
HYDERABAD – GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting
Sunday, November 06, 2016 – 12:30 to 16:45 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting, 12:30 to 16:45.

GRAEME BUNTON: Hey all. We're still getting some food and we'll get started in like three minutes.

Hey all. Just before we really get going and while this thought is in my head immediately, I thought that was a good and productive session with the Board. I think we need to think a little bit about going forward how we interact with the registries because it seems to me there's probably other business that we should be talking about with the registries rather than just our meeting with the Board. And so there's probably other topics that get dropped as we discuss that.

Probably what we do going forward is for the next meeting, is convene a separate session for registrars that are interested to work with the registries for that joint Board session so that we can work through those topics and figure out who's going to speak and have that ready to go so that we can use that hour we have with the registries more productively to talk about more issues of common interest.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

As part and parcel of that, I'd love to see more registrar participation there. We were a little bit underrepresented and it would be nice if we had some more people engaged in speaking in those Board meetings so that it's not quite so registry heavy. So as we think about Copenhagen in the future and we look at getting that smaller session together of people who are interested, I'd love to see participation and volunteers for that.

I'm happy to take other people's thoughts if they disagree with me. [Inaudible]. Glad to hear it.

Marika will be here shortly to talk about GNSO Council issues. I should remind you there's wonderful brochures about the RSG on our tables and I believe there's also Chinese and Arabic translations over on the side. So if you don't know who we are or what we do, take a look please and thank you.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Just on the brochures side, it just has Darcy as Tobias and Tobias as Darcy, whichever way you want to look at it.

GRAEME BUNTON: They're almost interchangeable.

Marika's here but she looks like she's still chewing on something so we'll give her just a moment.

Great. Alright. We're going to get started. I'm not sure if this is being recorded already or we need anything formal to get going but we're going to get going.

Thank you very much to Marika for joining us today to talk about policy stuff, especially after our previous session. We appreciate that you still talk to us.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thank you very much, Graeme. I did bring some slides along if you can maybe pull them up. I was just in the session that you had with the Board. Just maybe to clarify because I think Chuck already made that point as well. There is a set of principles in place that deal with policy and implementation. So at least from a staff side I think there is or there's supposed to be a transparency and clarity over who does what and which part of the process, and our GDD colleagues work with us closely when we're supporting the policy development phase. And again, we support them as well when they are supporting the implementation phase and of course there's a lot of coordination as well between us. Maybe that's not visible enough to the community and maybe we need to do better on that side, but it's definitely no longer the case that they work in isolation and just throw things over the wall and then suddenly realize that things are not implementable.

One point I wanted to make in that regard, if you do allow me the opportunity, and I know we need from a staff side we can often provide input on implementation concerns as part of the policy development phase. But I think it's also very important for you to go back to your colleagues who will be responsible for implementing policy recommendations to get their input as part of the policy development phase because, of course, they're the operational experts.

From the staff side we can provide some perspectives, but at the end of the day we're not the ones that are building the systems or making changes to systems, so I think it's a joint effort and important to engage all those that have expertise and knowledge in that process.

If we can go to the next slide.

I think I was asked to talk about GNSO issues and motions, although I think some of that you already covered as well this morning in your discussion. I wanted to take the opportunity here as well to point out that there is a GNSO project list that we update on a monthly basis, so basically ahead of each GNSO Council meeting we update that with the latest information. And again, if you don't have time to participate in working groups or be on weekly calls, I think it's a great tool to just in a couple of pages really see where the different projects are at. So it doesn't

only cover the projects that are in the policy development phase or in the working group phase, but we also cover those projects that are in implementation. So again, it gives you a snapshot of where the different projects are at and also with links.

If you want to go deeper into detail, there are links to the different websites or wiki pages and also information on who is Chairing those efforts, who is the staff support person for that respective project, so you also have a point of contact to reach out to if you have further questions or need further information.

So as you can see there, we have a little table that starts off that project list that provides an overview of which projects and which phase of the process they're at. We currently have around 20 projects on the way, which includes 10 Policy Development Processes that are in the various stages of development. And you see the link here where you can find the project list. And so if you have any tips or suggestions how we can make that information even easier accessible, do let us know. We're always open for suggestions and feedback.

Do you want to go to the next slide?

What I've just listed here – and again, I think this is an open discussion so if you had any questions or comments, feel free to raise your hand or interrupt me – I think most of you are probably aware of the four Policy Development Processes we

currently have in the working group phase. All these initiatives have or already had working group sessions during this week. There's the Next Generation Registration Directory Services to replace WHOIS, the PDP the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures, the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms and all gTLDs, and IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms PDP.

The first three on these slides, they're still in relatively early phases. A lot of work is being undertaken and all of them are of course on track to deliver at some point an initial report for public comment. On the Curative Rights one I believe their initial report is expected to be published relatively shortly after this ICANN meeting for comment.

Again, I think the main point I wanted to share is, it's important to keep up-to-date on these initiatives. Hopefully many of you are participating because we need all the perspectives represented in those initiatives.

Do any of you have any specific questions about any of these?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Not from myself. I think we're going to talk about a couple of these later on this afternoon in more detail, but I don't think there's anything that – Oh, I see McKailey's hand.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Thanks. The IGO-INGO Curative Rights thing, what realistically is the path forward with that at the moment? We seem to be having a kind of staring match with the GAC which degenerates into a yelling and screaming match at times. Can we just leave it in a state of stalemate or is there a path forward? What is it exactly?

MARIKA KONINGS: There are two separate issues at play there. On the one hand you have the Curative Rights one, and at least I think from a staff perspective that is on a path for initial report so any input that will be provided there including the proposal or advice that may come from the GAC in relation to that issue will need to be considered by that PDP working group and reviewed and analyzed.

And then there is the other issue which is basically there are still a number of outstanding recommendations in front of the ICANN Board as a result of an earlier PDP that looked at the IGO-INGO and Red Cross protections. Basically the situation there is that the GAC has issued advice already a while back as well that is in a certain extent in contradiction with some parts of those recommendations so the question is now indeed how those two can be reconciled.

I think on both sides – on the GAC side and the GNSO side as well the ICANN Board side – they need to consider how that can or should happen. From the GNSO side, there are provisions or mechanisms in the Policy Development Process that would allow the GNSO to modify the recommendations either before the Board considers them or should the Board reject the recommendations there is the ability to do so. But of course the ability doesn't necessarily mean willingness, so I think it's also a question of indeed what is the ask or what is the discrepancy between the two recommendations and I think based on some of the comments that were made during the session with the Board I think there's a desire as well from the GNSO side to better understand what is different from when that same input was considered as part of the PDP. Has something changed that would maybe result in a different viewpoint from the GNSO Council or from the GNSO community or is it just the same input that's provided that was already addressed and considered?

So I think that's a bit where things are at and hopefully a path forward will be found because I think most people are probably tired about talking about this subject at every single ICANN meeting.

Can we go to the next slide?

I just want to list it as well but I think it's also something we'll be discussing later. The PDPs are in the implementation phase and I know some of them were already discussed as well this morning. There's Thick WHOIS. I think a part of that is out for public comment at the moment.

A Translation and [Transiteration] of Internationalized Registration Data. There's an IRT in place that I think has recently kicked off and I think is also meeting this week or may have already met if I'm not mistaken. So if that's a topic that you're interested in please join that IRT.

Then there's the Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in all gTLDs, so those are the specific recommendations that were adopted. There's also an IRT in place for that one as well.

Then recently the Privacy and Proxy service Accreditation Issues IRT kicked off and I think they've already met as well and may have another meeting this week and I actually assume that many of you are involved in that one.

