RySG Meeting
Buenos Aires, Argentina
Tuesday, 23 June 2015
RY 3: Afternoon Session (following meeting with ICANN Board)

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Keith Drazek: Okay, so again apologies for the slight delay in getting started here but appreciate your understanding. The first item on our agenda actually is a presentation from colleagues from Westlake Consulting for the groups that - sorry the group that conducted the GNSO review.

We decided to consolidate their presentation into this session rather than doing it twice independently as the contracted party house that ICANN and the GNSO thought it was reasonable that we would have this session now together. So please join us.

All right so while we're getting situated let me just run through the agenda briefly. So we will have the presentation with Westlake. We have allocated 20 minutes for this but just to note that 20 minutes will need to include any questions and answers and dialogue and exchange.

And then we'll talk about GNSO council issues and motions of interest to the contracted party house, planning for the GNSO council chair nominations, pending public comments periods to the extent we need to discuss those.

I know the two that we've listed, Whois accuracy program specification review and privacy and proxy working group draft report are both of interest to the registrars and we certainly want to engage with you on that.

The issue of URS and legacy TLD's is something that was discussed by the registries earlier. I had quite a lively discussion on that and felt that it would be a good idea for the contracted parties to discuss that as well together.

And then a review of any topics that we plan to raise with the ICANN board. So with that let's get down to our colleagues from Westlake.

Richard Westlake: Thank you Keith. My name is Richard Westlake for the record and I have my colleague Colin Jackson both of us from Westlake Governance here and we are the independent reviewers as Keith says.

Now, we have a very short period of time. If I could perhaps ask that whoever has the slides could take us to perhaps straight to number 7 would be good place to start.

Right, got it right. Those who have been involved in the GNSO review will be aware that we've been working on this process now for just over one year since London ICANN 50 and it's been extended in order to allow us to gain the level of feedback and commentary we've needed.

We are now at the stage having gone through some original draft text with the GNSO review working party that we have a draft that is available on the Web site for public comment.

That is open until the 20th of July. So you have approximately four more weeks for anybody who wishes to do so. To those who commented through the working party earlier thank you. To those who haven't but wish to please do comment now because this is the final opportunity before we're mandated to produce our final report.

Once the public comment period closes on the 20th of July we have to produce our final report by the end of August where it then comes back to ICANN and it will go to the SIC who will then recommend whether or not the report should be accepted by the board.

Now the recommendations we have produced have come in total to 36. Now we recognize in relation to feedback we've heard from some people that's a significantly large number.

So to make it easier to absorb and to gather we have grouped them into the four themes you see up there. I would be surprised if any of those is a surprise to anybody.

Participation and representation certainly are the bulk of the recommendations that we think should make a significant difference. The second is around

continuous development particularly some enhancements and refinements and tightening within the PDP process itself.

The third one because transparency is a part of the values of ICANN is just to improve and ensure transparency within the way the GNSO operates in total. And again and because the GNSO doesn't operate in a vacuum but is part of the greater ICANN we've made some recommendations.

Two recommendations that as far as is responsible practicable and having regard to the fact that there are always limited resources, limited time availability and a lot other priorities that to the extent possible the GNSO's policy development program should be aligned or at least not inconsistent with ICANN's broader strategic plan.

For those who haven't had a chance to read the report it is available. If you have an interest in only one or two of the areas that we've commented on please read the report summary at the start that gives you the overview.

It doesn't give you the analysis or the full rationale. To give you the broad picture to understand why this isn't a smorgasbord but is in fact an entire set of recommendations that we would like to put to you.

With that could I then perhaps invite any questions, any comment, any feedback rather than laboring what's in the slide deck here?

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much. So we'll open the queue for questions or comments, inquiries. Thank you Brett.

Brett Fausett: I have a quick question. Thank you, I appreciated the presentation that you gave over the weekend at the council's meetings. On transparency one of the recommendations was that there be transparency around the statements of interest I believe.

Have you thought about how you'll handle, you know, it's easy for those of us in the room. We all, you know, have typically a company that is paying for us to be here.

It is less easy for some members of the IPC who obviously represent trademark interest but they'll often say that they're speaking in their personal capacity or they're representing their law firm.

They don't actually identify the clients who ultimately have an interest in their advocacy. So I'm wondering how you address people whose interest may not be as clear as it is for those of us who are registries and registrars.

Richard Westlake: Thank you for that question. Yes it's a very personal question and we did address this and what we've said in our report I think we've been quite clear is that we do recognize that some people operate under client confidentiality and lawyers would be classic cases of that.

