RySG Meeting
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Tuesday, 23 June 2015
RY 1: Morning Session

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.

Cherie Stubbs: Good morning. My name is Cherie Stubbs and I'm the secretariat for the Registries Stakeholder Group. And to my right is Sue Schuler who is the data management assistant for the registries and we'd like to welcome you today.

A couple of housekeeping details, if you wouldn't mind. If you do speak, have a comment, would you please remember to please announce your name prior to speaking for purposes of those participating remotely as well as for the recording. And we do have a free-standing mic up on the right side of the room so if anybody in the audience has a question as we go along. And with that, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Cherie. So good morning everyone. Hola, Buenos dias. So the recording has started, is that correct? Okay, thank you. Okay so let's get started. Welcome to the Registries Stakeholder Group meeting of ICANN 53 in Buenos Aires. This is Tuesday the 23rd of June, 2015.

So what we would like to do now is just to welcome everybody and we will go through the agenda. But I thought this would be a nice opportunity to give the stakeholder group an update on our membership. We actually I think have too many new additions to be able to list and name all at the beginning of the session, which is a nice thing, a nice problem to have.

We have currently a total of 104 members of the Registries Stakeholder Group. The geographical dispersion is North America 47, Europe 40, Asia-Pac 13, Latin America and Caribbean 3, and Africa 1. So of the Registries Stakeholder Group we have 55 voting members, 8 non-voting members, and 41 observers. In the NTAG, 38 voting and 46 non-voting.

But of the Registries Stakeholder Group we have 104 members, and I think that's a tremendous thing. So welcome to all.

So for the agenda, we'll go through briefly a review of the agenda right now. So at 9:30 this morning, so at about 25 minutes, we'll be joined by ICANN staff, which will be primarily the GDD. With that group we will discuss two-character country names at the second level issue, GDD scorecard, any open issues, ICANN registry fees going forward, the registry agreement amendment developments, the GDD industry summit that's scheduled for September - is that correct?

Man: Correct.

Keith Drazek: Thank you. And then studies and metrics to inform the AoC review of the new gTLD program. And if there's any other business please feel free to let us know if you'd like to add something to discussions with the GDD staff.

At that point we'll take a break and then convene at 11:00 for stakeholder group business. And this will include a working luncheon through 12:45. We'll review topics for discussion with the ICANN board, discuss the GNSO Council issues and motions, discuss GAC request for feedback on proposed implementation procedures, stakeholder group comments, URS and legacy TLDs, Stakeholder Group Evolution 3 Working Group charter amendments, the role of the executive committee going forward.

This is - we've had some discussion on the email list and on our last call about the need for discussion around the role of the Registries Stakeholder Group Executive Committee and how we would like the ExComm moving forward to engage on our behalf.

Universal acceptance, GAC public safety working Group, and then the interest group updates - NTAG, geoTLD, community, and the Brand Registry Group.

At 1 o'clock we'll have the joint registry/registrar meeting, which will be in this room with the registrars. We'll discuss the GNSO review report. We'll actually have a visit from the Westlake Consulting Group that has been conducting the initial or the latest phases of the GNSO review, an opportunity for the Contracted Party House together to discuss and to review the report.

We'll discuss the GNSO Council issues and motions, planning for the GNSO Council chair nominations, pending public comments to include the RAA Whois accuracy program spec review, Privacy and Proxy Working Group draft report, again URS and legacy TLDs. And we'll talk more about that ourselves, but this is sort of a question of, you know, do we have the ability as contracted parties to voluntarily accept terms, new things in our renewal agreements as legacy operators.

And then the procedural concerns around what has gone through a PDP and what has not. And then review of any registry and registrar topics for discussion with the ICANN board. At 2 o'clock we'll adjourn for the meeting with the board. At 2:15 we will meet with the board and that will be in (unintelligible) AB, which is right next door. The three items that we identified as possible topics for discussions with the board were operational issues, budgeting to include allocation of resources, and the IANA transition and ICANN accountability if we wanted to talk about that. That was sort of a placeholder.

And then we'll wrap up with stakeholder group and other business continued from the morning sessions. Specifically there we'll talk about developments around the ICANN accountability CCWG and IANA stewardship transition CWG. And then we'll wrap up.

And we have a reception in the Catalinas Room for the registries and the registrars. So this evening at the end of our session we'll have a reception with the registrars. Any questions, any comments, any additions? Okay I see none so actually I'll (unintelligible) Adobe.

Jonathan Robinson: Keith, just a quick - it's Jonathan - just a quick comment. I mean Ken just messaged me that he seems to be able to hear but not speak. I'm not sure if there's an issue with...

Woman: I just sent him the dial-in info.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you. So we'll work through those technical issues and we'll come back to Ken if he's got any comments. So at this point I'd like to actually introduce - we have some fellows here with us, and if they could hello, wave or stand or let us know that they're here. Miss (Simla Vudu) from (unintelligible), and Mr. (Olivier Kwame).

All right, (unintelligible), welcome. We're very pleased you're here, and if you have any questions or comments or would like to have any contributions during our session today, we would certainly welcome that. So you are welcome. So Chuck did you want to comment?

Chuck Gomes: There we go. Have to learn how - these new machines here. I just wanted to comment on (Olivier Kwame) because he was able to attend by using one of the slots that the Registries Stakeholder Group had that we were unable to fill. And this is all of these first meetings - and he has been co-chair of the Policy and Implementation Working Group.

So I just - for those that weren't aware I thought it would be good to be aware of that and in cooperation with ICANN staff we were able to pull that off and not just let that slot go by unused.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Chuck. Okay so I think seeing no other hands we will go ahead and move forward. The next step is to discuss sort of a briefing and discussion that we had following the ExComm session with the GDD on Sunday evening.

These sessions are - we began those sessions back in London, which is just a year ago now where we were having a lot of issues and operational concerns and service delivery issues with ICANN and the GDD in particular. And we started those joint Registries Stakeholder Group/Registrar Stakeholder Group and NTAG ExComm sessions with the GDD staff to include compliance.

The hope that we could try to resolve some of the issues, get their responsiveness, identify the concerns, and that was what led to the development of the GDD score card that I think has proven to be a very useful tool and continues to be a useful tool for ensuring that at least there's a tracking mechanism for concerns that we have with GDD service delivery to us as contracted parties.

So we had another session with the GDD staff. It included compliance. Allen Grogan was there with (Maggie) and we talked through a number of different issues, one of which was the two-character country name issue. And so I'm going to pause here and ask if any of the ExComm who were there on Sunday would like to speak specifically to any of the topics that we discussed.

Paul Diaz: I'll jump in Keith. It's Paul Diaz for the record. We'll hear later when staff joins us, but a number of issues that were discussed and staff is going to note there are follow-on sessions later this week, either tomorrow or Thursday that will further tease out some of the things that were discussed. I'm going to leave it to Krista to provide those dates, times, and meeting rooms.

But please do listen when it comes up, specifically where we look ahead to the summit that's scheduled now for 9 through 11 September. There are survey results. They may touch on it in their brief, but there will be a session, a workshop if you will, Wednesday.

They also are looking - you've seen the email on the list - looking for a time slot that works for most of us to further discuss the moving forward on the two-character issues. Just checking my notes. Yes I don't want to speak too much because we'll just be repeating what they're going to say later but please do listen for the dates and times.

The opportunities face-to-face tends to be a lot more productive rather than trying to do things over email. So try to take advantage. Just leave it at that. Questions?

Keith Drazek: Great thanks Paul. Was Ken able to join? Was Ken able to join by phone? Okay is there anybody on the phone bridge who would like to speak? All right I guess not. So why don't we pause here for a moment? Are there any additional topics that anybody would like to raise with the GDD staff when they join us - or any other topics? Jordyn , thank you.

Jordyn Buchanan: I'm not really sure where this fits in. It's a little bit of a bridge maybe from the conversation we were just having about the service delivery from the GDD and the engagements that the ExComm's been having with them.

You know we have the score card as a way of tracking progress on specific issues but I think there's in my view, just having talked with a bunch of folks and gearing some of our own frustrations echoed by other registries, which makes me believe some of the things that are painful to us are common in common ways across a bunch of registries and often in ways that we don't get together and talk about.

