.

I don't know who to address this question to, maybe it's everybody sitting around the table. But from an operational standpoint, what the block was, do you run Sunrises on them and just not allocate it? Do you reserve them from Sunrise and then do you have to do another Sunrise? I'm not quite sure how that whole process is going to work with the block list, so I'll throw that out there if people have ideas on that.

Because I know that I've heard questions from the IP Constituency regarding having to run these names through Sunrise again. And I don't think that's a position anybody wants to be in.

Woman: So thanks Jim. I think that this issue is - we've heard it a lot this week. We've put some information out there.

We're working on more documentation to clarify. Our intention is to help a single Sunrise, so we understand we need to clarify for everyone just how the allocation of the block lists overlap.

Jim Prendergast: Okay great, thanks.

Sara Falvey: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, this is Jeff Neuman again. And on that, I mean to the extent that it is a recommendation that you can allocate these names in Sunrise, but not have them entered into the TLDs.

While it sounds like a simple solution, it's a customer support nightmare, right, and especially registries and registrars' nightmare to have to tell your customer, right, that we're going to sell you these registrations, and you're going to have to pay the regular price for these Sunrise registrations. We may or may be able to delegate that name to you at some point in the future, but we may never be.

And you can imagine the customers that are going to say, "Well, if you don't delegate it ever, even if you allocate it to me, then you owe me some money back." And there's refund issues and whole set of other issues that stem from it.

So it's not as easy as saying, "Well you know, just do it in your regular Sunrise because it is a customer support nightmare." I'd ask you to consider that.

I'm not advocating to Sunrises at all, but you know, whatever we do, just recognize that everything kind of flows down from there.

Sara Falvey: Okay, I think we're done with this one. Thanks everybody.

Next we've got actions and I thought I saw Brian just walk in. Brian? Is there a spot to use a table? Great.

So Brian's going to talk about where we are with auctions.

Brian Beckham: Thank you and sorry for running in late. My computer is pulling up my notes on the auctions.

I think there were a lot of questions raised in a letter that we wrote and then during the webinar, a lot of which have been answered and there are a few outstanding questions. One that comes to mind is regarding the batching or the kind of auction events.

But I think probably in terms of what it means for the NTAG, there's a question about what the NTAG wants to do to take forward the remaining unanswered questions whether that's writing a letter or engaging in some sort of dialogue with ICANN.

I think John made a good suggestion about whether there's any interest in asking for some sort of community dialogue. So I think, as far as I can see, that's sort of where it stands for the ICANN, so maybe it's - I'll just throw it up for people to think about the suggestions from John is a good one or whether there are other ideas without trying to get the remaining unanswered questions resolved.

Sara Falvey: So I'll just give an update in terms of, in case folks haven't been paying attention to this. The NTAG put together a group list of questions which a lot of people contributed to and we sent it to ICANN. And they answered, I think, the majority of them I would say, but there's sort of two parts.

One is that we have questions that haven't been answered. And the second part is we have a set of questions that we don't feel like we're maybe adequately answered or we didn't get enough detail.

And so what Brian and I did is we went back through and we sort of answered the questions as best as we could if we were sort of ICANN giving the information. And we sent it back out to the group. And so where we are right now is, you know, that's sort of the questions that we've asked, I think we've gotten more questions now. And I think there's also this community dialogue that's going on at the same time.

So we initially talked about the sort of issues that we had is we could send a letter, we could send a revised set of questions back to ICANN to see if they would answer those. We could engage with (Ross) who seems to be very open at ICANN and seems to be very open. He's not here I don't believe. Oh, there you are.

With (Ross) who is over here on my left. You seem to be at the time very open to sort of having a dialogue. And we could do it along the lines of the PDT, or we could do the sort of community process.

I think that's sort of what we're trying to figure out right now in terms of, you know, what people who really care about auctions kind of where on the spectrum do you fall?

Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: So one - there's one topic at least which is the size of sort of batches of auction contention sets that go into what, I think, ICANN's calling auction events. I think what actually probably would be really helpful for us as a community to come to some sort of view upon rather than everyone pitching their guestimate as to what they could deal with at any given amount of time.

There's a tradeoff between resolving the auctions as quickly as possible I think. I don't know. How many constituencies are you guys in (Jen)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jordyn Buchanan: One hundred fifty? All right, so those are 150 contention sets. ICANN's currently proposing that they do no more than 5 contention sets per applicant per month. You can do the math on that. That's almost - that's 2-1/2 years of auctions gated on donuts so it's probably not a great outcome for those people who would be in the later set of those contention sets.

On the other hand, probably, I imagine donuts doesn't want to be in 150 auctions all at the same time. And so we need to figure out the right balance there, and it's probably easier for us to try to talk about that as an applicant community and figure out if there's answer that we can all agree upon and propose that to ICANN than everyone just proposing random numbers and having ICANN accept or not accept those.

So I'd certainly say that's at least one area in which an NTAG position would probably be pretty helpful.

Sara Falvey: Okay.

Ken Stubbs: Those of you who have taken a close look at the contention sets and the proposed schedules, how this could be laid out, realize that there a quite a few issues.