They can't identify their customers and we've said in that case we do think it is essentially that you identify the issue and the if you like the view that you wish to take.

And to be quite transparent about that because otherwise you have a real danger of people hiding behind anonymity and sending comments which may or may not be valid, may or may not be impartial.

But we do think it's important to say whether people are representing a client who has, who is paying them to make a particular point.

Keith Drazek: Okay very good thank you Brett. (Jordyn).

Jordyn Buchanan: So Jordyn Buchanan with Google. I apologize I haven't fully digested the report yet but I'm wondering if you had the opportunity to not only take a look at the GNSO with regards to how it operates today and looked at sort of incremental improvements.

But if you had the opportunity to compare the policy development process within ICANN to other models in particular I'm curious about whether our current stakeholder group and constituency model is conducive to creating policy as opposed to other models like the ITS where people just participate sort of ad hoc in order to develop the technical documents that the ITF produces.

Richard Westlake: I can give you a partial - Richard Westlake again here. I can give you a partial reply and then I'll ask Colin to complete that which is to say, yes we have looked at other comparable processes.

I was for many years involved with New Zealand's national standards body and while not entirely comparable but certainly there are issues of having adequate representation from sufficiently diverse perspectives including consumer and user and producer groups.

There are questions of the process that was followed to achieve consistency and then there is the question of was some form of consensus actually reached. So I think there are significant parallels and I think we've drawn some of those out.

Colin Jackson: I'll just comment further if I may, Colin Jackson speaking. I having also observed an ISO process from the basement as it were I would have to say that the PDP is a lot better than that.

A lot faster at producing outputs anyway. I see Richard is nodding. Yes regarding that we have made recommendations about diversity of membership of working groups and that's something believe quite strongly.

Could we move the slide deck forward by two please? There those lines are the Internet, numbers of Internet users in China, India and U.S. and I hardly need to explain which is which when you look at them.

The point of course being that very large numbers of users are coming in from places that have not been traditionally been the core of the Internet. It is in our view central that people from these places and people with a more diverse outlook, diverse cultural assumptions participate in making policy and that recommendation and the supported designed to facilitate that.

Richard Westlake: If I could just go back on Colin's point as well sorry, not on this one but on the time consumed. If I remember right the ISO average standard development time had been improved from 35 to 32 months I think that was the median.

But there were a number of national standards bodies of which mine was certainly one where we had got the standards development process timetable down to approxi8mately 14 months I think was the median.

And saying that in fact much shorter than that and you will compromise the consensus building prices.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Richard, thank you Colin. Any other questions or comments? Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: It's an agenda question, do we have this on the agenda later? If not I would like to add a brief time and I'd like to request that the registries that we try to identify three or four volunteers who would take the lead in reviewing the draft comments that were submitted for consideration and come back to the broader group in a couple weeks to generate discussion and so forth.

We really need to get on that and if we don't get some specific volunteers I'm afraid it won't happen and I know how busy we all are but it is important because the results of the review are going to impact as registries, registrars too but I can't speak for the registrars.

And so I'm kind of giving people a warning. It would be nice to have three or four volunteers when later in the day when we're not in our joint meeting for that.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Chuck. Yes I think that's a great suggestion. So any other questions or comments from registries or registrars for Westlake Consultants on the GNSO review report?

I thought you were waving to somebody over there, go ahead Michele sorry.

Michele Neylon: Thank, Michele Neylon for the record. I did mention this at the GNSO over the weekend and I mean I think there is some very interesting, very important points raised in the report particularly around language barriers which I think is something that needs to be addressed.

But as I mentioned in the weekend I think we've got a bit of back and forth, though there probably isn't a simple solution and, you know, some of the recommendations they might be things that people would look at as being something to aspire to as opposed to something that would have to be achieved at all costs because, you know, in terms of saying getting diversity in workgroups.

Part of the recommendations is to talk about diversity and gender, diversity in language, diversity in culture and, you know, in some workgroups you're lucky to get two or three people turn up regardless of anything else.

So unless you can kind of sort of say to people well no you can't participate because even though you're the only person who cares about this topic you don't fit the demographic.

Richard Westlake: And we do recognize thank you, thank you Michele, Richard Westlake here. We do recognize that it's not a perfect science that you can make all the intent, you can provide all the goodwill, all the intention, all the facility for people to participate. You can take them to water you can't make them drink.

Keith Drazek: Thank you. (Jonathan).