You know, this is mostly a policy forum. We don't really have a very good operational forum, even though we end up moving a lot of that into this context because it's where we have the touch points with ICANN. But I feel like I'm persistently seeing a pattern where ICANN develops products or processes that without consultation with registries up front and they don't work that well and there's a lot of pain that we go through.

And then eventually we use something like the scorecard to try to like tactically work through each specific issue but there's a much more fundamental underlying problem with the design of those processes and the fact that they seem to be optimizing for things like through-put and repeatability as opposed to customer satisfaction.

And I don't know if we want to - I don't have any specific ideas. I'm not sure we want to just like complain at them yet again in the GDD engagement part of our agenda. But I do think it would be helpful for us to think more about how we can make that relationship with the GDD staff work more effectively and proactively as opposed to waiting for things to not work very well and then having to rely on something like the scorecard to try to fix it.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jordyn . I think you raised an important point right at the beginning of your comment about, you know, again the role of the Registries Stakeholder Group. You know I think Jon and others have raised the question, maybe Jeff

cherie stubbs 6/25/2015 11:57 AM
Comment [1]:

as well. You know, the Registries Stakeholder Group historically has been sort of the policy-making or policy development group for the registries, right?

And then only in the last, you know, year, year and a half have I think we have sort of evolved either intentionally or otherwise into the group where we have been dealing more with operational concerns because of the, you know, the significant expansion, you know, the concerns that we have with GDD in terms of the new gTLD program.

And I think it's a reasonable question to ask. Is this the role of the Registries Stakeholder Group, is should we consider creating, you know, and this is just, you know, off the top of my head - just, you know, consider creating a working group or some sort of a subcommittee or something like that to focus on more of the operational issues or the engagement with GDD as our service delivery organization.

And I think these are all reasonable questions. I don't think we're going to resolve this today but I think it is something that we should consider and thoughtfully try to develop sort of, you know, a path forward.

But to your point Jordyn Buchanan I totally agree that we seem to be a bit in reactive mode. And I think GDD and ICANN -- as we heard from Ashwin on our last call - they're going through the process of, you know, changing the way they operate and changing the way they develop systems and implement systems.

In the ExComm meeting that we had on Sunday discussions I think it was around the GDD portal, you know, we said, "Look don't implement, don't design and implement something without our input. You know, let's work together on the front end of this process to make sure that what you're building actually will work for us rather than having to find out later that it's been, you know, designed poorly or implemented improperly. Let's engage."

And so we discussed the idea of having a working group or a subteam or something like that that could engage with the GDD and Ashwin's organization as they move forward. So I think that is something we should strongly consider. Jordyn does that respond to your comment? Any follow-up?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes. I mean I think the GDD portal's a really good example. I heard from staff that they're like working on portal 2.0 or something like that. I wouldn't be surprised, but I would be disappointed if that was done without a lot of - like they know the engagement - like they know how we're going to be - or what their problems they're trying to solve with it.

They should do what any other product design team would do and be sitting down with the registries and saying like, "Hey, here's what this UI's going to look like. Here's how the work flow is going to work," and like do all that before they built it all and made it really painful to try to fix after the fact that, I don't know, so far I haven't heard - haven't invited us to work through that process.

Keith Drazek: So I'll just respond and then get to Jonathan. So I think this morning in talking with GDD when they're here it would be worth reinforcing the point that whether it's the GDD portal or other sort of, you know, implementations of, you know, of things that they're designing that we would like to be involved in that early so we can try to work together. I think it's a reasonable comment. Jonathan?

Jordyn Buchanan: Thank you. Jonathan. Very quickly -- Jordyn -- just set expectations for the GDD portal. Christine Willett was here on Sunday and she told us that their timeline for development, basically we're not going to see the full - or they talked about a six-month timeframe to work and that full functionality's a full year. So there's a lot of time - there should be a lot of time for this interaction/communication. But let's make the point when they're here.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks to both of your points Jordyn and Keith I guess on the subject. I would - it feels to me like - that we could - it would be in quotes "normal" to have some sort of user group in this situation. I don't think it's something that the ExComm is necessarily qualified to do.

I mean I think it feels to me like - especially it would be ideally people within the Registries Stakeholder Group or within registries in the Registries Stakeholder Group who have direct interaction with the portal. For example, I never do so I can't really add value in that sense. I don't interact with the portal.

And as a practical suggestion I would also favor in addition to having what you called a working group, I think it might be better to call it a user group so we knew the purpose of it and that that user group was able to report back to the Registries Stakeholder Group under an area perhaps not at every call but on some sort of reasonably regular basis on operational issues.

So we in a sense put something - we made it clear that this was separate to our policy work and experimented with dealing with operational issues so that would be my suggestion - two practical suggestions.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Jonathan. Reg ?

Reg Levy: Thanks. I'm 100% with Jordyn on this. We were - the GDD Portal Working Group met I think - Maxim's about to say the exact same thing as I am - yesterday or the day before. The days are all the same right now. And we talked about where we were with the scorecard and briefly about the fact that the next big GDD portal push is going to be adding the registrars.

And we encouraged them to reach out to people to beta test before they forced everyone in because for us when the GDD portal came out we were beta testing and it was live and it was not beta - I mean it was essentially a beta test but we were being all forced to use it and that was a source of much frustration.

And there was some receptivity to that but it wasn't the kind of like, "Oh yeah, totally, we're definitely going to have beta testing for this with registrars who volunteer." So that was concerning on the one hand.

And on the other hand I know that from our discussions with the GDD Portal Working Group and with ICANN, the people assigned to that working group from ICANN staff, that they're doing this to consolidate stuff on their end and I totally get that and I love it.

If things are streamlined for them then it's easier for them and that makes them happier and nicer and that's great for everyone. But I definitely don't feel that the impact on the contracted parties was the primary concern when the GDD portal went forward.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Reg . Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually we had last real updates of the change there long ago because of due to different reasons. And we usually report to the group. We may just short letter saying that yeah these things are going to be tested, that things are going to be tested, etcetera, etcetera. And we haven't had actual tests for a long time. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay Jordyn . Thank you Maxim. Jordyn .

Jordyn Buchanan: Just one quick point I wanted to make in response to Reg , I think when we're talking about beta testing, we're way too late in the - they've already written all the code at that point, right? Like, they need - the engagement needs to happen when they're thinking about what they want to build in the first place.

That won't just - when you're at the phase all the codes have been written and you're sort of like talking about how to like cure the most painful things...

((Crosstalk))

Jordyn Buchanan: ...you miss the opportunity to make the products, you know, fundamentally work in a different way that might be more compatible with the way that the registries want to use it in addition to the way that is going to be helpful for ICANN to consolidate stuff on the back end.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jordyn . Completely agree - great point. Any other comments or questions? Five minutes before we're officially joined by ICANN staff. Hi (Christine). Yes Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Actually we suggested that we're contacted on the phase of pencil design where only paper and pencil are involved and the ideas about data structures, etcetera, we suggested that maybe it will come to (unintelligible). Who knows?

Keith Drazek: Okay. Jon ?

Jon Nevett: Are you looking for filler for five minutes? Samantha , I was hoping that maybe you could give a real quick update. A lot of us missed the NTAG meeting due to the - no?

Samantha Demetriou: It's on the agenda for later.

Jon Nevett: Okay. If you think it will take more than five minutes, great. If not, maybe we move that forward. Up to you. Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: All right well check this one off for later then. Save us a little time. So we had an NTAG meeting this morning - thanks to those who joined - and we were focusing on, you know, kind of the next steps for the group and finding a way to shutter it in a way that might keep them unhappy.

And what we discussed is a voting threshold. When we reach three voting members that the group automatically shuts down unless those three voting members choose to vote to keep it going. Right now there are probably a higher number than most of you guys would expect of voting members in NTAG. A lot of them are inactive at this point.

So we talked with Cherie and Paul about doing kind of an accounting going into fiscal year 2016 to basically say okay you guys are observers. You're going to have to pay your dues. And anyone who doesn't pay their dues is no longer going to be considered a member. And we'll take account at that point of who is left as a voting member of NTAG. So that'll kick off that.