First of all, ICANN is going to have to determine before the auction what constitutes an applicant? I use donuts as an example and that is does ICANN use constructive ownership in determining whether or not an applicant is a single applicant or multiple applicants?

Number two, donuts - and please correct me if I'm wrong here John. Donuts has like 150 contention sets. If you place them in a process that has a limitation on the number of contention sets per applicant, if they're defined that way, by the time you get through a significant number of auctions, donuts is the only company that has contention sets.

There may very well be a way around this, hypothetically either ICANN or donuts or something could develop a process or an applicant could agree to waive their status as either a multiple applicant, etcetera, that's something that could be discussed. In other words, if an applicant is anxious to move forward and get resolution on this, decides he doesn't want to wait a year-

and-a-half or something like that, they could sign a waiver allowing them to participate at the same set of subs.

I think from a practical standpoint is not only the number of contention sets, but rather the way applicants either ICANN arbitrarily elects to treat them based on legal interpretation, or number two, how the applicant - the desire the applicant has with respect to that.

I'm always looking at a situation where I'd like to avoid any gaming and this predictability is absolutely the most bored thing. I think most people I talk to say very similar. "I want to know when I'm going to auction. I want to know once it goes to auction, what am I getting?" So those are the questions about string collisions and so forth.

But I think that's how you're going to end up arriving at a real productive discussion on timing and size of the sets. Thank you.

Sara Falvey: So just a reminder to say your name when you introduce yourself just so you can get on our transcript.

Ken Stubbs: I'm sorry.

Sara Falvey: Just state who you are and just introduce yourself again.

Ken Stubbs: My name is Ken Stubbs and I'm Director of Afilias.

Sara Falvey: Yes, Kristine is going to respond.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you Ken. The - I know auctions are a high interest topic, although with all of the other activity this week, maybe didn't get quite as much attention at the auction session.

What we shared at the auction session a couple of days ago is that of course the application and the applicant, the applying entity, are what is talked about in the Guide Book as the entity going through auction. However, we also have introduced a bidder's agreement, so each applicant and applying entity will identify a bidder, another entity that will be doing the bidding participating in the auction for them.

So the concept of a limit is by bidder or bidding entity, so that's where our proposed limitation, our suggestion that we would not force an applicant or a bidder to participate in more than five auctions simultaneously. Because we understand and we've heard feedback on one hand, "Yes, we want to move very quickly even though we may have many applications in contention."

On the other hand, some smaller applicants are sensitive to being forced into many, many auctions all at once. So we're trying to balance and make as level a playing as we can for everyone while honoring the steady progress of the program.

So that conceived limit of five participating, five simultaneous auctions, can be waived. So if the applying to entity to this to participate to say, "You know, I wave my limit of five, I'll participate in 10 or 20 or 50 auctions simultaneously," that would really give up some freedom and leeway in scheduling those auctions.

We've also talked about starting with ten individual auctions per auction event, 10 to 20 growing starting with one auction event per month. But given the cycle time of escrow agreements and submitting deposits and getting your deposit refund, we're looking at about a two week cycle time. So we could conceivably go to two auction events per month, but we're also sensitive to the constant turn on that as well.

So we're trying to balance a variety of interests. And I hope - we have multiple forth for feedback right now. We're considering whether to go to

public comment with auction rules because we're not getting as much feedback as we're looking for. So in additions to questions, I would suggest if there is specific feedback in one direction or another, that's something we would be very open to.

Sara Falvey: Go ahead Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, Ken Stubbs again responding. I'm pleased to see that you've adopted a philosophy that's a little bit different from most banks where the philosophy very simple is, "We're your banker, we know what's best for you." People who are operating with different business models, the opportunity to opt in or opt out is extremely important for various entities, and they need to look at their business plan and what they're planning on doing.

At the same point in time, I think it's extremely important to look at the practicalities in terms of the timing between the various auctions because you are dealing with entities that are located all over the world. And as hard as you may envision this, trying to move money from countries like India to someplace else and going through the banking sectors can be difficult; everybody is not got themselves in countries where that is the easiest process to do.

So the one thing that - the variable that I am most comfortable with and we've discussed it in our company is the changing of the number of sets. The variable we're probably least comfortable is the timing between the auctions because we do not want to create an environment where ICANN ends up getting criticized for catering to a specific set of applicants.

So I think you have to kind of - it's like name stringing an education. You can't necessarily work to the lowest common denominator; you have to find a practical denominator.

But I'm pleased that you're listening. I'm somewhat disappointed that there are applicants in the room here who haven't at least shot (Russ) an email or put their positions on the table because I don't want to get all the way down to the end and do a comment period and have somebody hollering sour grapes about a process that they could have put input into weeks ago to help make it more constructive for him. Thanks.

Sara Falvey: Okay, I think we should wrap this up. Does anybody else have any questions that hasn't spoken yet? Okay, I'm going to propose this up. Go ahead.

(Rubins Kelochbear): (Rubins Kelochbear), we are involved with zero contention sets.

Sara Falvey: You don't get to speak right now then.

(Rubins Kelochbear): So I'm at least making this comment which I don't see how applicants could evaluate their position on the auctions before the final mitigation plan on the collision (unintelligible) for that string.