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Keith. I guess this is kind of in support of Chuck's point. I think it would be really good if we could have a group possibly from both of these groups.

So it's kind of appropriate that we're talking about it here but in any event, you know, there are a comprehensive set of recommendations that we could go through and assist in supporting or take whatever view we - but of course

one of them is particularly pertinent to us and that's any views that support our position in having the two house structure.

And the nature of that carefully and very finely balanced structure and the value that that has to us as collectively contracted parties. So I would encourage anyone to A, recognize that it's important to have a look at the report and provide the final input as Chuck suggested and to bear that particular point in mind, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Jonathan. Just take a moment. Is anybody having a hard time hearing? Is the volume okay in the room? It's quiet yes. I think we lost a little bit of the volume in the mikes. Maybe we'll just turn that up a bit I would appreciate it.

Okay, I think - sorry Kristina sorry.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon and I apologize if I missed it because I did read the report in transit. But what I wasn't clear on is whether or not, you know, clearly the recommendations are (semantic) but it wasn't clear to me that you had actually done any prioritization from your perspective.

And I guess the question is if I'm correct in understanding that there wasn't that type of prioritization do you anticipate doing that in your final report and/ or would public comment to that effect be at all useful?

Richard Westlake: Thank you it's a very good question Kristina. No we haven't at this stage provided any view on prioritization because priorities are very different from different groups, different constituencies, different stakeholder groups, different houses.

The question where we are looking at we're not going to come to a conclusion on that until we have received whatever the final public feedback is. But even then we may well not come down but say in fact the difficult bit is about to start which is implementation.

And when you get to implementation it may actually be more appropriate that the GNSO collectively sit and decide what the priorities are. To a degree we have in that we've got the four themes and the fact that one has 14 and one has 2 and so on in itself should say these we believe are the areas that will make a difference but we haven't actually brought it down to the micro say this is an A or a B or a C.

Keith Drazek: Okay Chuck, last comment and then we'll move on.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and I'll be brief but one of the things we talked about in the GNSO review working part this morning at this meeting was the possibility of using

an implementation review team which would fit very nicely in terms of doing I think in prioritizing allowing the community then to establish those.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Chuck. Richard last word.

Richard Westlake: Thank you, it's not a direct response to what Chuck has said but other than to say for a start I would repeat this is the last opportunity people will have to comment before the final report is submitted but then and so I would invite people please if you haven't to do so.

And secondly, once the report has been submitted the implementation work is likely to be quite extensive, it's likely to be quite demanding. So I would on that certainly echo Chuck's comments.

Colin Jackson: One other supplementary almost, I heard (Jonathan) saying that the lack of recommendations about changing the house structure and so forth were welcome in his perspective from his point of view.

If that is a point of view of people in this room I would urge you to consider commenting on that since I am certain we will receive a lot of comments to the contrary.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much and Richard and Colin thank you for joining us today but also for the extensive work that you've done over the last year on this very important topic so thank you.

Okay, let's move right into the next items for discussion. Next is the GNSO council issues and motions. I can say that the registries have already been through our view of the pending motions before the council.

With that I will I think hand it over to (Jonathan) and then Michele, whoever would like to discuss your views on the motions we can certainly get into that.

Jonathan Robinson: So I mean we've been through the five motions before the council and just to keep the discussion short initially we have decided to vote in the affirmative for all five motions.

So we'd be perfectly happy to discuss with you if there are any nuances or concerns or issues around them but that's the starting point. So I guess the question is are you in the same boat and/or are there any specific motions you'd like to unpack a little and discuss more, thanks.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks (Jonathan), Michele Neylon for the record. We had - excuse me I think I'm about to lose by Tuesday, which is a new record for me. We had

quite a bit of discussion around the motions and other issues at GNSO this morning led by James and Volker.

I think where we are at the moment is supportive of voting in the affirmative on four out of the five motions. The fifth one is something I think we still should discuss a little bit further and you don't get to win a big prize for guessing which one of the five motions is the one we have issues with.

Jonathan Robinson   Well just put us out of our misery maybe you could make that unambiguous.

Michele Neylon: The IANA transition, I'll hand over to Volker to explain.

Volker Greimann: Yes, Volker Greimann speaking for the record. We also have an issue with some of the wording in the motion on translation especially with regard to one of the recommendations.

This was not noticed when the motion was presented to the council on Sunday. And thanks to the quick work of the members of that working group that language was seen as a clerical error and corrected, the motion amended and we no longer have an issue with that one.