We also have an election coming up. Jon thank you for your nomination. The current ExComm is willing to stay on. We also might look into doing a charter

amendment to extend the terms, depending on how many members we end up with after Cherie does her count, just so we don't have to continually have these elections every six months.

I think that's pretty much everything - oh and we made the decision to go to ad hoc meetings as opposed to scheduled meetings. So we'll do a call shortly before the meeting in Dublin. If there's interest in having an NTAG meeting we'll do probably the same thing - meet in the morning before the registries. But if not, we'll talk to each other here.

So that's pretty much it. There'll be some emails coming out about a vote for the ExComm and a vote for this voting threshold agreement. So look for that in your email.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much. As I understand it, the voting threshold sort of was identified as a positive because of the concern that at some point you could end up with such a low number of active members that you would be unable to actually vote to (unintelligible) or to take further actions. So I think that was a very sort of reasonable approach. Makes a lot of sense to me, so thank you very much for the update.

Okay, any other comments? Any other business? We have three minutes until we get to the ICANN staff GDD session. Everybody gets three minutes to look at your email.

All right, let's go ahead and reconvene, thank you. So welcome back everybody. We are now joined by ICANN GDD staff, ICANN staff so welcome, Akram and Krista and Cyrus and Christine and Xavier. Thank you very much for joining us this morning as we usually do on Tuesdays.

The agenda - we went through this earlier and I know that we exchanged lists. So we plan to talk about two-character country names at the second level, GDD scorecard, registry fees going forward, registry agreement amendment process, the GDD industry summit, studies in metrics to inform AoC review of the new gTLD program and any other business.

So why don't we go ahead and get started. Krista is there anything that you'd like to add to the agenda at this point?

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. This is Krista Papac. All right, that was a really loud um. Can Xavier go first on the finance stuff? And he - I think Xavier you also want to provide an update on billing which is something that's sort of come up periodically. If we can just add that, that would be great. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks Krista. Happy to reorganize. So with...

Man: Only one.

Keith Drazek: So not hearing - is that better? Okay thanks. It sounds loud up here, sorry, which is unusual for me because I'm hard of hearing. Okay so we will - thank you Krista - reorganize to have the finance discussion first. So Xavier and I think Chuck and Paul will be helping to lead this session. So maybe I could hand this over to any of the three of you.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you Keith and thank you Paul and good morning everyone. Thank you for inviting us. I'll start quickly on providing a feedback on the budget process. And I'm assuming that with Chuck and Paul we're going to more specific subjects relative to that public comment.

                      So the budget process is at the very end for FY16. We're entering in the new fiscal year in a few days. And the board is about to consider the approval of the FY16 budget, which is now at the end of the process of development in consultation with the community.

                      We have closed the public comment period on the draft budget on May 1. Immediately after we have conducted a number of meetings and calls with the organizations that have submitted comments in order to enable better understanding of those comments and with the purpose of course to provide better response to those comments.

                      So we've had a call-in. Some of you have participated with the registries and registrars stakeholder group to go over the comments that had been submitted by these organizations. We have then drafted responses to those comments. The board members participated - some board members participated to those calls to allow us to have a board oversight over the public comment process.

                      And when we drafted responses we submitted those responses draft to the board members who participated to the calls to ensure they help us providing quality responses to those comments. Those comments have been overall been reviewed by the board and they have been published on June 5.

                      So on June 5 the 85 comments that had been submitted by nine organizations have been published with their answers on our Web site. The comments led to a number of changes to the budget and the revision of the budget as a result has been approved by the board finance committee and this is what will be submitted to the board tomorrow for approval. Chuck or Paul do you want to jump in at any point here?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Xavier. Let me start off by making sure that everybody here understands the significance of what happened this year with regard to the budget process because it really is significant.

Many of us have been requesting that the draft budget include enough detail so that we could submit our comments with enough time to allow for consideration of those comments and possible changes to the budget before the board acts on it. And this year that is actually happening. And it's in large part thanks to Xavier and his team, and it was a lot of work to make it happen.

In the past, the public comment period ended too late and there was no ability to make changes in the budget before the board voted on it. That is not the case this year, and in fact there are actually changes that were made to the draft budget in time for - to make those changes before the board considers it.

And one of them actually affected the - at least one of them. There were probably more but I'll cite the one that made a change to the head count for policy staff, a total of two full-time equivalent head counts were added to the policy staff at the request of some of the public comments.

And a little side note in that - and compliments to Jonathan and the GNSO Council - GNSO Council actually submitted comments in the comment period this time and suggesting that policy staff probably needed some more support and in fact two people were added. So some of you won't appreciate this as much as Paul and I but we've been talking about this for years and the team really pulled it off this year.

And so - and then the last thing I want to comment on - and some of you may want to look at this - Xavier and his team, and I see (Carol) over there and the - they prepared a nice summary, a detailed summary of all the public comments. And if you look at that, you will see all of the registry comments and their response and any changes to the budget that were made or future action items.

And with some of our comments, there's going to be some continuing discussion and actions on some of the comments like for example our comments with regard to cost benefit analysis and so forth. So it's going to be ongoing - because that's not a simple action to take on that - so look at the review of the comments. You'll see that all of our comments were reviewed, were considered, and in some cases it's going to be ongoing actions.

But the process is now working in a way that we wanted for a long time and that's in large part thanks to the very responsiveness of the ICANN finance team. So I certainly give my sincere thanks to what's happened and wanted

everybody to be aware of that. And then let me - Paul would you like follow on?

Paul Diaz: Thanks Chuck. Just to echo Xavier very appreciative of how you've managed the process this year. It is a pleasure to have the process work as it was planned. Would note that it's the first time in a couple years that you met the initial deadlines and everything worked to plan.

In reviewing the most recent ATRT recommendations, the financial ones, you can be very proud because you've hit most of the things that were called for. Of course what Chuck is hinting at is a little bit further in a development, the multi-year perspective, the cost benefit analysis.

And those are things that, you know, members of the Registries Stakeholder Group and other parts of the community, you have your ad hoc group that helps advise. We most certainly want to continue the dialogue, the engagement and the conversations we've had through this current budget process.

This stakeholder group has made it very clear we really want to have those conversations, in particular as they impact our fees, you know, so that we have a fully efficient budgeting process that the community's been looking for and that you've made such tremendous progress on over this last year.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. We've mentioned a couple times the subject of the cost benefit analysis. So this is one of the comments submitted by the Registries Stakeholder Group and also by PIR through Paul. And as Chuck indicated, this is a conversation really starting substantially now - not that it's new but that we're going to need to continue so that you understand the perspective that we're using for that subject.

We now produce the budget with 300 projects, each of them assigned with their allocated costs broken down into categories of costs between personnel, travel, professional services and admin costs. So it's a lot of information. This answers the question as to what - what are we doing and how much are we spending on it?

What this does not answer in this the conversation that Chuck, Paul and I have had is how efficient is - what value are we getting for the dollar spent on each of those 300 projects. So in order to be able to answer those questions we have -- through work with the community - we have launched a number of months if not years back, the dashboard project, simply using metrics to be able to measure the efficiency and the progress against all the activities of the organization.

And you have seen a glimpse of that dashboard on Fadi's opening ceremony presentation yesterday with just a few slides on it. And this is a dashboard that's coming for the 20th of August as with the first set of KPIs.

So KPIs are going to help us measure the activities that we carry out with specific targets, specific achievements or lack of achievements and monitoring those progresses. It's helpful for a cost benefit analysis but it's not sufficient. So what you want to do once you have a KPI is you want to benchmark it against an industry best practice ideally.

So for the next stage of the dashboard is - and that's the Recommendation 12.3 of the ATRT 2 recommendations - is to benchmark the organization externally. And that benchmark a lot of people say, you know, there's no two organizations like ICANN. That's not necessarily the problem. You can benchmark more detailed function against other organizations that carry out also those specific functions.