Again, I think it's really important that you are involved in those discussions, especially from a very early stage on because it's important to identify if there are any issues or concerns so they can be addressed. And as I noted before, there are specific processes in place that allow for either bringing back issues to

the GNSO for further consideration or working them through as an IRT to get to an implementation that works for all involved.

Want to go to the next slide?

There are quite a number of issues that are on the agenda for the GNSO Council at this meeting. I know that James already covered a few of those during the meeting. I think he already covered the Internet Governance one if I'm not mistaken and as well the Bylaws Drafting Team recommendations. So in addition to that, there's also the consideration of the appointment of a new GNSO liaison to the GAC, and the GNSO Leadership has suggested that Carlos Gutierrez should be appointed to that role. Then there's also a consideration of the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group final status report and recommendations. As you may know, that group was formed already quite a while back to look at how to facilitate GAC early engagement in GNSO policy development activities, and some things such as a liaison are actually the result of the work and recommendations that that group has undertaken. And this final status report and recommendations basically represents the wrap-up of their work under the Charter that they had and once, if when, that report is adopted the group will close. There are some recommendations in there that also monitor the progress and were going forward especially through the coordination and communication between the two Leadership Teams.

And then there's also the consideration of the adoption of a Charter for a Cross-Community Working Group on new gTLD auction proceeds. Just to note as well there's actually a session later this week that is intended to brief those interested in that effort on what is in the Charter. The expectation is that once a number of ICANN SOs and ACs have adopted a Charter that the CWG will kick off in a call for volunteers that will go out. It is very important to note that the CCWG was actually not going to be tasked on the side and are discussing how money should be spent. They will actually be looking at what different kind of framework or mechanism needs to be in place which would then be tasked for allocating or assigning the funds. So I think it's very important to distinguish those two elements because I think there's some confusion or concern that the CCWG would actually decide who gets what and that's definitely not what the Charter foresees.

Jeff?

JEFFREY ECKHAUS:

Yes, thanks. Just a quick question on that piece on the auction proceeds. Just for some clarity's sake, [is] one have to go before the other in terms of how that process works? So first that group has to come together and then it has to be completed and then it figures out the framework of how it could be spent? I'm just

confused on, can they run concurrently or they run independently?

MARIKA KONINGS:

No, the idea is that the CCWG will actually come up with what should be the framework or mechanism and which principles or guidelines would that mechanism need to follow, and then once that work is complete that would need to go to the ICANN Board – well, first to the Chartering organizations, they would need to approve it – then it would need to go to the Board, they would need to approve it, and once it's approved then that mechanism or whatever it is, is created and would actually put all the processes in place to start – whether it's applications or grants or whatever form it would take – to start that process.

JEFFREY ECKHAUS:

Okay, so once that framework is set in place, then the actual process can begin of whichever method is developed – if it's an application or if it's a lottery or whatever it could be – then it goes to... Okay, perfect. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Do we have any other questions for Marika on currently what's going on? I think we heard from our Councilors this morning in the joint session, their perspectives on some of the GNSO

activities this week. And we're going to touch on a couple of these other IRTs and PDPs later this afternoon.

Cool. I think that's it. Thank you for joining us, Marika. Appreciate it.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks as always for having me, and if there are any follow-up questions or anytime, feel free to reach out to me or any of my colleagues. We're happy to assist as we can.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Great. We're going to talk about Transfer Policy in a moment, but we didn't actually properly introduce ourselves or do a roundtable, so we'll get that started right now.

If anybody doesn't know me, I am Graeme Bunton. I am your Chair. Thank you for electing me. This is my first meeting. Bear with me as Chair on my first meeting ever. Bear with me as I learn some of those ropes.

The rest of your ExCom is mostly here.

We have Tobias who is our brand new Vice Chair, also learning the ropes.

We have McKailey down the end who has just taken over for Volker as GNSO Councilor and/or is about to do so at the end of this meeting.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Something along those lines.

GRAEME BUNTON: It's a little fuzzy. And we have Darcy, previous Vice Chair is now a GNSO Councilor, took Jen Gore's seat when she betrayed us all and joined ICANN staff.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Turncoat.

GRAEME BUNTON: I'm sure James is maybe in the room. Is James in the room – who is our other GNSO Councilor?

And we have Ben Anderson who is around here somewhere maybe – There he is. Hey, Ben – you were hiding; stealthy – is our Treasurer.

Theo Guerts is our Secretary and he is not here.

And if you haven't met her, everybody should meet Zoe. Zoe raise your hand. Zoe is our brand new Secretariat. She is doing

killer work this week and helping us get organized, and it's super appreciated. So we're very pleased to have her around.

Be nice to her or I'll beat you up.

MCKAILEY NALEM: You're still pint sized.

GRAEME BUNTON: I can be very furious.

Now that you know who your ExCom is, maybe let's do a little round the table. We can start with Jen over there and we'll get to you people in the back of the room as well.

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. This is Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff, Director of Registrar Services.

JEANNE GREG: Jeanne Greg, GDD Operations. I handle the Registrar side of things.

KRISTIAN ØRMAN: Kristian Ørmen, Larsen Data.

MATTHIEU AUBERT: Matthieu Aubert, SafeBrands.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible], [SRO].

HEATH DIXON: Heath Dixon, Amazon Registrar.

SAIRAM SURESH: Sairam Suresh, Amazon Registrar.

GREG DIBIASE: Greg DiBiase, Amazon Registrar.

VIAD DINCULESCU: Viad Dinculescu, DNS Africa.

JEFFREY ECKHAUS: Jeffrey Eckhaus from Rightside.

THOMAS KELLER: Tom Keller, 1&1 Internet.

LINDSAY HAMILTON-REID: Lindsay Hamilton-Reid, 1&1 Internet.

MCKAILEY NALEM: McKailey Nalem, Black Knight.

TOBIAS SATTLER: Tobias Sattler, United Domains. I'm Vice Chair.

BEN ANDERSON: Ben Anderson, NetNames, CSC, and Treasurer.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Darcy Southwell. I'm Endurance International, GNSO Councilor.

GRAEME BUNTON: Graeme Bunton from TuCows, Chair.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Stephanie Duchesneau, with Google.

ZOE BONYTHON: Zoe Bonython, Secretariat.

THOMAS BARRETT: Tom Barrett from EnCirca and the NomCom rep.

[SIMA ORLA]: [Sima Orla], open provider.

KAREN YU: Karen Yu from ZDNS.

[SUFRA]: [Sufra] from ZDNS.

JANELLE MCALISTER: Janelle McAlister from MarkMonitor.

SARA BOCKEY: Sara Bockey with GoDaddy.

GRAEME BUNTON: Then let's maybe work our way through the back of the room. I don't know if we have a roving mic. Do we have a roving mic?

ALEXANDER SCHWERTNER: Alex Schwertner, TuCows.

ANDREW BARRETT: Andrew Barrett, EnCirca

[HAGI]: [Hagi] from [INVIX].

[MARIO PESCHEL]: [Mario Peschel, INVIX].

KEVIN KREISER: Kevin Kreiser, GoDaddy.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Owen Smigelski, ICANN staff, Director of Contractual Compliance on the Registrar side.

DENNIS CHANG: Dennis Chang, ICANN staff, GDD Services and Engagement Program Director, primarily responsible for Policy Implementation Projects.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Eric Rokobauer, Endurance International.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: Michael Flemming, GMO.

CLAUDIA [MARTUZZI]: Claudia [Martuzzi] from the BC.

SERGE [GARBO NOV]: Serge [Garbo nov], [inaudible] Center.