Jonathan Robinson   So are you discussing the updated version of the motion for CWG just to check that? James.

James Bladel: No and that's why I was going to mention is that they haven't seen the version that we've been passing around quickly. Marika, (Jonathan) and I have been updating some of the language on that that addresses the loose end that I pointed out in our meeting.

So I think that we're good that we've captured that contingency for some of those dependencies if they were to fall down and that chain of dependencies were to break.

And I think we're good with the new language I just don't know if it's been circulated yet. I'll have to - it is on the council list? Okay I'll forward it to the registrar list. Sorry things are happening very quickly.

Michele Neylon: Keith so that's - I think we're pretty much done then on the motions.

Keith Drazek: All right very good. Well it sounds - this is Keith for the transcript. So it sounds like we're aligned on the support for all five of the motions so that's great news.

(Jonathan) are there any other council issues aside from the motions that we should discuss?

Man 1: (Jonathan) reminded me earlier that there is 10 minutes on the council agenda to talk about ICANN's reaction to dot sucks. It was raised by the business constituency.

They want to address it with no real agenda items here. You know, from a contracted party's point of view and I addressed this in our ExCom meeting briefly the other night with ICANN staff.

I have real concerns about ICANN sending any contracted party to, you know, the government authorities. So, you know, I've asked (Alan), you know, on what was the criteria by which you evaluated this.

I think it's better to talk about the general practice of referring any of us to a government regulator than this specific case I know that the BC wants to talk about this specific case but I think, you know, generally as I look at it even though I'm an interested party in the sucks debate the, you know, there's a bigger question here about, you know, when might we see a practice that we have adopted, pushed out to a regular.

So I open that up for any thoughts or comments.

Jonathan Robinson Yes just a further point of clarification. As I understand the BC concern and maybe someone else can speak more to this but as I understand the BC concern is precisely that.

It's less about the specific case in this instance but more about the reference outside of ICANN before bringing it back to be dealt with within ICANN.

Keith Drazek: (Liz) go ahead.

(Liz Burke): (Liz Burke) PIR. Do we have any clarity on why the dot sucks RA was not put out for public comment? And I'm speaking specifically about the fee arrangement.

Man 1: You're talking about the registry agreement between ICANN? I don't have any insight into that. I would only think, you know, from ICANN's point of view I don't think they've put any registry agreements out for public comment as they've been negotiating them along the way.

Keith Drazek: Okay very good. Sorry Michele go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Just to that point, Michele for the record. My understanding is that the initial contract is never put out for comment. The only - if there is an amendment to the contract then there might be but not the initial one.

There are only (unintelligible) and things I mean - sorry so okay, so no.

(Liz Burke): Sorry just to follow up (Liz) again. Because it was such a material change and it's the base RA right and it was a material change to the agreement I at least in my mind would have expected to have ICANN at least put it out and let the community know.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Liz). Jordyn and then we need to move on.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes so I mean it is the case I don't think any other agreement has been put out for public comment but also the case I believe that every other registry sign the form agreement.

So there's been no alternations to the form agreement to put out for public comment prior to now that we're aware of.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jordyn. All right we need to move on. So the next item on the agenda is planning for GNSO council chair nominations. (Jonathan) would you like to tee this one up?

Jonathan Robinson Quite simply my term from a registry stakeholder point of view ends in October and obviously I'm council chair from - and my position originates from the contracted parties.

So I guess there's a couple of issues really. One is, you know, so we put forward a nomination in any event? Do we talk to the non-contracted party's house about what their views are whether or not their expectations are to try forward a candidate?

It is to the best of my understanding the only place we can, a candidate that may derive from this who is someone who is an existing councilor at the present.

One of the thoughts I had was whether or not a councilor that joins the council in October could potentially become council in October could potentially become council chair.

But I am advised and understand that it has to be an existing councilor. So for the purposes of this discussion our slate, our full slate across the whole council is anyone who is on the council present and who is not leaving the council in October.

My personal view is that we should evaluate this. We should take a view that the person we would want to be the chair of the council should be that person who is best qualified regardless of which house they originate from.

And I think we should propagate that message amongst ourselves and probably amongst the non-contracted party's house. So I would think we should argue to not be partisan but to encourage all of us whichever house we derive from to talk to people about qualities and skills and capabilities.

And then the other issue is about the ability to commit time. I mean I can speak to it and others will be able to speak to it that you could commit as much time as you have to this but it would be hard and clearly we don't evaluate this on a kind of standard 37-1/2 hour or 40 hour week or however you might evaluate a working week.