So quickly, only the automated path of today regulation - the requirement for the auctions. I think it would make more sense to make the final initiation plan a requirement for the auction. That's my comment.

Sara Falvey: Okay, great. Now I'll go with my proposal.

Brian, if you'd stop talking. Brian, if you'd be willing to - I think you've been the one who's closest to this. And I'm actually, I'm happy to help as I did with the last one.

But I think we should try to get together some sort of NTAG consensus sought and ship it over to (Russ). Would you mind sort of coordinating that at least as an initial step?

Brian Beckham: Yes, I'll happily send my thoughts over to the list and we can put something together.

Sara Falvey: And we can start being pulled together as smaller working group like we do with everything else. So feel free to email me if you want to be on the working group or just respond to Brian's email when he sends out some initial thoughts and we'll get a list sort of going. And then we'll try to produce something for the broader group shortly. Thanks everybody.

Okay, so now we're going - I just saw Philip. Where did he go? There you are. Do you mind talking about sort of brand contact negotiations and other stuff that you're working on? Thanks.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you very much. So it's Philip Sheppard, Director General of the Brand Registry Group; next slide please.

Just a couple of things I'll take you through just to update you on where we are in terms of the state of play. I thought it would be worth while talking about future relationships between different groups both existing and the future, then if you would, indeed on the Registry Agreement and also a related issue we're discussing the GAC, the Country Code thoughts track process. Next slide please.

So as you know, Brands are about one-third of all applications and their common vision is unique plans surrounding registries in furtherance. Typically in an existing business purpose, so that's something different to offering registry services to the generally public, in other words, not intending to complete a cell at the second level of the layer. Next slide please.

So we decided some time ago to form ourselves into initially a trade association which have now done. It's a not-for-profit registered by Royal Decree in Belgium under their regime there. That happened sometime back, and now we're looking at how we relate to integrating ourselves within

ICANN. Because as is fixation, we will do stuff that is mostly to do with ICANN but not exclusively to do with ICANN.

And this was on while I was looking at some of our newer members, I decided to toss up the annual turnover or net sales of them, and we have so far reached companies with a worth of $873 billion U.S. which I think puts VeriSign in perspective. Next slide please.

That's our estimated members to date. The list of companies, some of whom have been familiar with ICANN over the years are increasing, of course. We're getting companies who are new to this whole world and we're trying to integrate them as best as possible to understand what of everything that ICANN does is going to be relevant for them. And a number of those companies, we also have representation by proxy or an agent for them sometimes for language or sometimes simply for just facilitation purposes to make it easier for them to understand what's going on. Next slide, next slide please.

So future relationships; we started a conversation with the Registry Stakeholder Group back in Durbin just trying to understand how we may relate to the Registry Stakeholder Group. And that led to what's been a very useful discussion which is an evolution working group set up within the Registry Stakeholder Group. They asked me to Chair that group ordered back to the Registry Stakeholder Group. Some of you have been there, that was yesterday when I did that.

And essentially, we have got to the stage of after five or six meetings, we produced a draft report floating ideas, some of which were to do with simple expanding the charter changes that will be necessary in the Registry Stakeholder Group as a function of them simply being a bigger group in the future.

And then the second set of recommendations are considerations about what to do because they're going to have different types of Registries joining, and that was looking at questions like if the concept of interest groups like yourself currently within the structure of the Registry Stakeholder Group, but also trying to help without making a judgment, yet trying to suggest what the options are of the future such as the constituency model.

And also one idea that came out of the group was possibly the concept of an interim option whereby a group rather than individually registries, so group of registries, to perhaps join initially as sort of observer status or low fee while the much more interesting topic of how we work, our voting rights and balances takes place. Because we recognize that they will likely stay longer, so that may be a way of just getting some quicker participation why some of the formulary issues are discussed. Next slide.

So as past and future registries and sort of groups of the size ourselves as the Brand Registry Group, of course there is also the GO Registries Group now which is self formed. We're having dialogue with other groups such as the domain name association where as part of the London Conference a couple of months ago, we had a discussion there outlining our agreement to incorporate and avoid duplication in terms of what we did f course as your cells and how we look at the relationship there.

And it's interest just this week, we had sort of an Ad Hoc Meeting where there were a number of other groups who were asking questions about what we in the working group in the Registry Stakeholder Group is about. And we realized in fact there was a set of needs there for some smaller registries to want to get together, not just as new registries, but even to get together in some sort of grouping with some of the existing smaller registries.

So I think the whole dynamics of how we're all changing and integrating and wanting to best satisfy the common interests is a whole interesting dynamic. And the next slide.

So moving on almost to brand customized registry agreement. It's probably worth emphasizing what we've been trying to achieve is an addendum to the contracts. We're on a new contract. And we're almost, almost there.

And I see Cyrus in the room, so he's nodding towards me. We manage to receive text for the new Specifications 13, that in essence it defines what we mean by a Dot Brand which is a key criteria in order to have something different. And essentially, all we've done is within that, is if you're a dot brand then certain parts of the existing RA will not apply.

And the ones that will not apply without getting into specific detail are really those that were to do with registry protection because of course we have no need for registrant protection as there will be no registrants in the Dot Brand.