DAVE BARTH: Dave Barth, Google Registrar.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm Pedro [inaudible] from south [inaudible] of India.

[ASHA]: [Asha], ICANN staff Registry Service and Engagement.

PATRICK PENNINCKX: Patrick Penninckx, Information Society Department Council of Europe.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, everyone. [inaudible], Media for Change and the Cellular Operators Association of India.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm [inaudible], [inaudible] Limited, Nigeria.

[CONNIE]: [Connie] from [inaudible].

MAGUY SERRAD: Maguy Serrad, Contractual Compliance.

JASMINE LIN: Jasmine Lin, ICANN staff, Contractual Compliance.

ROGER CARNEY: Roger Carney with GoDaddy.

TOM YACOBUCCI: Tom Yacobucci, ICANN staff.

AMY BIVINS: Amy Bivins, ICANN staff as well.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. I think that's just about everyone in the room. There are still seats at the table and those in the back should absolutely feel free to join us up here. There is nothing special about it. And if you haven't had lunch and you're a registrar, there's lunch in the room off to our side and you should help yourself.

Great. Let's get started. And the next topic I'm actually going to hijack slightly to talk about Privacy and Proxy, but let's start around IRTPC which I know many of you are concerned about.

So here's what the lay of the land looks like right now. Implementation is going live December 1st. We approached the Council with a letter, and thank you to Darcy and Stephanie for helping me with that. To say that the particular piece of it where there is registrar pieces causing change of registrant instead of registrant changes causing change of registrant, particularly on Privacy and Proxy, which we should carve those pieces out of the implementation going live December 1st and move that discussion into the Privacy and Proxy IRT. And that makes considerable sense because the initial change of Registrant Policy which is now I think four years old doesn't address Privacy and Proxy services at all, and it's appropriate place to put that discussion. And that discussion is happening currently so it's not like we're trying to push this piece off for forever. So it's a pretty immediate solution.

The mechanism that I think is worked out is that we get the GNSO on board so we shared that letter for discussion and we've been reaching out to various communities within the GNSO, and it doesn't feel to me at the moment like we have any considerable push-back. I haven't had anybody approach me directly. Which makes sense. I don't think it's a wildly controversial proposal. I don't think anyone has a real – I'm not sure what the metaphor I want to use – a real stake in that where they would not want this to happen. We just need to be careful

that A) we don't make a huge deal out of it and that we're providing a pretty narrow solution for a narrow problem, we're not trying to reopen the policy.

So the next step is going to be, now that we've sort of informed and educated everybody, that we get a letter to the GNSO that will be from the GNSO to the Board, and that doesn't need to be a motion from my understanding so we'll write that letter, we'll get the GNSO to adopt that letter, so that I don't believe has to happen at a meeting. Someone can correct me if I'm wrong on that. The GNSO will endorse that letter to the Board. The Board – assuming there is GNSO consensus on it – will likely then carve that piece out for us and move it into the Privacy and Proxy Implementation Review Team.

I think the next Board meeting that that could happen at – assuming we can get it on their agenda and we can get all of this done quite quickly because I think the letter would have to be done by the 20th – is December 8th, which is kind of interesting and I might ask Marika or Maguy to answer this question is, if we get a letter from the GNSO and there's GNSO consensus on it and it goes to the Board, the Board can't address that letter until eight days after implementation of the IRTPC goes live, what happens in those eight days? Is Contractual Compliance going to be leaning on us within that window or would there be some recognition that that letter exists, that there may be immediate

action from the Board on it? Does anybody have any insight or thoughts on that? Nothing from Marika. Sorry to put you on the spot, Maguy.

MAGUY SERRAD:

Thank you for the question, Graeme. It's not like we're waiting at the door, get ready, set, go, December 1st we're going to launch a monitoring and an audit of this effort. I hope you all appreciate that. At the same time, if and when we receive the amendment or change, there's a lot of changes coming with this Transfer Policy. I don't know if people are going to start implementing it ASAP or not.

What I can commit to this team here is, if Contractual Compliance receives a complaint, at a minimum we can initiate an inquiry not a notice and based on what type of complaint it is and how it's impacted based on the letter and the concerns we may make a determination to put it on hold or you may even have a solution and be able to resolve it.

So my commitment is, no audits on December 1st. No monitoring activities for the new policy on December 1st. But I do ask your patience because if we receive a complaint we do have an obligation to at least follow up and follow through even if it means, "Thank you for the complaint. There are issues that are being addressed and we'll get back to you." Is that fair?

GRAEME BUNTON: That seems pretty reasonable. Does anybody have any response to Maguy on that? I see Ben.

BEN ANDERSON: I think it would be quite useful to understand what kind of FAQs you're going to put up on the site for registrants if they're querying this policy.

MAGUY SERRAD: Thank you, Ben, for the question. I just sat through an earlier meeting between the GNSO and the contracted parties, and I followed you to the Board meeting and I always listen with heart and mind. There are two types of things we are working on. The team is in the process of updating the complaint form we have on ICANN.org. There is a section of it that we call "Learn More." So we are in the process of finalizing the documentation that's going to be put up there to support educating whoever is coming to file a complaint. But my ask of this audience, when we met in the closed session we presented you few slides and we haven't been doing that for a while at any ICANN meeting whether it's a lesson learned or a new policy coming out, how is Compliance looking at these efforts?

My ask of this audience is, when you have an opportunity – before December 1st if possible and if not we’re happy to entertain the dialog later – but take a look at those slides. We’ve done our best effort in translating to you what and how these thoughts of the policy and implementation is going to be addressed from a Compliance perspective. And if you would like to invite us to a call or a meeting with you or a subset meeting, we’re happy to accommodate that so we can align and proactively avoid not frustrating Stephanie but frustrating the whole world. Okay?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Great. Thank you. We will follow up on that. I’ve got another question from Ben.

BEN ANDERSON:

Yeah, I just want to follow up on that. Thanks very much, Maguy. I think, just from my point of view and from many of the registrars I think there’s just going to be an incredible amount of complaints about domain names being locked after something’s happened, and I think we need to be proactive in limiting the amount of Compliance complaints that you get that you need to send on by actively asking questions about did you opt in or opt out. I just want to limit the amount of time that we all have to spend on something that should be very clear.

MAGUY SERRAD: Thank you, Ben. We plan on doing that – asking the rapporteurs up front as much questions and possibly anticipation for to avoid sending it your way. And while we are all learning this – this is a new policy to all of us and we all know new policies will bring opportunities – I don't want to say issues – opportunities – so where we learn this and you face these opportunities and we have not caught them, please let us know. We'll make sure we will work through that. And we'll just take one day at a time.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Maguy. I should point out here that there is no guarantee that the process we're doing right now with the GNSO and the letter to the Board and make that happen, that that will work. So if you have not started trying to implement IRTPC, you need to do that. I would not rely on this working. You need to be out in front of this. You would be insane not to be out in front of this. And it's quite a bit of work. We're working on trying to make a piece of it better, but that whole thing is coming and don't think it's not.

Stephanie?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: I would actually reframe that a little bit and say that we are just working on a little piece of it, not that we believe is still open for interpretation, not trying to challenge implementation of the policy on a whole. From my perspective I would just echo what Graeme said with that in mind.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Stephanie. So that's kind of where IRTPC sits at the moment. I know it's been problematic for many people. Tom?

THOMAS KELLER: Just one clarifying question. Do we have a sense whether the GNSO will go for that or whether they're going to endorse it or not?