But I would encourage anyone thinking about this and talking to any prospective candidates to envisage that the candidate would be prepared to put in approximately half of their time and for their employers should they have an employer or for them to evaluate it on that basis.

And so those are the key criteria I would be putting forward, you know, it's a case of skills, capabilities first and second, ability to commit. And clearly you'll be aware that those skills and capabilities are things like the ability to chair a meeting, the ability to deal with complex issues and negotiate and manage those.

The ability to often be called on to represent things yet not really technically be empowered to represent anything. There are a number of significant challenges that go with the role including obviously understanding the mechanics and operations of the council.
To the extent that it's necessary I'll be willing and able to assist with whatever handover is required. So I'll make myself available to whoever comes in but generally I think my message to the group is let's think amongst the entire council population who do we think is best qualified to step into that role regardless of stakeholder group or house that they might originate from.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much (Jonathan). Michele you're next.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Michele for the record. No I think what (Jonathan) says is very, very important and very true be it for the position of chair of the GNSO or any position on the GNSO council.

But we need to be sure that whoever is representing our interests is the best person qualified that they are able to do so in a fair and even manner that they are able to handle the workload, they're able to commit the time and that they won't be an embarrassment or an empty chair.

I mean it's far too easy at times to look at some of these positions as being how can I frame this, as being important as being something that you can add to your CV.

But unless the person who is filling that role is the best qualified person for it then it is a problem. And personally just speaking personally not on behalf of anybody else I would be more comfortable seeing a good strong person from I don't know the IPC or something rather than having a weak registrar or registry. Yes and that was for your benefit Kristina.

Jonathan Robinson   I'd like to object I think Michele has gone too far this time.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Michele. Any other questions or comments or views on this? Chuck go right ahead.

Chuck Gomes: First of all let me totally agree with what both (Jonathan) and Michele said that the primary criteria has to be somebody who is qualified and can commit the time.

If those both aren't there it's the wrong person. But it's a really important role and if we make those assumptions that those are the prerequisites I would suggest and I'm perfectly open to strong disagreement on this but it's maybe a little bit far-fetched recommendation.

But I would suggest that Keith and Michele reach out to the chairs of the other two stakeholder groups the non-contracted parties and let them know that that is our belief that those are the two criteria.

And if they can identify someone that meets those we would seriously consider supporting them. I know that they have wanted for a long time and some of you come from that house previously they really would like to have somebody from their houses.

Now we know that they have the awkward situation of having a difficulty identifying a candidate that both groups will support. That's really the key issue with regard to GNSO structure.

And so I would suggest the two chairs reach out to them and say hey we think these are the criteria. We have no problem supporting someone from the other house if those criteria are met and we would seriously consider that.

I think that would be a nice gesture to them. Now in the recent past they haven't been able to produce someone I think mainly it was who had the time. They probably had several people who could do it if they had the time.

But I throw that out, again if people think that's a crazy idea I'll accept that.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Chuck. Jordyn and then we need to move on.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks, so one thing just to take up a point that (Jonathan) made which is that our pool of candidates is the current set of councilors. So I think that is true if you want to have a chair, a new chair immediately upon (Jonathan's) transition.

But the bylaws for the operating procedures do allow for the vice chairs to temporarily operate. So if for example there was someone from the non-contracted house or from our side that we thought was an amazing candidate that was not currently on the council we could in theory have that person run for council and hopefully get elected.

And no one could replace (Jonathan) immediately and then, you know, the vice chairs could run it for a meeting or something like that and then have someone else pick it up.

So I agree with Chuck's suggestion I think that's great but that may give us a slightly larger universe of options.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Jordyn. Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette. Without betraying too many confidences from my former life in the CSG I will say that there is definitely an interest in having a chair from the non-contracted party house.

But it has always for the nine years I was involved more an issue of time commitment. I would also say while I recognize Jordyn's suggestion I think we did have that happen once on the council and it was very disruptive to the operations.

So I don't know if the registry stakeholder group or the registrar stakeholder group charters would allow to have an early election so that you have a councilor seated before the chair election if that's the concern but that might be another less disruptive way to go about it.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Kristina. So I think we need to move on in the interest of time. (Jonathan) thank you for teeing that up and a very important topic but not something that we'll resolve today obviously.

Next item on the agenda is pending public comments. So the two items that we identified of potential interest here are the RAA who is accuracy program spec review and then the privacy and proxy working group draft report.