And we're also looking at questions of failure protection of course because there will be no victims of failure. If the Dot Brand goes down, the least problem is the Dot Brand. It will be the underlying company that will be going down.

So with those differences there, and as I say the key of that was defining who we were first. And once we finished just dotting the Is and Ts and discussing the ands and the ors of Spec 13, that will be made available. And the next slide please.

So linked in with that, and again, based on the fact that we have defined ourselves, we have made a suggestion to the GAC, and I'll be talking to the GAC about that later this morning.

That if you are a registry who has a Spec 13 criteria or you've hit the criteria Spec 13 as a Dot Brand, then we have suggested the process to the GAC for the release of Country Code or country names to Dot Brands. It will be fast

track in as much as there would be an indication that the answer would be yes.

So we're saying that if there's an objection, we're going to the normal discussion as to why and try to resolve the objection. But it will be 180 day period, and after which if there's no reply, then the default would be that you could go ahead with the request for the release of those names.

And if GAC is happy with that, then our understanding is that we will then get back to talking with ICANN just to implement that process. So that was a link to quest to the initial ability to be able to define what we mean by a Dot Brand.

And I think - if we could have the next slide - that was it.

Sara Falvey: Thanks so much. So the reason why we asked Philip to come in was to make sure that folks in this group who might not be Dot Brands or who are and are not working with his group are aware of the specific contract negotiations that they're engaged in. there's also a session in the GAC later today that will deal with Sunrise and two letter country code issues specifically for Dot Brands if folks are interested to see how that plays out.

Does anybody have any questions? Alex.

Alex Stamos: Alex Stamos. Commonly question. Common is our new officer should make it a goal for us to get reorganized under a real decree I believe for the NTAG.

The question which is perhaps for Staff, what is the bit that has to be flipped in the application system that allows a company to sign a Dot Brand application? Yesterday, there was a question from the GAC to the NGPC about whether or not the category to close generic protections were going to be expanded.

And the answer from (Sherry), to paraphrase it again, was that the contract has protections to make registries open and that will be applied to every single applicant. He didn't say anything about Dot Brands. Clearly they're not going to be applied to Dot Brands. There has to be some determination by Staff somewhere in the contracting process that these people are Dot Brand and these people are Closed Generic.

Do you guys have any clarification of where that happens?

Philip Sheppard: Yes, I'm not sure how much I can answer - I can answer that. And what we've done is spent some considerably legal effort to make a definition that we think is robust as to what we mean by Dot Brand. And that makes it pretty clear I think what we are.

I presume essentially it's in the question of those organizations saying, "Yes I am, that checks with my - what we said in our application." And we specified that and therefore Spec 13 would apply. But Cyrus might have another comment to the process of that.

Sara Falvey: Go ahead there.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you. I don't think I have much more to say about that. There's actually a certain set of criteria that's defined by which an applicant decides whether they actually qualified to be categorized as a Dot Brand, and then they submit that to ICANN and then we'll review it. And if they pass that gate, so to speak, then they actually become eligible to essentially sign a Spec 13 as an addendum to the contract.

So hopefully that answers your question. We'll be hosting, by the way, once we finalize our discussions with the BRG, the Specification 13 for public comment and review of course.

Alex Stamos: Right, it would be great if we could see that and also if there's transparency in that process because saying that I get opt out of stuff that nobody else gets to opt out and I get to do the self-certified, seems incompatible with the other kind of hoops we all have to jump through. It might as well be as inconvenient as the rest of the process.

Cyrus Namazi: Absolutely.

Alex Stamos: Great, thank you.

Sara Falvey: Anybody else? Thank you so much. All right, next we've got Craig and he's going to talk about what's been going on with the CPE, Community Priority Evaluation.

Craig Schwartz: Thanks Sara. Craig Schwartz, fTLD Registry Services.

Actually I don't think there's much to say about CPE at this point anymore given two evaluations are underway and two other applicants said they'd invited. I'm not sure there's a particular reason to continue to keep CPE on the NTAG agenda, but if during the course of the discussion of any other business, we might want to raise something we can do it then.

I will note that during Kristine's new gTLD updates session the other day, a couple of applicants asked questions about who makes the final decision on a CPE evaluation. And I think what I heard Kristine say and maybe Dan Halloran chimed in on this as well. That if you have a question about that that you should submit it to the customer service portal and ICANN can then take, you know, the right amount of time and diligence to give you an answer.

Other than that, I don't think there's much more to say on CPE now.

Sara Falvey: Thank you. I think we just kept it on - there was an update and I wasn't sure if that was going to be a big change or anything like that, so we can move on.

Yasmin is going to talk about delegation and post-delegation issues. Where did she go? There she is (unintelligible). I don't know, my eyes are bad.

Do we have her presentation loaded up? Yasmin, do you mind just maybe starting while we get work to get your presentation up? Maybe just do the intro stuff.

Yasmin Omer: Hi guys, thanks Sara. I'm the Yasmin Omer, I'm the General Manager of DotShabaka Registry and we thought we would provide you with insights regarding the delegation and post-delegation processes having recently completed these processes and (unintelligible) and ice period. And the slides are up.