So the benchmark is the next stage to the dashboard. It's going to take us a while because we're really starting now the dashboard. The dashboard is something that we're going to need to mature over time and as a second phase we will include external benchmarks for the KPIs where it's relevant and ideally be able then to measure ourselves against the best practice.

The other aspect that will be necessary is be able to associate the progress in those KPIs with costs because that's how you can do a cost benefit analysis. You can say your KPI is looking like you're pressing very well against the target but it comes at a very high cost. So the cost benefit analysis will need that additional element to be brought in.

So this is why this is a conversation that's starting. It's because there will be several phases to go down that path, that this group has been very influential in providing a lot of input on this subject and I'm sure will do a good job together in going down that path. It will take a certain amount of time for sure. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Xavier. Any final questions or comments on this topic before we move on? Okay, thank you very much Xavier.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. I will also discuss that subject if we have time for it.

Keith Drazek: Yes, I was moving on to billing process updates, so thank you.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. Sorry, I don't know - thank you. So we've discussed with a number of registries as well as registrars over the past few months a number of billing issues and a number of cases and billing subjects more generally speaking as

we ramp up the number of registries that are in the (road) then we have more and more of course billing.

There's a number of topics that we've basically now started mapping in terms of billing. One, we have put in place an issue tracking mechanism so that we have a centralized source of information about any issue customer by customer or contracted party by contracted party or TLD by TLD that's been identified so that we can resolve those issues, one, tactically but also identify the root causes of those issues and then resolve them structurally.

There's a number of elements that contribute to resolving those issues, the type of issues that we've listed and we've - I'm not providing the whole list here but simply the categories. We have invoicing schedule that we need to address to deliver invoices on a timely basis in a predictable fashion to all the registries and registrars.

The contact information has been a source of issue with the bills that we have sent. And sometimes it's driven by the confusion in what is the point of contact for billing. Sometimes it's driven by other issues.

The customer inquiry - so we now have put in place a process to be able to ensure a responsiveness, adequate responsiveness to the customer inquiries. And we're going to also centralize the point of contact to provide billing comments or billing questions so that - and that's simply going to be through the CSC so because they have a process of logging and tracking the customer cases.

So this is what we're going to do to address the customer inquiries and ensure that we have a timely response and a timely resolution of the issues. Next please.

Won't go into details. There's some information that we are going to try to make sure are adequately included in the invoices so that those of you who receive those invoices and know what TLD is about, when you have more than one TLD the invoices need to indicate the right information.

The transaction to reporting has been a subject of challenge for us because as you know the registries report the information on transactions and we use that information in order to be able to bill the registrars. So when we're missing a registry's reporting then any registrar billing is wrong by definition so we need to have - it's been very manual so far but we need to automate the process of transaction reporting.

And we're also working with our billing team to do a lot more education and work on their ability to deal with issues and communication with our contracted parties.

In order to be able to address that we need to - we have of course the three elements of any process, which is the system, the process design itself and the ability of the team to carry out that process. So there's actions on every front that we need to carry out and we have a road map to be able to embed these improvements on a sustainable basis.

I'll stop here and would like to know if there's any questions on that subject or comments.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Xavier. Any questions or comments?

Man: Xavier I'll ask for the group. Some members have expressed problems in the past, incorrect billing contact, etcetera. Since we understand the GDD portal is going through an update revision and what not, if there are errors, do we still use the portal? Should we engage with our engagement manager? Who should the point of contact be for something as important as just a billing contact?

Xavier Calvez: The CSC in the portal is the way to go. So if there's an issue, the CSC needs to be the point of contact for that and we'll route it. And it's in the portal that we want to make sure we have the adequate contacts. Once we have that as far us to be able to pull then correctly into each of the processes whether it's billing or others that we use that information for.

One aspect that we want to manage well that's been challenging so far is the hierarchy of customers and the subject of families of "customers" in quotes when we have one operator for several TLDs. We need to build the right structure of families in Salesforce.com in order to be able to bill the information to the right TLD but then provide that bill to the right contact which may be one for several TLDs.

So there's a hierarchy in the system that we need to bill, not that it's highly complicated. Many companies face that need but we need to structure that well in Salesforce.com.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you very much Xavier. Any questions or comments? I see none. Thank you very much.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you for...

Keith Drazek: Jordyn . Sorry there is one.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sorry. So you mentioned you're in the process of automating some of this but it seems like there's still - I don't know, at least from our perspective - a lot of pain in making whatever the current process is working. I mean we want to pay you guys if it turns out to be really hard.

So I'm worried when I hear you say you're automating it when it seems like the pretty manual way is still not working very reliably. And if we lock in - if we lock in whatever we're doing now and make it less flexible than it is now then it seems like we're - I'm worried that it's going to make things worse, not better.

Xavier Calvez: I'm sorry if I conveyed the idea that everything's manual. It's not. There are some phases of the process that we are still doing relatively manually now that need to be automated. One of those phases is the one that I mentioned when I spoke about the transaction reporting is as you know we receive the transactions by registry and by registrar from the registries.

So we need to be able to aggregate all the registries' information in order to know one registrar's number of transactions to bill. So that's a part that is today automated but the challenge that we have is the validation of that information.

So today we do validation of an automatically produced information in a manual fashion. That's the type of things that we need to be able to automate, simply also because as you know we're trying to bill by the 30th of the month that follows the end of the quarter and we have the data at best by the 20th of that month.

So we have ten calendar days to collect everything, verify about 600 registries' data, verify it by registrar, aggregate it by registrar and bill registries and registrars. That phase is time-consuming and challenging today and that's one that we need to automate. But the collection of the data and the aggregation of the data is automated today.

Keith Drazek: There's another question I think.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Is it possible to have a pro forma invoice for those who send their reports? Example we sent a report on the first date and pro forma invoice, unlike the real invoice, it's not an obligation. It just sign that form is okay or something because it's really good thing to be able to check if everything is okay before you really issue an invoice and you have to open the case and it would save some time.

Xavier Calvez: Sorry, I'm not sure I fully understood what your question was as to when to send invoice (unintelligible).

Maxim Alzoba: It was about ability to issue pro forma invoices for those registries who send their data with the marks like it could be corrected in any way. But we need for our internal purposes to understand what they - if you're wrong with our address again or something.

Xavier Calvez: So it's the early validation of the data so that we can send earlier the bills for those who have provided the information? Is...

Maxim Alzoba: Pro forma invoice is more like draft of invoice without obligation to pay, where we can check if everything is okay on your side this time.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, we'll have to think through how effective that process is. What I'm concerned with is that if we tried to start producing draft invoices and insert that phase into the process, it's going to be fairly challenging as I said. I'll think through more of that and we'll come back to you on that.

Maxim Alzoba: Could you please return to the group with it because it's quite normal for other businesses?

Xavier Calvez: Okay, understood. We'll think through that a bit more and try to come back with addressing it. I'm not sure yet whether it's operationally efficient to do that. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Maxim. Thank you Xavier. Jordyn I think has a follow-up but we need to move on. We're starting to run short on time.

Jordyn Buchanan: Maybe one alternative approach as opposed to producing a draft invoice would just be the date to pay is fixed, right, like, so the term is like you have to pay by 30 days after when you're - in issuing the invoice now but if you submit your report earlier you get the invoice earlier so you actually have more lead time.

So you get paid the same time either way but you give the registry operator more time to pay if they provide the report earlier.

Xavier Calvez: Understood and thank you for that. The subject of when we get the transactional reporting has been a long discussion with the registries and registrars. But we'll try to see how much work we can advance for those from whom we have the data earlier. Yes thank you. That's helpful, thank you.

Keith Drazek: All right thank you Xavier. We need to move on. I very much appreciate your briefing, the overview and the update. And just to second the observations of Chuck and Paul that we very much appreciate the work that you and your team have done over this last year and years to get to the point now where we

have much greater visibility and therefore the opportunity to provide the input in a timely manner so thank you very much to you and your team.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, thank you. We've done our job, thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you. Let's now move onto the next item on the agenda which is the GDD scorecard. Any open issues or action items before I hand this over to Yasmin to run for the registries? I'd just like to note and to remind everybody that we've been engaging with the scorecard now for just over a year that we, the registries, feel like this has been a very constructive and helpful tool for the registries and GDD staff to engage to set up some expectations and baselines and - but it's really become an effective tracking mechanism in that we still see value in continuing with the GDD scorecard. Excuse me.