GRAEME BUNTON: My sense right now is that they will. I haven't heard any strong push-back or people pulling me aside personally and saying, "Not a chance." So I think there's a reasonable shot. But again, it's that narrow piece and it's not guaranteed. McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM: Just to Tom's point. This is something that we discussed at the GNSO already in the last couple of days and the first issue is to actually explain to people what we were talking about, and then

there's several groups said that they would need to go off and discuss it within their own groups. As Graeme says, we haven't had anybody come to us and go, "Hell no. We absolutely totally disagree with you. Hell will freeze over before we agree to it." But we haven't had a ton of people saying, "Yes, yes, yes. We're going to 100% back this." So I think we'll have to wait and see

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, McKailey. I saw Heath.

HEATH DIXON: I appreciate that we haven't heard anybody say no yet, but from the conversations that I've had with folks on the IPC and the RYSG, it sounds like they haven't even been talking about it. And so my concern is, given the short time frame that we have, not hearing a negative reaction isn't enough. If they want to table it, if they want to further discuss it, we're going to get into trouble from a timing perspective. So have we thought about what steps we can take to get it on their agendas and get some affirmative response from them?

GRAEME BUNTON: I don't think we have a mechanism to formally get it on anybody's agenda. It's mostly back channel conversations. Darcy?

DARCY SOUTHWELL: It was on the GNSO agenda and we actually did discuss it, but there's a little education involved there, like McKailey said. I think the IPC in particular has asked a lot of questions. I actually feel pretty good about what they've said to me so far. But nobody really objected. I think it's been on the agenda and everybody understands that there's going to be a more formal letter coming that we're going to ask the Council to forward to the Board.

I don't know how we get it any better on the agenda. It was definitely on there and nobody raised a red flag. There's probably a little bit more education to do, but we should be able to do that very easily in the next three weeks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Anybody else have questions on that procedure, where we're at? Stephanie?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: In response to Heath's question about how we get it on other people's agendas –at least speaking for the registries, it was one of the issues that was outlined in the document that I circulated to the registries and the registrars both in advance of the Board session. And I know we're planning on turning that into a more

formal correspondence to the Board to follow up on the session that we just had. So there's probably an opportunity there also for more substantive conversation within the Registry Stakeholder group around how, even if it doesn't necessarily affect them directly from a registry perspective or from an implementation perspective, how the process issues are similar and how this is something that we should probably be reaching across for and providing mutual support.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Stephanie. McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM: Just very briefly – If Heath, to your question about getting on people's agendas – If there's a document circulated to the GNSO Council and people are asked to sign on to it and endorse it then I would assume that they would take that back to their respective groups. So I suppose in some ways the letter, the document, kind of answers the question in some respects.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks, McKailey. We had carved out an hour for this particular conversation because I was worried it might take a lot of time, and we still have 40 minutes.

I'm going to bring up another issue momentarily unless anybody has more questions or thoughts on IRTPC that they'd like to share.

Nothing...Tom?

THOMAS KELLER:

Not so much about the IRTPC part itself, but what we've seen over the last couple years that we went through various endeavors to change transfer policy which made it a freaking mess [what it is but] now,. And the question is whether we should as a crew maybe together with registries sit down and formulate something what we might want as a transfer policy. Because what we have now is awful and doesn't get any better.

And I can totally understand that we as a crew don't really like to run another PDP, but since this is really something of our core business I think it would be good for us to actually go through these various policies and come up with something sensible, including some of the viewpoints people out there have in terms of registrant protection and stuff like that. But if this is going any further, this will be unmanageable at the end of the day.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Tom. I think you raise a good point. Transfers cause a lot of tickets. They're clunky. They're slow. The policy on them is in

many places archaic. You can't do it if there's privacy on a domain name. People have to expose themselves in the public WHOIS if they want to transfer. We talked a little bit about this on the list around whether we want to open up a new Transfers PDP, and there was some disagreement. And so this is probably a good place to have that conversation.

Starting out a new Transfers PDP, whether it's the equivalent of the RDS PDP or something where we look at transfers very holistically, we could solve a lot of problems but then we also open up these things to the rest of the community and who knows what else ends up in there.

I genuinely think there's lots of problems to be solved in there. I don't know what the right solution is. Or maybe there is another method which is we talk to the registries, we talk amongst ourselves, we figure out a sort of concrete, fundamental way like actual implementation of how transfers could be better and then we can bring that to the community and use that as a starting place for that discussion.

I see Marika's hand raised and then I see Alex and then I have McKailey in the queue.

MARIKA KONINGS: Just to note that actually one of the IRT Part D recommendations – and I just quickly looked it up because I had a recollection there was something in there that basically says, “Once all IRTP recommendations are implemented including IRTP Part D and the remaining elements from IRTPC, the GNSO Council together with ICANN staff should convene a panel to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine whether these enhancements have improved the IRTP process and dispute mechanisms and identify possible remaining shortcomings.”

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. So it’s sort of baked in that we’ll tackle that.

Alex?

ALEXANDER SCHWERTNER: I share the concerns, once we open up this process to the PDP that we end up with all the feedback that led us to the IRTPC, and that would be a pretty disastrous outcome.

That being said, if there is this provision to revisit all the IRTP PDP, I think we should start in getting something together where we feel comfortable that this may be a good option. And then once we have a document on the table then decide if it’s good

enough that we feel comfortable to get this through the process or not.

So I think we shouldn't be sold on starting a PDP but getting together a document and a policy that we like. I think that's a good next step.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Alex. I've been terrible at this. This is Graeme for the transcript. We should probably be saying our names because there's people who don't know each other so let's try and remember to do that.

I'm going to interject myself before McKailey briefly. It sounds like there's interest in talking about this a little bit more and I don't know if that's going to...when we want to do that. But if there is some sort of Transfer Subteam that we can spin up within the registrars to talk about this then maybe we can do that maybe after Christmas sounds like a better time because I think we're all heads down getting IRTPC in place. But maybe we can set that up if there's people and resources to do that.

In fact, that's another point about before we start another PDP, to your point we would need to have a lot of registrars in there. They would need to be able to commit for a long period of time to go through that process, and IRTPC is a good example of

where we just didn't have enough bodies in the room [and] to figure out what was going awry. And that's a very dangerous place to get to again.

McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM:

Thanks Graeme. A few things. First off, within the [IRTP] recommendations there's that review thing. I think that's good. I guess that makes sense to go back and look at what's happened out of four different PDPs. But the idea that we would come up with a completely alternative mechanism or something to handle transfers seems a bit backwards because ultimately that goes against what everything that we keep on fighting for here. So I think using the review to review what has been implemented might be a better approach.

But as you said, we need to have bodies and at the moment there are multiple reviews, there's multiple PDPs, that have taken all the bodies. So either 1) you need to wait several years before we can do that, or 2) you need to bring more bodies.

So for some of the larger registrars, as a small registrar I'd look to you guys and go, "Look, would you please, please, talk to your bosses, talk to the people that control the purse strings to

maybe get more resources because those of us who are at the smaller end of the scale simply can't.”

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, McKailey. It's a sort of classic registrar problem. I think you raise a good point there that that is maybe a little bit backwards an approach but perhaps there's still room for that discussion to figure out, we'll convene some people probably after the holidays to figure out what approach is best and if we want to build a strawman and gather input on that.

So Transfers, IRTPC – any other thoughts on that?

Great. So we still have half an hour on the schedule in this slot and there is something that should have been on our agenda and I forgot completely about but we need to have a discussion. The Interim Spec on Privacy and Proxy expires January 1st. That's in the RAA. We're going to talk about Privacy and Proxy IRT a little bit later in the afternoon under Any Other Business, but it's likely at best that wraps up January or sometime in 2019. I think it's entirely possible it goes longer.