All right, thanks. So there's our agenda. I'll start off by emphasizing that the insights, the description of the processes and the insights that are being provided this morning are based on our individual experiences throughout the delegation and post-delegation processes. The processes may have changed and in some cases we know for a fact that they have and that's a good thing.

We've provided feedback throughout the process and it's really good to see that ICANN has been receptive of that feedback. So yes, so there's been some good back-and-forth there. So hopefully this will be helpful to you guys. Next slide, thanks.

I'll start off with CNCH integration testing services. Obviously, their testing of the registry operator's ability to conduct these as necessary to implement these Sunrise and claim services in so far as those steps are related to the interaction of the Trademark Clearinghouse.

We had to request the TNDB registration token from ICANN. We then conducted the steps necessary to pass integration testing. We had to pause for a little because the claim functionality wasn't up until the 9th of

September. Once that was up and running, we passed - well, we conducted the test and submitted the certification request to IBM.

No, this wasn't for the service request that's mentioned in the documentation. That's where the portal wasn't really working at that point in time, so it simply sending an email to IBM, and they're responsive to demonstrate our successful completion as the test. And that's one of the elements of the TLD startup information that you need to provide to commence the Sunrise. And I'll touch on that a little more later on.

So except for the TNDB integration process, review the terms and conditions now; they're up, they're public. So mitigate - well, to minimize any delays later on, some in-house legal reviewing it. So don't wait until you get the registration token.

Determine who will be accepting the terms and conditions, so whether it's the registry operator or the RSP, the process is such that you can set your account up, accept the change and conditions and then provide the credentials to your registry services provider if that's something you with to do.

And if possible, obtain registrar access to the TNDB. We were able to do so. Well it didn't really provide us with any advantage over other registry operators. It - well it allowed us to gain a complete understanding of the system, and that was really beneficial because we were able to report thoughts to IBM, and they listened back and forth there. And that was particularly important because it was, well, during the early stages and really helped us - well, us and IBM.

And finally, with respect to (TNT) integration testing, be proactive. Familiarize yourself intimately with the process where you know all the documentation that's out there. Don't expect the process to start - yes, know the details, know the process and start it yourself. Next slide, thanks.

And that's just a screenshot of the TNDB registration page and in there are the (unintelligible) conditions. Okay, next slide.

So next up we have the Contact (unintelligible) Services, it's basically a spreadsheet from ICANN which (Krystal) will provide more information on that. But asking for contacts like, you know, the RSP, legal contact, media contacts, URS contacts, abuse contacts. Well, once again (Krystal) will touch on this later on, but the primary, secondary and the emergency contacts has to be real persons.

So tip here, define your roles and responsibility with your registry services provider now to avoid any back-and-forth later on which will cause delays. And define responsibilities internally now as well, so who's going to be handling the (unintelligible), who's going to be handling abuse, etcetera.

Registry On-Boarding Information Requests. So this is a document that has a request. It's basically a request for technical information; it should most likely be filled out by your registry services provider. It's information regarding the provision of (unintelligible) access, both in registration data access, data escrow, and a couple of other things there.

To ensure that your registry services provider is ready to provide this information now to avoid any details later on, and be prepared to clarify or respond to further questions and to expect some back-and-forth there. Next slide please, thanks.

So then we have the IN Delegation process. Once again, (unintelligible) this was the process that we followed. It may have changed.

So we first received notification of eligibility, so the ultimate path to delegation and the report which contained all the second level domains we needed to block. There was then a request from ICANN to the delegation point of

contact, the delegation token was then sent through the customer service portal. The delegation pin was then sent to the delegation point of contact. You then need to take the token and the pin and into the root server management system to initiate the process.

The following information was entered so the manager which is basically the registry operator contact. The administrative and technical contact so these are the contacts that are required to process any requests through the IANA process, so only change to the root so on an ongoing basis.

Name server information needs to be entered and certainly registration information including the location of the Whois server.

So tips for the IANA delegation process, ensure that the delegation point of contact and the primary contact coordinate with each other. Obviously they have two pieces of information that need to be entered into the Root Zone Management System.

So the other issue we encountered was that sort of Whois according to the Registry Agreement needs to be located at Whois dot (Nick) dot TLD. In order to proceed through the Root Zone Management System - well for us at least - access to the Whois service verified, so you need to enter that address and it checks in order to move forward. This was problematic for us obviously because the TLDs yet to be delegated and so it (Nick) Dot TLD doesn't exist.

We overcame this issue by hosting the Whois server, another location to (parelley) and then went back and updated the information through the Root Zone Management System. The Root Zone Management System is otherwise efficient, it's up to date and pretty user friendly. It provided us with real time status updates regarding - sorry, during the delegation process so I provided some examples up there pending (unintelligible) publication. So it's some status updates. Thank you.

Okay, to TLD status information. We submitted the request to ICANN for the Sunrise dates - sorry. We submitted the request to IBM for the Sunrise dates prior to submitting the TLD status information to ICANN, and that was in accordance with the RPM requirements document.

Some time was taken by ICANN to review the TLD startup information, and as a result, the Sunrise dates that had been approved by IBM had since expired. The process - this is an example of the update to the process, so thankfully the process has been updated to address this issue. So now you need to submit the startup information to ICANN and ICANN coordinates with IBM to get those dates accepted.