But we recognize also that as we work through the issues that have been identified that it makes sense. That it's logical. That there's issues where at this point hopefully be removed from the scorecard therefore creating a much shorter and more efficient scorecard. So I think our mutual goal is and should continue to be sort of making the scorecard less necessary. But we're not quite there yet and we think that it is still very much a constructive tool. So with that, let me hand it over to Yasmin .

Yasmin Omer: Hi, thanks Keith. So the scorecard working group from the, sorry the registry scorecard working group met with ICANN staff yesterday in what was a very productive meeting, I think. We - there are still a number of items that are outstanding and they've been the sort of recommendations that are outstanding and we've grouped them into a number of subject matters.

So I'll just go over them really quickly and I can do that now because we don't have many items left which is great. So to begin with we had a few items relating to the contact information that registry operators have been provided not being used by ICANN. That recommendation is being closed now. We feel that the initial issue that led to the wide scale issue in the first instance has been addressed by the GDD.

Of course cases may occur here and the recommendation to registry operators is that if and when they do occur, of course, by all means raise them through the GDD portal but for the time being that recommendation in and of itself is being closed.

Second item relates to - they required a few recommendations in the original letter regarding functionality of the GDD portal. The - there was concern expressed by ICANN during the last meeting about the time spent in tracking and monitoring these recommendations given that the - they were committed

to but there would be quite some time until they were actually implemented due to a number of issues.

So the agreement that was reached during the last meeting was that a roadmap would be provided to the working group which indicated when certain features or functionality would be implemented in the GDD portal and that was considered acceptable to us because that would effectively serve as a commitment as to when these features would be implemented but would allow us to wind down those particular items -- so there are about 11 outstanding recommendations that relate to the roadmap. So once that's provided we'll be in a position to wrap up that item as well.

The next item relates to performance metrics for the SLA systems that ICANN operates that impact also the GDD portal, the customer service portal and the CZDS. The original recommendation was that we much in the same way that we have SLA's, ICANN has some SLA's regarding the systems as well.

And where (Justin) and (Iman) and I met with Jeff Reid during the last meeting and we're now in the position where we have a draft document that at once the IT operations performance metrics. I'll be seeking some feedback during the next week or so with respect to what we should be asking for. So we're currently working with the ICANN IT operations team to wrap that up.

Now next item relates to independent certification regarding security threats, sorry, security breaches. This was raised about a year ago due to a number of issues that came about and the registries and the applicants presented the need for independent certification once the security - once these security breaches do occur as a way to mitigate the appearance of these security breaches.

Now, we've - we had a good discussion with ICANN staff yesterday and it's apparent that there are mechanisms in place that ICANN do deploy with respect to independent certification of these - of security breaches and the, I guess, the only issue was that there wasn't visibility for us regarding what those mechanisms were.

Now, the last -- with respect to the last incident -- there was quite a bit of visibility which was great but the, I guess, the issue that we have is that with like some sort of consistency and the manner that that's reported to us given that in most instances it's (unintelligible) this relates this to. The - so we are - we're continuing to engage ICANN staff in providing us with that visibility and what was originally put forward was something similar to the root cause analysis responses that we provide to ICANN compliance that outline the preventative and corrective actions that we would be taking. So that will be coming shortly.

Now the other outstanding item relates to service level targets with respect to customer - with respect to the customer service team. We as most of you would have noted the interest that probably would have notified your upbeats service level targets for the customer service team and quite a few other ICANN processes are up on the ICANN web site.

Things like a seven day response timeframe for cases in the GDD portal and those service level targets are being reported on a monthly basis and then obviously that gives us some sort of indication as to what it is or how those targets are being met. The - there are still quite a few service level targets that are not being mentioned at the moment and that's because of the need for system functionality in the GDD portal.

The - both items will be on the roadmap that will be provided to us. But until those items - they've been assigned but until we're in a position to measure those items or at least have some sort of commitment regarding the placement on the roadmap we won't be racking up that item.

And I'll just say that for all of you who haven't seen the metrics on the ICANN web site please have a look at them and let us know if you think of any other metrics that do need to be defined.

We had a few recommendations regarding the designation of account managers and the interaction with them. Those given that the account managers are being deployed and the feedback's been - that the interaction with them has been good and they do remain - they're quite responsive and they engage with us quite well so those recommendations will also be closed.

There were a quite a few concerns expressed regarding us at the originally. The assets has, I think -- well, not I think, I know I've experienced them -- significant improvement since we originally raised the issue. A "How to Guide" will be provided and once that's provided we'll be in a position to mark that item as closed.

And finally there were quite a few recommendations regarding the improvement to the webinars that are held by ICANN. These recommendations have been implemented and they will also be marked off as closed. So the, as I said, we're making really good progress and we should be in a position to wrap up the recommendation in the scorecard in the near future.

What was discussed with ICANN staff yesterday was the ongoing issues that some registry operators do have and these - they're not necessarily micro

issues but we're talking about macro issues that registry operators do experience on a wide scale.

And the - we discussed the need to have a coordinated approach by which the feedback is provided and conveyed to the GDD so that we're providing feedback that's in a constructive, and meaningful way similar to the process that we undertook in developing the original letter whereby we conducted a survey, took your feedback on board, and developed actual implement for solutions.

So the channel by which we're intending to do that is this working group so that's something that ICANN staff have been - are open to and the - they will continue to engage us in a constructive and meaningful way. Internally, I guess, as members of the Registries Stakeholder Group do need to have a discussion about how that is structured.

What I envision now - well, at the outset is that the - you do raise issues with the working group. We do. And we'll have a discussion about them and determine whether they are issues that are being experienced by registry operators on a wide scale and if they - if there is enough support we would raise these issues uniformly with the GDD.

So as an example I know that recently quite a few registry operators have been experiencing issues with the, bless you, with the assignment process and that's something that we would raise with the GDD once we've had - well, once we've had some time to discuss it internally. So we envisage moving forward meeting every ICANN meeting and only having calls in between ICANN meetings if and when necessary to address these issues -- obviously depending on how urgent and pressing the issues are.

So as I said, we'll continue to - we'll have a discussion internally as to how we do define that - with, I guess it's probably going to evolve into more of a standing committee, per se, rather than a working group that was allocated to specific tasks. So, yes, if you have any questions please direct them to the working group...

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you very much Yasmin .

Yasmin Omer: ...and finally, sorry.

Keith Drazek: Oh, I'm sorry.

Yasmin Omer: Okay, yes, finally I just want to thank ICANN staff for a really productive meeting yesterday so thanks for the engagement and, yes, moving all of these forward.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Yasmin . This is Keith for the transcript. So yes, thank you and to the GDD scorecard team that's been working on this. I know it's been a tremendous amount of work. As Krista had previously noted, not just the engagement and the actual work but the maintenance of the list is, you know, not an insignificant amount of work.

So with that, Krista maybe I could turn it over to you, you know, to take advantage of the fact we have GDD staff here with us. Any comments you'd like to make about the scorecard process before we move on?

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. And I just wanted to say thank you to Yasmin for her leadership and to the rest of the team. It really was - we had a really good meeting yesterday. It's - I feel like the engagement with that team and then with you guys even is really helping you guys understand the work that we are doing, us to understand, and for us to provide you with that visibility and to have that open line of communication.

And so it's too bad (Valerie)'s not - couldn't make it to this meeting, but she's done a lot of work with the team as well and so as the rest, of course, the GDD team. But I just really want to thank you guys because it's been helpful to us and I think it's also just enabled us to have a better open line of communication, so thank you.

Akram Atallah: Thank you everyone for having us here and thank you for the report Yasmin . I think that the vision is that the scorecard is something of an interim project until we have in place the right tools to do the work of what normal - how normal companies do the work. I see the issues in two categories.

One main category is that, you know, the portal and the features of the portal and how you - the tools that you're using to report to us and give us information and that typically becomes a roadmap where we show you a - the next version of the release, what features it's going to have, and the feature after - the release that - and the features that we included -- and that's part of the scorecard.