ICANN staff have reached out to us about extending the Interim Spec. I think the pitch was two and a half years although Jen can correct me on that. And so we need to decide if we want to extend that Interim Spec on Privacy and Proxy.

We have options here. We do not have to extend that Interim Spec at all. We could just let it drop, and at that point there are no rules for Privacy and Proxy services. There are probably people within the community if I'm guessing that would find that unpleasant, and that may gain us ill will. I'm not sure that extending the Spec gains us the equivalent amount of good will. We certainly don't have to extend it for the period requested by ICANN. We could do six months, we could do a year, we could do whatever we felt like.

We need to think about this and I brought this up on the list a little while ago but I'm curious to see or hear anybody else's thoughts on this – whether you feel like we should extend that Interim Spec or not, whether we should leave it as is and let it lapse.

Don't all jump up at once. It's a pretty important topic and we'll have to vote on this. I see McKailey. Please.

MCKAILEY NALEM:

Thanks, Graeme. Just because we've got the option to do something doesn't mean we have to do something. I'd be wary of letting it lapse completely because even if in practice and in reality a lot of people will probably continue to follow what was in the 2013 contract. I can easily envisage a rather awkward situation involving members of the IPC and some other groups

getting up in our faces again. And after spending –like you – a couple of years on that PDP I could really do without it.

You're right, though, when it comes to the extension that we aren't obliged to extend it for as long as ICANN has requested, so extending it for a shorter period might be a better compromise. Obviously, the rest of you please you should weigh in on this. As they say, it's a big thing but that's just my personal view.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, McKailey. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: I would just like to open up the question as to whether anyone thinks that there's any actual advantage to extending the Interim Specification. I think McKailey's right that there are considerations we have to talk through about not doing so even though it's likely that most people aren't going to change their models overnight once it lapses. But I do think that the one thing not extending it would gain us is that it does put pressure on the Implementation Review Team to actually move forward, compromise, accept the recommendations, versus feeling like that can be stalled given that we have an Interim Spec that's going to go as long as two and a half years unchallenged.

GREEME BUNTON: Thank you. I see Heath. Anybody else want in the queue? Jeff, and then McKailey.

HEATH DIXON: I think that's a good point. One other thought that occurs to me is we're all thinking about this from our own perspective. I suspect, and none of us would do anything to change in a negative way. The question that occurs to me is, are we concerned that there are some registrars out there who would take that as an opportunity to take some pretty bad actions that would reflect very badly on us as a group and that might undermine our position in the IRT that's going on. I don't know the answer to that but that's what occurs to me.

GRAEME BUNTON: Sure. It's part of this discussion. It's a consideration. None of us in the room – the people that attend this meeting – are going to be de-engineering our Privacy Services to take advantage of no rules, but there may be some.

Jeff?

JEFFREY ECKHAUS: For me, my thought is why would we burden ourselves I would say with not additional rules and regulations because we've

already put these into place, but we're now subject to compliance based upon this Privacy Proxy Spec. So 1) I know it would probably lessen everyone's tickets that they would receive and for me personally I see no reason why we would I guess subject ourselves to additional scrutiny and rules and regulations even though they're in place now when there's no benefit to it at this time.

The other part is, it may be a way for registrars here for us to actually prove, "Hey there are good actors and bad actors," and saying "Hey, look. Nobody changed it. People have kept it in place even without the rule and that registrars are good actors and good parts to the community."

So I think that there's a lot of benefits there in letting it expire because it's just the elephant in the room. It gives us leverage as well, and let's just be clear about that. Me personally, unless I could be convinced another way which probably if you grab me and talk me into it I would probably switch sides but I see no reason to extend it without any sort of additional carrot to do so.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Jeff. McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM:

I think we all agree none of us are going to – in this room who have implemented the policy as for the contract – to go back and undo it. I just would be very, very, wary of removing it completely because it's – being blunt about it, I don't get tickets about this from my own registrar but I do end up in the situation where say yesterday with the DNS Abuse high-level topic thing where registrars in general are all beaten up on various topics, and if the entire thing around this policy was to address issues or concern that those in the security community and a lot of the brands and people at that were having completely non-responsive Privacy Services and non-responsive registrars. The reality is, those people out there exist. They're the bad actors. They're the ones who are causing headaches for the rest of us. And just to reduce a few tickets here and there, do we really want to give them the ability to have complete carte blanche to do whatever the hell they want even if it is only for a very short period of time? Just playing devil's advocate, guys.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, McKailey. Contrary to that, I think that rule or not isn't going to change how the bad actors in this space are operating. I think they're going to do what they're doing regardless of whether those rules exist or not.

Chris had a question in the chat. “What’s the worst that could happen – theft of a domain?”

My response is, I’m not sure that’s even a practical problem with this. I think it’s more what we’re talking about here is the impression of the Registrar Stakeholder Group as a whole is really the up or down side of this and how we feel that that might impact us.

We’re clearly not going to solve this particular issue today, but the January 1st deadline is coming up very shortly. I know ICANN staff was hoping for a decision on this in three days, which is not going to happen because our voting structure wouldn’t even allow that to take place because we haven’t had a chance to really have this conversation out in the open yet.

I’m still looking for more input. The downside of being Chair, I will share this with all of you, is that it’s rare that we get a strong mandate from the Stakeholder Group to make a decision on this and ultimately it’s not going to be my choice. It’s going to be all of ours when we have a vote. But I want to make sure everybody’s informed and up on this because it’s important.

Tom?

THOMAS KELLER: If we can't really find a benefit for all of us that makes it worthwhile extending this thing, there's no reason to do it. This is really just...this policy was imposed on us actually. We had to accept it at that point of time in the negotiations. It is sensible in some way. Now it has to be extended if you really can't find any better benefit that serves us,, let's not do it.

GRAEME BUNTON: Cool. McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM: Just going back to the thing around tickets and volumes and all that, there is data. And looking at the data that Compliance has released for the period of September, there were three complaints related to Privacy Proxy, there were 4,980 related to WHOIS inaccuracies. So the volume of complaints in terms of something using that part of the contract is negligible.

And also [to] second getting the mandate from the members. Welcome to my world. I used to have fun with that, too.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, McKailey. It's the most interesting thing I've learned so far.

I've got Darcy.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: To Stephanie’s earlier point about the IRT and holding the IRT’s feet to the fire, we’ve only had one meeting and as you know when you do those things it’s pretty much an overview and an introductory meeting. We haven’t even figured out how often we’re going to have our meetings, and that’s going to dictate how we get through a work plan. But I think it’s a good point because we only have I think about 40 folks in there, but there are people in there who there has been a suggestion may want to try to manipulate the policy that was put forth. And if that’s true – which again, only one meeting, we don’t know – but if that’s true, I think Stephanie’s point is a good one that at least having some sort of Interim Spec – maybe not two and a half years – but some sort of Interim Spec may help put pressure on that to move forward and not deviate from what the policy says.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Darcy.

Tom?

THOMAS KELLER: Just a point of process, I guess. If we say no to it now, does that mean that it’s a no forever basically until the new policy comes into play? Or if we see that there is unwanted behavior that we

can say we're going to extend it now for whatever period of time?

GRAEME BUNTON: That's a good question. I'm not sure what the mechanic is so if we let it expire can we re-up – if we give it six months and we go, "Oh, man. People are doing terrible things. Can we bring it back?" I don't know what the answer to that is. Does anybody know? Jen, do you have insight on that?