Would anybody from the registrars like to take the lead on introducing these particular points? James I know that you've raised these in the past particularly privacy and proxy and I would defer to anybody who would like to volunteer here.

Michele Neylon: So I mean the privacy and proxy I think is the one that from the registrar side is the one we are probably most concerned about at the moment. When no matter people stand on this issue there is a push to make significant changes to which entities which people would have access to privacy proxy services.

I mean what essentially you could end up with is a situation where as a registry, sorry as a registrar you would have to get involved with issues around content control and content policing.

Bearing in mind that whatever the percentage is these days over the Internet that might use domain names but isn't necessarily public accessible that does become a bit of a problem, a bit of a challenge.

But while the burden of this may rest with the registrars and proxy privacy service providers it will impact the registries as well. Obviously we as a stakeholder group do not have a uniform position on this and cannot really have a uniform position.

It is something that is of deep concern I think I can say that confidently. So maybe some of my fellow registrars may wish to add further color to this. I'll recognize Jennifer then Volker.

Jennifer Standiford: Jennifer Standiford web.com for the record. I'd just like to clarify there is actually an alliance within the registrar stakeholder group, not the registrar stakeholder group in its entirety that have taken a position publicly against some of the items that are currently in the preliminary report.

I'd also like to point out within that alliance there are registrars that are geographically based that are subject to local laws that prevent some of the recommendations, some of the actions associated to the recommendations within the report.

The alliance obviously will have various recommendations depending upon where they're geographically based associated to certain things such as a court order, what's considered proper documentation for the reveal process and have concerns around some of the items related to how you define a financial transaction Web site associated with financial transactions and how that's defined.

So we will be submitted comments to both of the items listed above. One from the alliance and one from - we're circulating a draft, one from the registrar stakeholder group on the Whois.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Jennifer. Volker go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Throwing a little curve ball here one thing that we have to bear in mind that should this program come to fruition as it's currently foreseen we would essentially be talking about creating a third group of accredited parties within ICANN.

This is in many cases the Whois privacy service provider are affiliated with registrars and would probably fit into the registrar stakeholder group but in many cases there are also unaffiliated privacy proxy services that are not registrars.

And therefore could argue that they would be a third group of accredited parties and therefore they are proof of contracted parties which would also effect potentially the house structure.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Volker that's a great point. Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jeff Neuman. Just a quick question. Before the preliminary report came out did the registrars in that group object to those provisions that they're now - that this alliance is now objecting to?

I just want to make sure from a procedural standpoint. What we don't want to do right is put the council in a position of going against what's in a report right because we've been arguing for years that the working group is where the work should be done. So it would be good to have that back up.

Volker Greimann: Essentially the report does not recommend anything towards these issues. It delineates the arguments that have been made in the discussion and says these are open questions please comment on that to give us further guidance.

That was something that we could not very well argue against because it lists both options.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Volker. Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchannan: Yes so Jeff I think we're not talking about instructing councilors to do anything right now we're talking about public comments on the report right. And so presumably non-participants in the working like one of the features of the process is at some point the working group gets to the point and publishes

the report and then people comment on it including potentially stakeholder groups.

So I think in that context it's fine to say whatever the broader group says now that it sees the report.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I'm sorry yes I misspoke on that. My question was generally like what I would hate to hear is that the people in the group agree to all the - if there were recommendations which there are not I would hate to hear that the people in the group all agreed to it and it was had consensus on the report and now we're kind of substituting that but I understanding what you're saying, yes.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jordyn, thanks Jeff. Over to James and then we need to move on.

James Bladel: Yes so just to emphasize that Jeff we've been kind of holding the line on this very unequivocally since day one. And the goal of this campaign was not to undermine anything that the working group has done or to cast any of its working in any sort of a negative light.

The goal was to step aside as providers and hand the stage to our customers because I think it was becoming clear to us those participating in the group that some of these decisions that were being discussed could possibly impact millions of customers of paid services that had no idea that these things were going on.

And that's I think is using the public comment mechanism exactly as was intended to raise awareness of this to the people who are actually being affected by it.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. I recall on a previous joint ExCom's call that there was some discussion of possible comparing or sharing of possible comments and we certainly stand open and willing to consider whatever the registrars would like to put forward as a beginning point.

So with that let's go ahead and move on. Next item on the agenda and I should note we just have 10, 15 minutes because we started 5 minutes late. We have 15 minutes left.