Another part of it is basically when you enter something in the CSC and you receive a reply. How well are we servicing you and we want to add to these cases a rating feedback so that you not only can, you know, get what you've asked for but also you can rate us on, 'Was this satisfactory? Did we serve you?" and you know? So something very simple that you can rate us on and that would help us also gather information.

And lastly in the CSC, you're always going to be able to ask for new things that maybe are not in the roadmap of this or additional services that we did not

think about or something that we can improve and we can always reply to the CSC to get - and we aggregate them and know what we should be working on in the future.

So once we get to these three areas, I think, we will have a good mechanism that we can replace these kind of tracking -- manual tracking -- because of that we use. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you Akram. Thank you. Krista, Jordyn , saw your hand?

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks Akram. I'd like to - I agree with you 100% that it'd be great to get away from a sort of scorecard model where we're trying to track individual issues that you guys are working on. I do think though in my mind it doesn't look to me like a tools problem. It looks like an engagement model problem and I think a lot of that just comes from you guys tend to build stuff and then come to us and say, "Haha, here's this thing. How does it work?"

And sometimes it works okay, and sometimes it doesn't work very well. And once you've invested the time and energy into building it in to the first place, you know, often it can be hard to adapt around what the customers actually need. And so I think a big part of what we need -- and it's great to hear it like the customer feedback from each interaction is great and will hopefully help you guys shape the future -- but I think the product design process -- and I would say "process design" process as well - process design process, that's very meta -- but those are things I think we just need to figure out how to be more collaborative. We - you know, we need to - if we need to spend more time giving you guys input up front, I think we need to make sure we're available to do that.

But I think just as importantly you guys need to come to us earlier in the process when you're thinking about what you want to build because often I think you're trying to solve problems for ICANN which is great. You guys should be solving your own problems, but I think there's almost always going to be opportunities to do it in a way that solving problems for registries as well or at least doing it in a way that makes it easy for us to help you solve your problems and I think often those opportunities are missed by the way these things are designed.

Akram Atallah: (Kristine), do you want to address this some of that to the product management?

Kristina Rosette: Certainly. (Kristine) Rosette. So I agree with you Jordyn . I think that we have in the past ruled out tools that we didn't get a lot of - as much engagement as we would have liked to early on. This year we've established a dedicated

Product Management Team for the Global Domains Divison and I think some of you have met Leanne Champagne. She's here this week.

She is the product manager focused on the portals. And her role will be - she's already engaged with, I think, through the portals users group with some of you to understand the business needs -- so she'll - will be engaging early and often. I heard some of the earlier conversation when I entered the room that by the time we get to a testing on a deployment phase it's really too late for product management to engage with the end users.

We need to get all of you as end users of the tool - we need to get your input earlier. So it's through this product management function that we'll be able to do that. So I expect you'll see more from the Product Management Team -- Leanne and others -- as we build the team out in the coming months.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much (Kristinae) and Jordyn and Akram. Yes, I would absolutely like to reinforce the comments and that, you know, a collaborative approach to this will serve all of us far better and that we absolutely would support that. So any further questions or comments before we move on? The next item on the agenda, which is actually an earlier item on the agenda that I skipped over.

So we'll go to Donna for the update on the two character country names of the second level issue. I will note that Donna sent an excellent summary update to the email list yesterday so if you haven't seen that you can certainly refer to it, but thank you Donna and over to you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Keith. It occurred to me that we just say two character and we assume that everybody in the room understands what we mean by that. I'm very conscious that we have some other people in the room that might not. So just a little bit of context, the two character issue is registry operators can seek - can submit a request to ICANN to use better letter combinations at the second level of a top-level domain that are currently on the reserve list according to the registry agreement.

We've made some considerable progress in this area that the current process that we have has enabled the release of quite a number of those letter letter combinations, but as part of the process individual governments are allowed to comment on strings that they have concerns about at the second level.

And we're in the process now of trying to develop a process that enables the evaluation at the comments that have been received from the governments which from our perspective aren't necessarily reasons or have any rationale or are related to confusion so we're just trying to work through that last element of the process to enable at least if not the use of those letter letter

combinations at the second level to understand why their government doesn't want them used, what their concerns are to enable a dialogue to try to move forward.

So that's where we are and I understand that Krista has a process that we will be able to talk about on Wednesday. Rich and I have signed up for 10:30. I'm not sure who else has responded to you Krista but, so I think the intent is to have a look at the process on Wednesday and try to move forward from there. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Donna. Krista?

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. I don't have the web - there's a number of people that responded though and yes, oh, sorry. It is really loud up here. There's a number of people that responded. I believe (Winnie), we're confirmed for 10:30 tomorrow. We'll send out a meeting invite for those who are interested in coming.

We're just trying to find a room right now, but we'll invent something. We'll figure it out. And really what we have is a (unintelligible) chart that we want to show you guys, it's one slide, but we'll talk through it and then get your feedback and from there we'll look at trying to roll this thing out -- so thank you very much.

And Donna and Reg in particular have spent a lot of time with us talking through this and trying to understand what our thinking is and the position we're in we're trying to balance a very fine line between you guys and governments and so anyway thank you both for your help with this and looking forward to tomorrow's conversation.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you Krista. Any other comments or questions? Jeff , go right ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, sorry, it's just - I'm trying - can we get a little less abstract maybe? What is it that's being discussed exactly tomorrow that we can't spend five minutes on right now? Because if there's a chart or something that's developed - I'm sorry, it just seems very abstract right now.

Yasmin Omer: Krista, can I ask you to respond to that please? Just, yes, thanks.

Krista Papac: I don't think it would take five - I think it will take longer than five minutes. I'm happy to talk about it right now but it - I think it - it's up to you guys. It's your agenda.

Keith Drazek: I think we'll leave the really detailed discussion until tomorrow but maybe if you could give a little bit more substance...

Krista Papac: Sure.

Keith Drazek: ...in detail that would be fantastic.

Krista Papac: Sure. So what we're looking at is if you look at the text of the registry agreement - so as a reminder we've already given a blanket waiver to - for all non letter letter codes so that means basically your registry agreement still says that you need to continue to reserve letter letter codes and then as we've said, "Put them through the process." So it - the contract says, "You can release them by either reaching agreement with the relevant government and country code or by asking permission from ICANN," and that would be based on measures proposed by the registry to mitigate confusion with a country code.

So what we're looking at is having governments provide rationale that explains why it's confusing with the country code. So focusing their comments to require them to be about confusion with the country code and then having the - right now in the process that you - when you request release you have to check a box that says you're going to put measures in place to mitigate confusion with country codes.

What we would be looking for is the registry to say, "We have these measures that mitigate this confusion." The part that's hard is what if the criteria that says, "Yes, this could be considered confusing and yes, this would be a measure that would mitigate that confusion." So we're looking at using a community process to collect feedback and criteria from the community -- a community developed process -- that establishes that criteria by which we would use to then for a lack of a better word "evaluate" the confusion and the measures.

So once that criteria was established, governments could still comment. If they receive comments we say, "Okay, registry, what are your measures? Do they map to this community developed criteria? Okay, it does. Please go ahead. These are released. Or it doesn't. Let's figure out how to make them map," and then you can release them -- so that's the high-level.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Krista. That was very helpful. Jeff , back to you and then we probably need to move on.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, that is helpful. So I guess let me ask the hard question then. Does that mean that ICANN is then committing to no longer giving governments an automatic veto right over strings? In other words, you kind of - you went around the issue here, but the real issue is are you really going to do an evaluation which may conflict with what a government actually wants?

Akram Atallah: So Jeff , I like how you jumped to a conclusion in the hypothesis, I like that. But we've never given the governments a veto right. What we've done is we've received, I want to say, over 200,000 combinations of requests versus gTLDs - number of country code for TLDs -- over 200, 000 requests for those. Out of these we've said do we wait until we have a full process finished before we start releasing these codes or do we actually release these codes as quickly as possible because of the urgency you guys put on us to get things moving and then go back and figure out the process that addresses the GAC - the countries that objective to releasing their codes.