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. In anticipation of this question, we posed it to ICANN Legal and I am expecting a response but I have not received it yet.

GRAEME BUNTON: That response would be greatly appreciated because it may inform how we decide to move forward.

I saw Theo's hand up and then did I see you, Heath, in there? You're still thinking about a question. We'll come back to you after Theo. Theo is remote. Give it a go, Theo.

THEO GUERTS: I am remote. Good morning, how is the line?

GRAEME BUNTON: Good morning. Do you have a question?

THEO GUERTS: Okay. I think you guys can understand. I just have a comment there. This is basically when it comes to [PPVSIA]. That's basically Consensus Policy, so even if we do not have something in the contract or there is something in the contract, it doesn't matter because at some point we have to comply with it anyways. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Theo.

Heath, did you have something?

HEATH DIXON: Now that I'm thinking about it more, especially in the question of what will we do six months from now if we don't extend this. I'm not sure that we have the authority to – this is like a contract amendment basically – and so I'm not sure that a Registrar Stakeholder Group vote is the right mechanism for this and if it is, I'm wondering what kind of precedent that would set for ICANN coming to us with other concessions that they'd like for

us to make and negotiate outside of the normal RAA negotiation process.

Actually, now that I think about this, why I'm a little more concerned about the precedent that this would set. So we should definitely think about if we are going to agree to this, what the mechanism is that we want to agree to it.

In particular because there's the ICANN Compliance Team can attest from yesterday's meeting there has been concern expressed by some other members of the community about agreements being reached between two groups within ICANN that aren't going through normal processes. So I think we should definitely think about the "how" of this as well as whether or not we want to do it.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Sure. That's a good point, Heath.

Jeff?

JEFFREY ECKHAUS:

Thanks. Just two points on that. One, even though I was part of the negotiating team for the 2013 RAA I cannot remember about what the process is on if we don't come to this agreement, but I think one of the things that I think – this is just going to pivot

quickly on that – is that we’re saying we asked ICANN staff and ICANN Legal to get us a response of what we think the rule should be and I’d say to us, we should probably look at it ourselves. This is a two-party agreement. We should have our own legal opinion on it. And I think that, yes we would like some input from ICANN Legal of what their point is but I think it would be worth it for us to get our opinion on it just in case we want to because relying exclusively on them means that they’re the ones who set the rules what they believe it is where again, a two-party agreement – we both sign it, we both negotiate it. I’m not saying to get a full legal opinion but [for us] to have at least – I’m not a lawyer but if some others in the room to take a look at it and say, “We might not be in agreement with ICANN Legal’s response,” and it’s when Jen and the team come back to us with their response we may say, “Oh, I agree. I concur. We’re in agreement with it,” or we say, “No, that’s not our interpretation.” But I think we should be able to have that optionality on it and look at it besides what ICANN Legal believes it is. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Cool. Thanks, Jeff.

I think what I’m just learning now is – and this is from Jen. Thank you, Jen – is that this is not a RRSB vote it’s an all-accredited Registrars’ vote. In some ways I think the number of creds

owned by the registrars in the room might make that pretty similar outcome, assuming. But you're right. We should maybe have either someone internally who's a lawyer want to look at this and have a think and we'll get that input from Jen as soon as we possibly can, and that's going to inform the choices we make a bit.

McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM:

I'm looking at the contract and I'm looking at that because there's a couple of clauses within the 2013 contract which stated specifically that something has to be agreed between ICANN and all registrars and other areas where the only parties are the Stakeholder Group or, in particular the Chair of the Stakeholder Group, and ICANN. In this particular clause there seems to be a certain degree of ambiguity. It does not say that all registrars have to do this. The wording is: "Provided that ICANN and the working group may mutually agree to extend the term of the Specification." The "working group" is not defined.

JEFFREY ECKHAUS:

Yes, it is.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Where?

JEFFREY ECKHAUS: The “working group” was, I believe the terms were “the negotiating team.” Yes, and it is ambiguous because it doesn’t mean we bring back the gang like me, James, Matt, Rob, and Becky, and the initial negotiating team or does the Registrar Stakeholder Group nominate or put forward a new working group. But it’s basically the registrars sponsored or whatever you want to call it, working group that they’ve put forward so we can decide whoever that may be, and that’s sort of who the working group is.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Okay, sorry. Yes, I’ve just actually brought up the wording. So Jeff is correct and incorrect at the same time. It’s not all registrars, it is a group of registrars and it’s the Registrar Stakeholder Group who decides who essentially. But it’s not all the registrars or even all the [inaudible] of the Stakeholder Group itself which is even more bizarre.

So essentially we could say, “Jeff and Graeme are the only two people that decide on this and you hold our fate in your hands.”

[JEFFREY ECKHAUS]: [That's correct].

MCKAILEY NALEM: That's a really scary thought, but okay.

GRAEME BUNTON: Interesting. That's good insight. I wish we'd had this conversation earlier because that now makes the timeline of January 1st very soon if we're spinning up working groups and making choices like this. I feel like Jen's got some input over there.

JENNIFER GORE: I'd just like to say that obviously there's interpretation on both sides of the agreement and once I get the clarification back from Legal I will share that and I've requested that we get it sometime this week.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks, Jen. Right. That's a very interesting discussion I think we just had. Does anybody else have more thoughts on this before we I think pull it back and we have to take a look at the actual language in there and make some choices ourselves? Lindsay is nodding vigorously. She's a lawyer. That's wonderful of you to volunteer like that.

We'll get some input back from ICANN and then I guess this is probably notice for everybody in the room that it may be us making this choice and we may need to spin up a working group or something like that and we are going to have to do that in relatively short order, so I would encourage you all to take this issue home, think about it carefully, the implications of doing this or not, and be prepared to share those back again with the Stakeholder Group and we can have that discussion again on the list in the very near future because we're going to need to get on this very quickly.

Connie had a comment in the chat about the aftermarket, and I'm not sure around IRTPC, specifically in China and the impact on the aftermarket and transactions. I'm sure there's an immediate answer to that question. That's more operational and I'd probably leave you to talk to other aftermarket providers and how they're dealing with IRTPC because I don't think that's a question we can answer here today.

We're doing pretty well on time at the moment. Is that a new hand McKailey? That's an old hand?

MCKAILEY NALEM: That's an old one, thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. I'm going to close this off and we can move on unless there's any other insight or input here.

Great. So that's "Extension of Privacy and Proxy" and "IRTPC" closed off for the moment. Next up starting at 2:00 – and we're running 12 minutes ahead which feels like a minor ICANN miracle – I'll invite Jen Gore to give us an update from GDD.

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. Do we have the slide?

I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce some of my fellow ICANN staff members. If you could please come up to the front I think we should probably... If you don't mind. Thanks.

Realizing that we only have about 45 minutes today, there's many activities that are going on related to the registrars that have obviously not come to fruition. So you're not feeling them yet in my third month in tenure, but there's a lot of work going on on the backend. The one initiative that I wanted to highlight today is related to the Registrar Portal, and walk you through the Portal and what we believe the features should be and want to put out a call for volunteers for a Portal Users Group. But before I get started I just want to introduce my team behind the creation, development, and implementation of that Portal.

We have Chris Gift who's the Vice President of Product Management. We've got Bob Schumacher who's going to be responsible for the design and implementation. And Gary [Petzer] is responsible for the development efforts – PMO – all of the above.

Let's quickly run through the slide. Again, I just want to point out this is a collaborative effort in which we're seeking volunteers and we'll be sending out an e-mail to get those volunteers. I'm hoping that we can get a geographically based and various registrar models to represent and participate.