The next item on our agenda is the discussion of URS in legacy TLD's. As I noted previously - I'm sorry (John) go ahead.

Jon Nevett: Yes I'd propose that we would skip that because that could eat up the time very easily and then we go to the review of what we're going to talk to the board about in 20 minutes and then...

Keith Drazek: I have no objection unless anybody else does. All right so let's so I'm sorry Jon suggested that we skip over the topic of URS and legacy TLD's at this time and move directly to a discussion of the review of the respective discussions with the board.

And I see no reason to object to that unless anybody else does. All right sounds good.

So the topics for discussion with the board, we will be leaving here in 15 minutes to go to our session with the board. The items that we've identified as the registries for discussion are operational issues, you know, the long list the laundry list of data breach, trademark clearinghouse any number of the topics that have come up.

And it's not only to cite the examples but to really press the issue of communication and better communication and proper communication in addition to trying to find ways to limit these problems or eliminate these problems in the future.

And then we're going to pivot our plan the registries is to pivot from that discussion to talk about budgeting and the budgeting process to ensure that the parts of ICANN that we interact with are getting the resources they need to make sure that their systems are capable and that they are an appropriately funded service delivery organization.

And it's not clear to me that they are or they're not at this point but I think it's a matter of making sure that in future budgeting processes that the GDD and the folks that we deal with as customers have the resources they need to get it right.

Having said that we've also acknowledged the sensitivity about trying to call for more funding for example for any particular group because that could result in pressures for more funding overall is something that we clearly would not support.

So it's really more about proper allocation of resources. And then the third item for the registries is placeholder to discuss anything related to the IANA transition and/or ICANN accountability cross community working groups.

So those are the three topics that we've identified. We may only get to the first two depending on how the conversation goes and I don't know if you all have had your conversation with the board yet but it's a new format that was proposed.

Where I think as Brett reminded us earlier here in the registries is supposed to be I think six representatives subject matter experts or topic leads from the stakeholder group and then six board members or something like that and everybody else in the audience.

So it's going to be a different situation than we've experienced before. I'll stop there. Michele any lists from you?

Michele Neylon: Sure thanks Michele for the record. Yes just before I go onto the substance beyond the format we also got that missive and I have no idea whether this is going to be a roaring success or a total train wreck but I guess we'll find out. We'll be speaking to them later.

We have a couple of topics and in no particular order. We have raised issues with the board in the past so one of the things we thought we'd do was just give them an update on any of those things if action was required we get from our side to their side ICANN staff or whatever.

So we're just going to go through a few things there which would include universe of acceptance, contract interpretation and I also think we might mention Whois related initiatives.

A recurring theme that several of our members are quite excited about and found quite important is the general community workload. It's not exactly something that we can expect the board to make any substantive changes with but I think maybe just making sure that they are aware that things are not moving at a particularly fast pace or that things are not being studied in detail and simply because there is just so much going on.

The other one which is I think this is slightly a bigger topic in many respects is with respect to vocalization of the openness. And like as many of you know the Chinese Government made some announcements in the last few weeks which impacts both registries and registrars.

Also the Russian Federation has imposed a lovely set of terms on social networks and companies which to do business there and there are probably plenty of other examples that one could cite. So it's something that we thought we might raise with them.

And as a segue to that I also ended up having a glass of wine with a couple of board members the other evening who when she raised the topic with me which was like interesting because it was very rare that we decide to talk to them about something that they're actually concerned about.

And they said it was something that they were thinking quite deeply about. The other item that we did want to mention I think just in passing but I think it's something that, you know, it's just more a matter of how we frame this is just simply around the CEO search and the transition if there is anything that we can do to help with that.

That was way far down the list because obviously the simple answer to that one is, you know, we're covering that in depth in somewhere else. So I think I should have counted that off our list or (unintelligible) actually did. So those were are works thank you.

Keith Drazek: Great thank you Michele. Any comments or questions or thoughts? Your comment Michele about the CEO search I think is, you know, when we submitted our list of topics to the board this was well before Fadi's announcement that he was planning to resign.

And so I think that actually is a very important topic because they've already identified the chair of the CEO search committee on the board. It's going to be George Sadowsky again.

And it's clear that they're already starting to think to move forward in terms of the planning. And I had the change to have a conversation with George and he was very interested in input from us and from the community, not individuals at this stage but sort of like, you know, what is it that we as the community see as sort of the next generation of ICANN as an organization.

Who are we, what do we want from ICANN? And which of course is bounded by the bylaws and the Articles of Incorporation and the commitment and all of that.