So what we did is we released over 97% of these requests first and then we said we're going to go develop a process to handle these objections and now that the process is coming together, I hope that we will be able to finalize it and then put it in place. And still it's going to take some time because there is - there are some - we all know that this string similarity issues and confusability issues are subjective, not very objective measures.

And finding criteria that says, "Yes, this is confusing," or, "No, this is not confusing," or, "These measures address those confusability." This is going to be difficult. So we were trying to help move the process as quickly as possible and then we got hit with giving the countries the veto right. But, you know, I hope that clarifies our intent from the beginning.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you Akram. I've got Reg in queue and then Jordyn and then John and then we need to move on. Thank you.

Reg Levy: So Jeff , this is why we didn't think that it could take five minutes and what we just heard today is not - does not comport with the most recent that Donna and I had. So this is changing every single time we talk about it. It's not a process that we can discuss in five minutes and it's clearly going to keep on going.

Keith Drazek: Okay, Jordyn and then John.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks Akram and I appreciate that explanation for how you guys are approaching the process and to me that makes a lot of sense that you would release the low, you know, the "low-hanging fruits." I do think somewhat better communication around that would be better for both us so you don't get us yelling at you that you're giving a veto right to governments and for the governments so that they have clear expectations that these names are not currently being released but their objections aren't necessarily being, you know, sustained or, you know, they may not be sufficient in order to block the release of the names on an ongoing basis because right now everyone's forced to sort of read between the lines, right?

Like the - you guys announce you're going to accept the submissions from governments, they submit things, you release everything except for the things that the governments submitted comments on and so everyone just sort of make assumptions about what that implies about the process. So I think some better transparency about what you're doing at each step along the process would probably - you'd get less fury from our side and we're going to have less of a problem with governments who might think that the process as it is now that does give them a veto right.

Akram Atallah: I agree with you 100%. We did not do a good job with communicating our intent past releasing the first batch, so I agree with that.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Akram, thank you Jordyn . I'll let John and then Jeff , last word on this one.

Jon Nevett: Sure, thank you Jon Nevett. So I want to agree with Jordyn but also we recommended at the last meeting that when you release these and then -- and we thank you for that. That totally makes sense. But when you seek comment or objections from the governments that you actually ask for a basis of law or some history of confusion and you didn't do that so then you set up the problem where we didn't know if you were going to use that standard and then the governments didn't know that so, you know, some of the objections might not have come in if the governments realized that you would be looking for a basis for those objections so in the future instead of 97% maybe we would had 99% or something like that -- so but again, thank you for getting that one when you did and look forward to resolving the last 3%.

Keith Drazek: Thanks John. Jeff ?

Jeff Neuman: Just quickly -- and again I appreciate the process -- but the process only gets us up to a finite point. At some point in the process a decision will have to be made and I guess that's what I look forward to hearing about is to whether ICANN staff will make a decision and an evaluation because ultimately there will be some strings where the governments says, "I don't know want to release it on any - under any circumstance," and then ICANN's going to have to make decision.

The process will get us up to that point. And that's what I look forward to hearing about is how that ultimate - how that decision will be made and will you make that decision -- so, thanks.

Akram Atallah: Thank you Jeff for narrowing the decision to this. The process actually is not all in parallel. It's actually a serial process which means we're going to ask the governments for clarity on how is strength is confusing. And based on that,

we're going to make a decision whether the rationale is actually a valid rationale before we go and ask the registry to mitigate the confusability.

So it's important that we narrow the focus in order for us to be able to make an objective decision otherwise it's going to be like, "Yes, this is very confusing. Okay, now how do you judge that?" So we're asking for - we're going to ask for a very specific rationale on confusability and if there is no rationale, then we're not going to accept the objection.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, and Keith do we have this on the agenda internally to discuss today because I just want to - there was a discussion between the - a few other brand registries and some governments yesterday on this very issue and the rationale is not necessarily what we would think of as confusion but it's more that governments impose certain requirements on their own ccTLD and they're worried about the reverse where someone wants the ccTLD dot or what they're thinking of as two letters dot whatever the - our string is.

They're worried that we as registries will not apply the same standards for that as they apply to their own ccTLD so it's not necessarily confusion in a normal sense. I know that sounds abstract as I'm trying to - I'll give you an example. So let's say for Singapore, if someone wants SG-dot-photo as opposed to photo-dot-SG these countries - the reason they're holding back their approval is because they don't believe that the same standards that they require for photo-dot-SG will be applied when someone registers SG-dot-photo.

So it's not an issue of what we would all consider "confusion," but an interest in applying the same -- I hesitate to use to "content standards" -- but the same standards that they do in their own ccTLD. And that's not something I have heard before and I'm not sure that - it's not a confusion argument and that's where the "rubber going to hit the road" as to, "Is that an acceptable reason?"

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much Jeff and thanks to everybody for this conversation. It's obviously a very important issue that a lot of us care about but there is a session tomorrow, correct, where this can be discussed in further detail. And Jeff , to answer your question, we didn't have this as a specific standalone item for our internal agenda, but we can certainly add it, okay?

And we can carry out this conversations internally and then take advantage of the session tomorrow. So, thank you. Let's move on now to the next item on the agenda which would be the registry agreement amendment process update and I will hand that over to Mr. Nevett.

Jon Nevett: Thanks Keith, Jon Nevett. So we're, as everyone knows, in a process of moving forward with amendments to the registry agreement that would be considered by this body so we've been in negotiations with ICANN staff for -

because it's many months, let's just say, six to eight months. We started the process - actually kicked it off in July so it's been - getting close to year.

So we're going through a round of potential changes. We're getting pretty close on reaching agreement. We had a very productive meeting on Saturday internally and then Sunday with ICANN staff. They're making a round of changes, working on a couple of the technical issues in the specs and once that gets all resolved we hope to have a really good redline to share with the community -- this community -- at first and then the greater community so I'm cautiously optimistic that we could wrap this up by Durbin (sic), I guess, next month or so and - so stay tuned for a full report.

You all have the existing redlines and the charts that were produced before this meeting and we'll have another good redline coming out of this meeting. Questions?

Keith Drazek: Thanks John. Any questions, comments, feel free to raise your hand. (Cyrus), is there anything you'd like to add to this particular conversation?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Keith, thank you John. No just echoing what John was saying. The discussions have been very productive. I think the session we had jointly on Sunday led to clearing up a whole bunch of open issues. There's only really a small handful of issues left.

We're working on that on our part given everything that's going on obviously in Buenos Aries. Hoping within the next two weeks or so we can probably get something back to you, thanks.

Jon Nevett: Of Couse I meant Dublin, not Durbin (sic), I apologize.

Cyrus Namazi: I was wondering about that, yes.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thank you (Cyrus) and thank you John and I've made that same mistake recently myself. So any comments or questions before we move on? Okay, seeing none. Krista I'm going to hand it over to you now for the GDD Industry Summit Update. Thank you.

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith, Krista Papac. Yes, so there's a GDD Industry Summit that's going to occur in September of this year .The dates, as you all probably know, are September 9th through 11th. We are going to have it in the Los Angeles area. We're close to having a venue but we haven't signed a contract yet so we'll - once the contract is signed we'll communicate the venue to you.

There was a survey that was sent out a few weeks back but I think 60 or so people responded to both registry and registrar about format and agenda and

topics. Sorry, let me take a step back because everybody might not know what the purpose of the Industry Summit is. So the reason we're doing this is the ICANN meetings, as you guys all know, have gotten busier and busier.

There's a tremendous among of policy and governance work that's going on at these meetings and it's making it difficult to have - to focus on the actual business needs of contracted parties. The purpose of the ICANN meetings is to deal with policy and internet governance issues so it's doing its job but it - we thought it would be helpful to the contracted parties to have a special business focus meeting where you would come, registries and registrars, and meet with the team -- the GDD staff team that supports you -- to talk through different issues that are going on, ways that we can engage together better, it's also an opportunity for you to collaborate with your business partners on the registrar's as well as us -- and so that's what the summit will be about.