(Unintelligible), so this is with respect to the elements of your TLD startup information. The RPM requirements document says that you need to provide your Sunrise policies and your SDRP, your Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy. We needed to provide the eligibility policy, and that's - yes, so provide the eligibility policy along with your launch policy and your Sunrise Dispute Resolution Policy because this we were told that we needed to provide this because that will help ICANN ascertain whether or not there are any Sunrise only restrictions in the TLD.

So now the tip is remember to legal review, so ensure - at least it was for us. Ensure that the policies clearly demonstrate compliance with the RPM requirements document; use diagrams. Consider having a cover sheet with all the requirements in the RPM requirements document and making reference specifically in your policies to how it shows those requirements. And obviously, the clearer you make it, the less time it will take and you can cite your Sunrise period. Next slide please.

Okay, so first delegation. We requested registration of IDN tables with the IANA (unintelligible) of IDN practices. That's obviously an IDN gTLD only requirement. So those IDN tables are up now.

We have been accepting requests to (unintelligible) access through the Centralized Zone Data service. And we submitted our first monthly report through the registry reporting interface. And last slide, slide.

Great, and there's a quick timeline of the tips and dates of the steps that we went through. So the first chunk - well, we - yes, executed our registry agreement on the 13th of July. Then needed to go through certain steps to typically create pre-delegation testing, finally received the notification of successful passing on the 26th.

The transition to INS delegation process was initiated on the 19th of October. And we will conclude our Sunrise period on the 31st of October - sorry, December. Thanks Adrian. And that's it.

Sara Falvey: Thank you so much. Adrian, good, introduce yourself.

Adrian Kinderis: My name is Adrian Kinderis, I am the IR Registry Services or (unintelligible) or something, I'm not sure. Quite a job Yasmin, one of the best in the field.

Just wanted to make a comment here that clearly, this was somewhat of a unique process for us, and I think ICANN agrees. You know, we worked - sort of had an understanding with ICANN to two things.

Number one was a hot pressure situation for us at DotShabaka because we wanted to be first. And I think we put a fair amount of pressure back on ICANN to make sure that that was true. So it was unique in that way.

And because of that, I think we were breaking, you know, sort of cutting through the jungle with a machete, you know, through this whole thing, we saw ICANN.

So while this is fantastic, obviously it's for us to share our experience. I know you said it a number of times during the presentation, but it's important to note that this was our experience.

What would be great perhaps is for ICANN to take a good look at this deck and to sort of say how much this has changed or if there's a new document that's been put out there. Because a couple of times through the process, we weren't - and as I say - given those two waivers that I started with, we weren't sure exactly where we were and what was coming next. And the pressure took a situation of wanting to be first and wanting to move quickly, which I agree not everyone will want to be in, it was a little bit disconcerting.

So it may be helpful for everybody else in the room, and Yasmin, I appreciate the time you've taken to put the slides together here and hope everyone gets benefit from it, and certainly we'll make them available to anybody that wants them. The only benefit for us here was to share this information with you all.

But if ICANN can somewhat respond to this and maybe say, "Hey yes, that was your experience but we've adjusted that now." Because people are taking note of this. And John, you're probably in the same boat mate. Then we don't want them to necessarily say this is gospel because we realize there's been of a delta since then. So I think that's helpful.

Sara Falvey: Jordyn - I know Jordyn. Anybody else?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, so a related point. I do think that would be super helpful, Adrian, for ICANN to do that.

I think in the meantime, I've been talking with a few folks, Yasmin and Andrew and a few other folks about just some self-help that we as applicants can probably do in the meantime. I think I ran this by some folks at ICANN and they agreed they wouldn't be offended if we started posting like forms that we had received and so onto something like ICANN Wiki so that people

can see what to expect, and you know, tie the extensive details that Yasmin has outlined here with people's evolving experiences and so on. We can just go in and edit it and so everyone can say what their experience is as they go through.

So I don't know. We'd be glad to do some of that with our experiences, (Donuts) and others would too. That would probably be super helpful for folks coming behind.

Sara Falvey: I think that would be great. Does anybody else want to - Krista.

Krista Papac: Thanks Sara. Krista Papac, ICANN staff.

So I think Yasmin actually eluded to this a couple of times in the deck. There are a number of things and process improvements that have already been implemented. I also expect there will probably be more along the way. Actually, I know there are more that are coming from both an automation perspective for improved automation, you know, scaling, recognizing efficiencies, things like that.

So I'm happy to - I don't think now is a good time because I know you guys have a tight agenda, but I'm happy to - some of it we talk about in the On Boarding and then Contracting session later today. It's not going to be specific to what you just talked about, but I'm happy to - in your next call or set up a separate call to kind of talk through these efficiencies we've recognize the changes we've made so far.

To Jordyn's point, I've also been thinking about this throughout the week and in this session in particular today. And a lot of these documents, the contact information request, the on boarding information request, there's probably a way we can post those so people - like we did with the CIRs so you can prepare in advance for those. They're not secret documents; they're things everybody is going to need.