And then what type of person as a leader do we want to have, you know, in that position? Do we want somebody who is internally focused and operational, you know, focused person.

Do we want somebody who is more maybe in the mold of Fadi today in terms of more the statesman, the diplomat somebody who is out on the world stage. I'm not saying that they're necessarily neutrally exclusive but George was I think asking some very legitimate questions about, you know, so what is it that we want to be as a community as an organization and what's the best type of leader?

Do we find somebody who is inside the community, do we look outside and again just questions I think very legitimate questions were posed.

Michele Neylon: Excuse me, just as I mentioned sorry I gave you a list of what was the original list but they rebutted the CEO question. So we can't actually have that conversation with them.

But I'm just going to go to James in two seconds but just to mention that did bring up the topic of ICANN's future leadership and how that might impact and how ICANN handles things for the future in our discussion this morning.

And one of the things that I think is something I can't remember who raised it but it is something that does concern us. Is that if the leadership of ICANN changes quite dramatically then some of the things that we are currently used to seeing where ICANN might draw the line on pushback against people.

That could change if the leadership changes. So for example a topic which has been a lot of concern to registrars is around abuse reports and where we are seeing reports that are more to do with matters of content.

And both Fadi and (Alan Grove) are going to push back on that but that might not be the case in the future. James.

James Bladel: No that was the topic I was going to raise. I know that we had our discussions about that. The concern is beyond just the CEO search Keith. The concern is that Fadi brought in a number of high level folks and built a very concise leadership team.

And I think we all understand that when CEO's turn over that usually percolates down to one if not two levels from that office. So very shortly thereafter.

And having that sort of turnover or potential for turnover in, you know, in the leadership team during the backdrop of the IANA transition is just a concern. Obviously it's not something that I think the board can go into great detail about because it's a personnel matter but they should be at least willing to acknowledge that it's something that they're aware of and that they are taking steps either comprehensively or on an individual basis to address it.

And to Michele's point whether it's an insider or an outside I think is a good question but I think even more importantly is understanding the potential successor's views on things like the transition on things like dragging ICANN into content management issues on things like privacy.

And all of these concerns that I think we've outlined here we'd hate to see them take an abrupt 180 for example on we found that elevating (Allen Grogan) to his role has been very useful and if the new CEO if he or she does

not believe that that is an appropriate C level position then I think that's going to be a challenge for us as an industry.

So we're going to have to determine what it is that we want and what things we want to stay, what things we want to change and then communicate that to the search process.

Keith Drazek: Great thank James. Very well said. With that I think we're going to draw a line under that particular topic. Thanks for all the input. We have one more topic for discussion and that's (Tom Barrett) I think would like to give a brief update.

We have like three minutes and then we have to leave this room and be in the next door room with the board the registries do by 2:15. So (Tom).

Tom Barrett: Thanks Keith. About a year ago ICANN created a partnership with the Egyptian Government for something called the DNS entrepreneurial center. So the idea was to help these underserved regions develop their DNS industry be it registries, registrars, resellers.
And so I was asked to develop a business draft for that right. Do it with music? All right, so as part of that DNS entrepreneurial center we created a business workshop, five day workshop that was conducted earlier this year.

They've asked us to come back and do more later this winter. And many of you by the way provided content for that which we appreciated. The reason I'm here today is one of the things we want to do is to create an online mentoring service for folks in these regions.

And all the people in this room we'd like to recruit as mentors for that service. What I'm looking for today is a few people who want to work with me to help develop that service.

I think we've already found a technology solution so it's more about the logistics of how we recruit the mentors, get them on board, link them up with the mentees from these various countries.

So if you're interested in helping out please approach me or shoot me an email, (tbarrett@inserving.com). Again the timing for this is after the Dublin meeting but probably before (unintelligible). Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much (Tom). Any questions or comments? Okay Michele anything else from the registrars?

Michele Neylon: No thank you that's fine I think we'll be I mean just so those of you who are not familiar with the concept I mean we do have a fairly regular joint (X Com)

call so there is communication between the registrars and the registries in between meetings. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Michele and thanks for the registrars for joining us. Yes, thank you Michele reminded we have a reception at 5 o'clock after the end of the business day for the contracted party house.

So we are hosting a reception for registries and registrars in the (Catalinas) Room.

Cherie Stubbs: And just a reminder we're adjourning to meet with the board and the meeting room is next door. We'll return here and resume the afternoon session at 3:30. Thank you.

END