There was a survey to get your input and the registrar's input on what you'd like to talk about and what sort of format you're looking for. We compiled the results of that and we're actually going to be presenting Mike Zupke, my counterpart on the registrar side. Him and I will be presenting the results tomorrow in a workshop that we'd love to have you guys on the registrar come to as to we can talk through any additional feedback

What will happen after that is Mike and I will go back to our respective offices, work with the rest of the team to finalize the agenda, and then send it out for you guys to take a look at and then once everybody's sort of seen it, we'll get it posted and communicate that out, so, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you Krista. Any questions or comments on the GDD Industry Summit?

Man: (Unintelligible) for that in for the record. Krista thank you for the possibility to have to summit. What we discussed in our two interest group was you're setting up a summit and then asking us for giving you some topics, all right? You should have done the poll on what we want to talk about before and not after what you have done - I wonder (unintelligible) please tell me what we should do. It should be the other way around asking us for topics and then setting up the summit so just - it was somehow the feeling we want the summit we don't know what to do please give us your input so it should be the other way around. Do we have some topics and then setting up a summit?

Keith Drazek: Maybe I can take a quick stab at that.

Krista Papac: Yes.

Keith Drazek: You know, I think there's - it's sort of the "chicken in the egg" question, right? So which comes first. And I think certainly -- and we heard this from the registrar's as well -- concerns about costs and time and travel and commitment to something to a session that has yet to be defined agenda.

But there's also the flip side is that logistically speaking in order to be able to plan and to secure the function space and to commit the resources and to lock something in so people can start early enough to establish their travel arrangements you need to have a lead time that's long enough to be able to accomplish that so there's a natural tension there, I think.

I see both sides of that argument, actually that, you know, yes, we would like to have these sessions sort of only if necessary and based on specific criteria and agenda items but if you have to have a six month lead time or really a four month lead time to plan then the agenda topics may change in those three or four months -- so I think it's sort of a balance.

I agree with your concern, but I also see the flip side of it in terms of planning and logistics. So I saw some hands. Jeff , anyone else? (Rubens)? Jeff , go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, can you just - I guess real quick, when's the session tomorrow that you're going to...

Krista Papac: Yes, I'm happy to share that. We actually just sent a note to Cherie which she will be forwarding if she hasn't already that has that session as well as a number of them but let me look it up for you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Krista Papac: We're sending an email that gives you guys all the sessions.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, there's just - and maybe we can cover it also on the next registry call because there are so many overlapping sessions and it'd be good just to hear about this and since I don't see anything on the schedule we may have - a number of us may have other things to do so

Krista Papac: Yes, so it's 3:00 p.m. tomorrow -- 1500. And (unintelligible) which is (Gina Fairman), I think. So yes, I know that there's a lot of overlapping session - or there's a lot of sessions going on which is why we tried to help you guys. With that I don't know if it was helpful but to send you an email just letting you guys know like these are the things that, you know, we're doing to engage with you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so if we can - if I can just make a request that we just do it on the next registry stakeholder group call. So if we could just - I know there be a repeat for you but there's a lot of other things going on at that time and I - it wasn't on the schedule -- so if we can do that, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you. I've got a queue building so and just a moment to please remind everybody to state your name before speaking for the transcripts. (Rubens), and then Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes.

Keith Drazek: Hi Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I know that that at least the...

Keith Drazek: (Rubens) was first. Sorry, (Rubens) then Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I'm sorry.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. Krista, is the venue defined? Is the venue defined location?

Krista Papac: Not yet, we're very close. It's going to be in Los Angeles but we haven't signed a contract yet. Once we do we'll communicate the venue. But it will definitely be the LA area so if you're thinking about travel, LAX is your friend.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that. Chuck Gomes. The - I know that the after the first half hour there's a CCWG Accountability Working Group so obviously it'll conflict with that but I hope that there's enough of us that have that covered that will be able to communicate with one another and cover that.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you Chuck. Jeff , just circling back to your question. There was some confusion as to precisely what you were referring to about discussion on our next stakeholder group call. Was it a question of the proposed dates -- the target dates -- in September or the (unintelligible)?

Jeff Neuman: Right. The subject that they're covering tomorrow on the summit since it's not in the schedule and, again, it's not your fault. You said you and Mike Zupke are going to present your findings from the survey tomorrow at a session at 3:00 p.m. tomorrow.

There's a huge amount of conflicts with that and a number of meetings have been scheduled. So what I'm saying is if you could cover on the next - if Krista could cover on the next registry stakeholder group call, the stuff that you guys are covering tomorrow at the session we'd appreciate it.

Kristina Rosette: Yes, absolutely. Just a couple of things. It's not on the schedule because it is a closed session. One of the questions we actually had for you guys is, "Who should this be - who should this meeting be for?" I - what we heard from some of you before if you wanted it to be for contracted parties and the people who support them -- so RSP, for instance, may not be a contracted party but they might be somebody you'd want to involve in this -- your consultants that you work with.

So the reason it's not on schedule is it's close because we wanted to give you guys the opportunity to tell us who you want this to be for and be able to do that in a session with us. So it's - just a reminder this session is for not just registries although you guys are very important, it's also for registrar's, applicants, and then applicants and if, you know you're a service provider if you wanted to include them.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Kristen. We're running out of time here. We have one more agenda item. So Kristina I saw your hand. Go right ahead and then I'll note for everybody that Donna has suggested in chat that perhaps a webinar -- a joint webinar -- for the registries and registrars together would be a constructive for those that can't make the session tomorrow but we can take that offline. Okay, so Kristina and then we'll move on.

Kristina Rosette: Hi Kristina Rosette. I - just along the lines what I was thinking, you know, if you could have a session tomorrow transcribed, make it available to us, then there's no, you know, that eliminate some of the duplication.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks. So we have the last item on the agenda now which is to discuss studies and metrics to inform the AOC review for the new gTLD program. Then Karen is here. I saw her come in. Hello Karen, thank you. We probably only have five minutes left, thank you.

Karen Lentz: Thanks Keith and thank you registries. So I'll be quick and I don't know if you had, you know, specific questions on this as an item but I'll kind of recap where we are. I've been briefing you for a while on the economic study that we have underway and this originated in some metrics proposed by the GNSO and ALAC to help collect pricing data which would be one effort to look at in this competition.

What the impact on competition has been of the new gTLD program. And so we've hired an analysis group to undertake that study for us. They came up with a sample of TLD's and a sample of registrar's to study. We kicked off the study and started requesting some data from contracted parties back in March -- and thanks to those of you who did respond with your data.

We are pretty much wrapping up the data collection and analysis of these. We expect to publish the report from that study in August. If you were in the new gTLD program review session yesterday we went through some of the findings from that report. I'll also note that the studies to be repeated in one year so I'll - this will go on for a while.

And I also wanted to note that we have Greg Radford from analysis group who's one of the key analysis in the study here at the meeting. Are you in the room Greg? Back? In the very back there. And he's happy to talk to anyone who has questions or feedback to us on that.

In terms of -- I'll just briefly mention some other metrics as the pricing ones were only a few of a larger set. We are also in the process of collecting a lot of data that comes out of zone files and transactional reports and all things that are publicly available and those will be available on a sort of dashboard which we expect to be releasing and announcing in probably in a couple of weeks so you can look for that as well. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Karen. Any questions or comments? Okay, I see no questions or comments in the room or in chat so with that I will hand it over to Akram for any closing remarks and we thank the GDD staff for joining us today.

Akram Atallah: Thank you Keith and thank you to all of you for having us here. I hope that we're seeing progress in the way we are dedicated to serving you guys in both on the services as well as the customer support side so we have more people focused on your needs. And please, you know, let's keep the communication open. It doesn't have to be formal.

If you see something that we can do better or something that you need us to start doing that we're not doing out - more than share if you could send an email, approach me directly, and, you know, talk to any one of the team. We will get on it and figure out how to address it. And with that thank you very much. I hope you have a great meeting. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Akram and thanks to the GDD team. I do think that based on the reports that we've had here today in the engagement that I do sense increasing enhanced collaboration and some serious progress -- so thank you very much for that and let's keep it up.

Akram Atallah: Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you.

END