I have to think about the on boarding information request because there's some key information in there, but credential information. So let me think about that but there's probably some stuff we can do to enable you guys to prepare in advance as well.

And then on TLD startup information, we actually posted stuff this week that is both the process as well as the form that you submit until the automation is in place.

But I appreciate the feedback, and you know, continue to talk with us. And then just let me know Sara, what you guys want to do as far as if you really want to address these items point by point. We can schedule something outside of this meeting. Thanks.

Sara Falvey: Yes, so if folks our interested, feel free to send an email; we can start a thread. I also think it's important to start getting information on the Wiki and maybe we can work with Ray and start putting some of the information out to these sent out if people would be willing to.

I know from just going it through it for us, it was - it's not like it's just a taxing experience and you don't always anticipate what they're going to be asking at what stage. And I think just being able to be prepared for that will increase sort of the speed at which you can run through them. So we can start something like that online.

Anybody else before we move on? Okay, thank you so much, thank you so much Yasmin.

Adrian, do you want to talk about DNA?

Adrian Kinderis: Wearing a different hat now, thanks Sara. My name is Adrian - goodness me, I'm a different Adrian this time. I'll take two there. My name is Adrian Kinderis.

I am the CEO of our Registry Services and currently the Chair of the Interim Board of the Domain Name Association.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today - NTAG is. I don't want to take up too much of your time other than to give a quick, very brief update of where the Domain Name Association is at just for your information, and to highlight the fact that we're having an information session later today. I may take the time to do that right now.

At three o'clock today, we are having a session for a couple of hours. We are expecting it to be well attended whereby we'll go through in-depth what the Domain Name Association is about, introduce our board, our executive director Kurt Pritz will be speaking as well.

And that's at the (LVR Heart Hotel), and apparently it's just a ten minute walk, five minute if you run. And so we'd love to see you all over there if you want to get some more information about the Domain Name Association.

So briefly, and I've had a little bit of an appetizer. The Domain Name Association itself has been set up to represent the interests of the industry. And we don't think it's been done before, certainly not successfully in my 14 years of coming to these meetings.

We wanted to mobilize with a number of - some of the bigger industry plays initially, mobilize them and come together as a single voice. And I think the new gTLD experience of seeing how collective associations can have a voice and lobby such bodies as ICANN - if you look at people like (Inter) and so forth. You know, that have managed to put forward the interests of their members in a very succinct way, I don't think the domain name industries have ever done that.

So what we wanted to do was pull together a formal association; we've done that. We've been incorporated out of Delaware in the United States. And we

are representing the interests of all domain names. This is not about gTLDs or ccTLDs, this is about domain names as a general rule.

So very quickly, we have no formal affiliation with ICANN and I think that that's important. We at times may not necessarily be aligned with ICANN as a commercial group. We're a non-profit entity, and as I say, looking and representing the interests of the entire domain name industry.

Members itself, our group's businesses and individuals that are involved in the provision and support and style of domain names, and this includes such organizations as domain name registries, registry service providers and registrars and resellers indeed.

So that's a just a brief snippet. I have Liz Sweezey here who's also one of the Board members. I'm not sure - who else, sorry? (Staton's) here, thanks. (John Nebbitt) was here who's another member of the board.

At the moment, we've got a pretty heavy waiting towards generic, gTLDs. I was certainly pushing to get some good representation from Country Codes on - as I said, this is the interest of domain names. This is to make sure that domain names remain relevant.

We as a group, especially those in this room, have already invested significant amount of money in your domain name spaces. We certainly want to make sure that domain names remain relevant and that the industry is acting in a way that continues to promote our interests against everything else that's out there that's assisting in navigation of the Internet. So we all have an interest in making sure the domain names don't go away.

So with that in mind, I'd like to continue to hopefully peak your interest and hopefully see you over at the (LVR Heart Hotel) at three o'clock today. If you can't make the three o'clock session, at five o'clock there is an open bar for a

couple of hours. I don't know how long it will be open for. I think it's (unintelligible). No, please come over and have some drinks on us.

I should also say Kurt is in the room. Kurt, if you wouldn't mind just giving a wave. For those of you who don't know Kurt Pritz, manage to grab him which we're very excited about. He's our new Executive Director, and he'll be speaking today and giving some more information, a lot more succinctly than what I am right now about the Domain Name Association and where we're heading and what the benefits of being a member are.

So I look forward to seeing you over there today if you can make the time. Thanks very much.

Sara Falvey: Thank you so much. Okay, we're going to move right on to GAC Advise. This has been - we've had a lot of emails right on this. We wanted to make sure we had time to talk about it in person.

Stephanie's been doing a great job of turning that working group. And so I don't know if you just want to give folks an update on where we are with that.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Thanks Sara. I'm Stephanie Duchesneau with FairWinds Partners.

So what the NTAG has been doing, I'm sure all of you have seen that on October 29th, the plans for implementing the safe guard advice in Category 1 and Category 2 strings were outlined in the form of a communication between Steve Crocker and Heather Dryden.

The NTAG has taken this, and after some spirited discussion on the list, formed a working group to discuss a potential NTAG response to this correspondence. I think we came up with some general agreement around text for Category 1 which was that we supported the way that these were being implemented through the public interest specification.