Sorry, the slide's kind of small.

[It] basically runs through one slide here where the Portal is – we're starting from the ground slate and the latest version of Salesforce. I know that you've heard about various other initiatives in the past, but this one is new to ICANN and new to the contracted parties.

Thank you, Zoe.

In talking about the Portal regarding the daily interaction with the registrars and with my personal previous experience as a registrar, I went through a wish list of what I believed was important to incorporate into the Portal. And upon opening or single sign-on with two factor authentication, I was perceiving a

dashboard which basically would be a health page roll-up summary of topics of your registrar or registrars. And in that there would be Avatars that would provide you information on your compliance, your previous radar contact information, upcoming news and announcements, anything that the Advisory Panel wants to provide input on.

I don't know how many of you have gone through the application to become a registrar recently but I can tell you that that application process has not changed for quite some time. So we are moving forward to an application process that's going to be electronically based and take advantage of DocuSign to execute agreements.

And then around the content management system – this is essentially the sun setting of radar and bringing up a content management system [with] inside the Portal where users will be able to apply changes to all registrars or just select the group of registrars to apply a particular change. This will come in handy when you for instance want to change your compliance contacts or your abuse contacts. You don't have to drill down in each of the accreditations in order to apply the change [or advice] or to confirm that your information's correct.

Any questions so far? Okay.

As I mentioned, security is one of our pillars as it relates to this because of the amount of privacy and information that will be listed in there so we want to make sure that we provide you two factor authentication and we will provide you options as far as what method you'd like to use for two factor as well.

Then obviously given the amount of daily interaction with the Compliance department, you'll have a view inside to all your tickets, you will be able to determine where the tickets...the status of each ticket, whether you owe information or we owe information back to you so there's a clear transparency here outside of relying on e-mail communication which we all know is not the most reliable or effective form of managing your compliance activities on a daily basis.

Graeme?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Jen. Briefly I think we're all very excited to see this. It's been a long time coming. Do you know if this compliance piece is going to mean also Compliance is switching ticketing systems, because I know we've all had headaches with that in the past, or whether they're porting that into the Portal or whether there's a whole new ticketing system for Compliance in there?

JENNIFER GORE: That's a great question, Graeme. I appreciate it. I should have said in the beginning that this is not necessarily a roll-out to external parties – meaning contracted parties – we're also rolling out this tool internal. So the same platform will be used internally as well as externally. So to answer your question directly, the Kayako platform will be sun-setted and our Compliance organization will use the Salesforce platform.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jen. I think we'll see some very happy people around the room about that.

JENNIFER GORE: Along those lines, too, and given our registrar experience there is only so much tracking you can do with inside a third party Portal. Given the size of Compliance organizations with inside registrars, one of my key areas to note in the proposed requirements document includes the ability to download the raw data and to be able to upload it with inside the registrar's Portal or content management system to manage your tickets accordingly.

And then there'll be multiple versions of the format which you can download those reports. That's not only based on the

compliance tickets, but you'll be able to download all your contact information by each individual registrar.

I just want to make this one point very clear – as we're also rolling out a Salesforce system for our contracted parties we are rolling out an Oracle system from a billing perspective. Those two systems are being rolled out simultaneously. There's additional work that will have to happen on the backend to link the two, so I foresee or propose to the upcoming Portal Users Group is a prioritization around online invoicing. That necessarily won't come out in the first phase given the additional work that has to take place but I'd like to propose that it comes out in a future phase shortly thereafter.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Briefly, I might have missed it but do we have a sense of how far away this is and – you'll pardon my cynicism – but does “shortly thereafter” mean?

JENNIFER GORE:

Understood. Let me just finish up before I address your question if you don't mind.

I don't want to leave the discussion without saying that we are researching right now the self-certification process with the EU/U.S. knowing that our privacy shield knowing the

information will be transmitted and we have to make sure that we're in compliance with this policy.

So, Graeme, I hear your question related to a timeline, and the first thing I'd like to say in regards to that is, it's kind of 20/20. I'm going to attempt to answer it and then I'm going to turn it over to my good friend Chris here. There's multiple ways we could do this so let me just start with that methodology.

If we wanted to roll out in phases where we essentially just roll out the content management system first, we could roll that out sooner rather than later. But if the Portal Users Group determines that they'd like to have greater functionality – that includes the compliance pieces as well as the content management system – given everything that we've proposed up here, obviously the timeline would increase given the functionality that needs to be developed.

Phase one of this is in the process of rolling out for the registries in the coming months, and then the Development Team will quickly thereafter switch over to the development of the Registrar Portal. With that in mind, I see it not necessarily as a siloed Portal, I see it as a Portal when registries are also registrars. And then we're also taking into account as we're going through the Privacy Proxy IRT right now that there's users

stories and requirements built in for Privacy Proxy accredited service providers.

Thinking more advanced of the type of users that we'll support within the Portal will be registries, registrars, data escrow agents, Privacy Proxy service providers, and registry operators. So that's five different profiles. And if you are a contracted party for more than one, you will be able to manage your services through a single sign-on for all of those different relationships that you have with ICANN.

You're welcome. I've been down this road before – development efforts. I'm going to allow my Product Team to turn over the question regarding the timeline and understanding your cynicism.

CHRIS GIFT:

Hi. This is Chris Gift, Product Management. I think Jen answered it well in terms of when it would be. We're still finishing up the registry piece. We will have a webinar before the year end in which we'll discuss more specific dates and timelines. We're just not prepared to do that today.

It also is dependent on the requirements. We have a good set of requirements from Jen and from the Compliance Team and from our internal operations as well. But obviously you guys need to

vet that and add to that. So that is a process we do need to go through. And then, as Jen said, we'll have to decide what's the minimum viable service we can launch with and when do we have subsequent releases?

The [wind] sort of depends on a lot of that and I agree, I understand, that's very vague and I apologize. But what I would like to offer to help mitigate against this vagueness is that we work on project plans together and that we keep them published so that you can see status and updates on an ongoing basis and that you can see when we're completing feature sets. We'd also like to work with you to make the service available as early as possible, so even if it's not actually in a functioning state that you can still see it, look at it, and then get a real sense of how progress is being made.

We'd like to work with the Portal Group on that, on how that can happen, and also with the wider registrar group as well. And we're hoping doing those kinds of thing swill not only involve you more directly but give you comfort about how progress is being made.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you. Do you think we could commit to like monthly updates on this? Because we get them right now three times a

year and probably as we're getting closer it would be appreciated to have some more insight on what's happening.

CHRIS GIFT:

Yeah, for sure. The Portal Users Group – monthly at the very minimum. I think we're going to have to, given I hope the speed at which we move on on the registrars once we started, it'll probably may even have to be more than monthly for the Portal Users Group. I wouldn't be surprised if we have to meet every other week. But as for updates, it's not just monthly but I would also propose that we just put that in a public place – whether it's the community wiki or some other public place – so that you can get the status whether it's weekly or every other week because we actually work on two week sprints. More than happy to propose that we just publish these things on an ongoing basis.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you. Right, agile. [Inaudible] don't want to give me timelines either.

Darcy?

DARCY SOUTHWELL Do you have any sense of – are we talking two years, four years, for phase one or what? Because we’ve been talking about it for a little while so I’m really curious about just a general timeline.

CHRIS GIFT: Less than two years.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Alright. A little bit more specific would be great.

CHRIS GIFT: We could keep playing this one – more than six months, less than six months, less than a year – I’m definitely hoping within the next calendar year would definitely be my goal.