But there was a lot of kind of discord around how to respond to the Category 2 safe guards, and it whether it was appropriate to send off correspondence at all if we were only able to address Category 1, whether it was problematic to suggest that there was that much divergence that we couldn't agree upon any language for Category 2.

And in the context of this meeting, what we've seen is that the NGPC as asserted that the timeline for implementing it is moving forward. They've stated that unless they get consensus advice from the GAC opposing the implementation plan, that they do plan to move forward with implementation following the Buenos Aires Meeting.

So my recommendation, and of course put this open to the group and member of the working group, is that once we see the communication coming out of this meeting, that we reconvene on the list and see if there's a potential response that we can put forward after this.

Sara Falvey: Jordyn, I think you raised your hand.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, thanks Stephanie; that sounds super helpful. I haven't been following along on the discussions, so it would be great to see the results of all your hard work over the next - well, in the near future.

It does seem like based on the observations about the progress with GAC Advice at this meeting that we're much closer at being sort of affirmatively done for everyone on the Category 1 Advice than Category 2. So it certainly seems consistent with where the overall progress of discussions here in Buenos Aires.

I guess, you're right. It makes sense to wait and see exactly what the (unintelligible) looks like. But I would certainly encourage if we have something roughly like consensus on the Category 1 Advice, and it seems like that discussion is closing down in terms of the dialogue between GAC

and the Board, that we get something as quickly as possible to the Board endorsing the approacher providing any tweaks that we might be suggesting; whatever it is you guys have worked out.

Because I think the Board has done, overall, an excellent job in transforming the Category 1 Advice into something that's implementable. And I think we want to make that clear that as applicants, we'd like to see them codify that and allow us to move forward and to just close off this discussion.

I know there's a lot of people who've been waiting a long time for the issue to be resolved. For us portfolio applicants, you know, we can bite our time with other TLDs, but I know that there's people who are basically completely stuck. And I'd like to see all sorts of applicants allowed to proceed at this point as well.

Sara Falvey: I'm shocked that more people don't want to speak on this issue. (Unintelligible) I put it at the end, you're all tired.

Okay, so I think it sounds like one person has spoken in support of - well, I think what we should do is take up Stephanie's suggestion and try to get something out on Category 1 and (save enough) Category 2. And then to the extent that we can reach agreement on Category 2, then we can send sort of an amended letter, and if we can't, then people can sort of start to send their own letters in their own capacity. I think that's the best way to move forward.

I don't know if anybody else wants to - okay. So that's what we'll do. That was super easy.

Okay, so just we have a few quick things and we'll actually probably end early unless anybody has anything else they want to bring up.

The first issue is this NTAG to RYSG transition. This is something that we've been talking about and likely been (Next ExCom). NTAG ExCom will have to deal with this.

But we're going to start kicking off thinking about making sure that the transition between the two groups goes smoothly particularly for applicants who are new to the ICANN space. And this is basically, you know, once you sign your agreement, you're an official registry and you know longer have to sit in the applicant group if you don't want to and you can become a full member.

And making sure that we're working with the RYSG so that folks who do join that group, they understand, you know, what voting is because you now have a whole new set of rights that we don't actually have.

So we're going to start putting stuff together. There's also a transition group that's going on on the RYSG that's looking at as their membership expands, how are they going to change their bylaws to make sure that voting still works, that, you know, membership is sort of included.

And so for people that are interested in that, I'm going to start working on that now and I'm happy to pass some off if anyone else, you know, loves this idea and wants to get involved, just let me know and we can start forming a little group. But this is something that we're going to work on with the next (ExCom).

Assuming no one has questions on that, we'll go to the next issue which is introduction of the new officers. This is very exciting.

So just quickly before I introduce them, there has been a little bit of confusion. I think everyone thinks that the three of us up here just die right after this meeting, that will not happen.

What we're still going - the term of our term will go until the end of December. So January 1 is the official date that the new folks will start. So we are still your (ExCom) until that point.

The reason why we wanted to have early elections this week is because - well one reason there is only three of us because we lost Tim all right. And two, because all three of us will be rolling off, we want to make sure that there's a really good amount of time for us to transition information, to do lessons learned, and to make sure that the new (ExCom) can just hit the ground running on January 1st.

So don't worry, we're not going anywhere. We're still here. I'll still be the Interim Chair until the end of December, but we have new folks who can start taking on new issues and learning how to run the NTAG.

So with that, I'll introduce them. Jacob Malthouse is with DotEco is not here; he has a new baby. So we congratulate him for that, and also running NTAG so that's exciting.

(Rubin) is right here, he'll be your new Vice-chair. (Reg) - I just saw (Reg). (Reg) will be your new Treasurer, and then Andrew who is over here will be your new Secretary. So let's give them a round of applause.

Thanks to everyone who ran and thank you guys for being willing to volunteer for this. It's a fun job.

Okay, does anybody else have - look, I said that and I totally meant it. Does anybody have anything else that they want to bring up before we adjourn eight minutes early? All right, thanks you guys. Have a great meeting.

I'll follow-up on all the action items that I've written down for myself so you'll be getting an email.

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you and we can stop the recording. Thank you.

END