GRAEME BUNTON: I’ve got a hand from McKailey over there.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Same question. The reason why it’s the same question is simply because we were told two years ago that the Portal for registries was priority number one and that the Portal for registrars was priority number two and that it would be happening within about 12 months, and that was over a year ago.

The thing is that ICANN has spent a large amount of money on all of these different projects but those of us who are actually having to deal with these things are still having to print out documents, sign them manually, and send them back via fax, or struggle with lost Compliance tickets, lost other things, and we're the ones who have the contracts that are actually in jeopardy because of this. We're the ones who are going to end up paying for this. It's like you really need to do a little bit better than a vague commitment like that, and we would urge you to please do so. Thanks.

CHRIS GIFT:

I understand the pain and we do understand the pain and we are sorry that we are late on the registry portion and therefore late to begin the registrar portion. I do agree that we need to do better on the date. My only hesitation is just today or at least within this week we do promise and commit to have a webinar before year end where we will give you dates. We will definitely do that and those dates will be something that you can hold us to.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you. Rest assured we will.

JENNIFER GORE:

As the onus of the service delivery, they'll have to adhere to me following up with them as well and being very persistent, as you well know.

I just wanted to follow up on the Portal Users Group and the timeline for implementation of that. The e-mail will go out today in hopes that we can kick off the initial Portal Users Group – assuming that we get a substantial amount of volunteers – at least the kick-off meeting to have initial discussions and obviously we're always open to additional volunteers at any point in time in the next two weeks.

And I have developed a document that walks through various user stories and epics that I'd like to provide to the Users Group and that we will also post that on the wiki page for the purposes of transparency that Chris was referring to, and then start finalizing those requirements. Based on that, we'll submit that to our Engineering and Development Team and get a level of effort back [of] them and be able to then finalize the timeline that Chris was referring to.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Jen. If I may – just so I'm clear – development actually hasn't started yet. You've got spec and wire frames or whatever that is, but the actual building of things has not –

JENNIFER GORE: Yeah. Actual service delivery for the registrar Portal, no. However, for the implementation for phase one which focuses on the registry piece we're very far along in that process and some of that development work will be applied on the registrar side.

I'm not saying that we're starting with a clean slate, but I'm saying that there's features and functionality that will be coming from the Portal Users Group that will have to be built on top of what's already in place.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay. Thank you.

JENNIFER GORE: Any other questions related to that?

GRAEME BUNTON: McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM: It's nothing personal – well, maybe it is. I don't know. No it's not. Ultimately I suppose the question I have is, what are the penalties for late delivery? And if it's simply a case of more e-

mails from Jennifer to other ICANN staff members, I wonder [but] is it – is late delivery something that’s going to impact a department’s budget, it’s KPIs, and some other kind of metric? Is there some penalty if you don’t deliver?

CHRIS GIFT:

Yes, there are penalties. They are tied to our departmental and as well as personal KPIs, which I don’t know how much I can say – I can just say our KPIs are tied directly to how we’re paid. So if we miss dates we get paid less as individuals, and obviously there are additional penalties in terms of our performance within the organization and our perception of our ability to get our job done.

I think anything beyond that you really ought to talk to my boss.

MCKAILEY NALEM:

And who is your boss?

CHRIS GIFT:

Akram.

MCKAILEY NALEM:

He hates talking to me. Thank you.

JENNIFER GORE: Please feel free to talk to him, McKailey.

MCKAILEY NALEM: You really want to make him suffer, don't you?

JENNIFER GORE: No, not today. Thank you though.

GRAEME BUNTON: Next? You've got more for us?

JENNIFER GORE: I was anticipating more questions from you related to that.

GRAEME BUNTON: I think you will get those questions when there is something to look at.

JENNIFER GORE: Understood.

SOPHIA FENG: Sophia Feng, ZDNS. I'm very excited to know about this naming service Portal that's really on its way. My question is, would this

portal reduce the amount of e-mail we got? Is one of the purpose to [having]?

JENNIFER GORE:

Being on the other side of that equation, I'd like to first say yes. I would like to use it as a primary communication tool so the information is pushed to the Portal. There are user stories that we're working through that will require e-mail communications in addition to what we push to the Portal for time-sensitive information to make you aware of it. We'd like to communicate it through two mechanisms or possibly even three. When information is put onto the Portal where it's time-based and sensitive we'd like to extend an e-mail in addition to what we put [it] out on the Portal. It won't technically eliminate all e-mail but it will drastically reduce the amount of e-mail that you're receiving today.

And obviously the Users Portal group will help define and clarify those scenarios and when they'd like to receive additional communications versus not.

SOPHIA FENG:

And through all the communication to ICANN with the Compliance issues or the other issues we're facing, we can communicate through this Portal as well.

JENNIFER GORE: Yes. It'll allow for push and pull technology so you can provide input, you can upload documents related to Compliance tickets, you can check the status of your tickets, you can pull up reports based on type of ticket versus the status of the ticket versus which registrar they're associated to versus the entire family of registrars.

So as I said, there's multiple user stories that we're walking through that we want to review with the Portal Users Group to see if we're heading in the right direction and we can confirm that the user experience will be a positive and a useful one.

SOPHIA FENG: Another question from me is, the online invoicing because currently we got the invoice for the registrars from [ICANNs] but usually that's three/four months later and then the accounting team would tell us you didn't pay but actually we never got the invoicing. Would that also cure this problem we have?

JENNIFER GORE: That is the intent. Again, I hate to keep going back to the Portal Users Group but this is going to be a forum in which we will gather all of your requirements as registrars, contracted party, and be able to put them in a document and together we will

prioritize the features and functionalities set. As Chris mentioned, it's an agile approach so we're looking to make updates to the system every two weeks. With each functionality there's a level of effort that goes into it based upon the complexity of delivering, testing, Q&Aing, and ensuring the user experience meets the intent of the registrars.

I understand that is a situation that is a frustrating one that occurs today, but in my mind, I propose that the way the functionality would work that you would receive your invoices through the Portal.

SOPHIA FENG: Okay. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Does anyone else have questions for Jen on the Portal?

Okay. Do you have anything else for us, Jen?

JENNIFER GORE: We can open the floor for questions at this point in time if you want to, Graeme.

GRAEME BUNTON: Sure. Like as in generic GDD what is Jen Gore doing with herself questions?

JENNIFER GORE: Yes, and I welcome Cyrus who's right behind you, too. And Francisco's back there as well if you want to discuss anything. I'll throw everyone under the bus. This is our opportunity to dialog of course with the registrars.

GRAEME BUNTON: Your wish has been granted Tom Keller?

THOMAS KELLER: Thank you. Is there already any concrete planning around the GDD meeting we're supposed to have for next year?

GRAEME BUNTON: That's a good question, Tom. My latest insight is they don't have a location yet but maybe staff has something fresher than that.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you very much. This is Cyrus Namazi from the GDD team of ICANN. We've been trying to actually what we did in May of 2016 to try to coordinate our next GDD Summit to be brought up

against the Board retreat meeting because I think at least most everyone found that to be a useful added benefit.

We almost had it nailed down but for whatever reason the Board meeting ended up actually moving so that reset a whole bunch of things. That timing in May, which is med-May, is what we're shooting for and the location is going to be in Europe based on the survey that we ran. Somehow space of the size that we need to accommodate 450 people which is the number that we had in Amsterdam is difficult.

I just came from a meeting with our Meetings Team and they have actually narrowed it down to a location in Madrid that can accommodate that many people. They've gone back now to negotiate with them and make sure that we can have a contract before we actually announce this.

The dates that we're looking for I believe are May 9th through 12th and as soon as this is all said and done and cast in concrete we'll send you a Save the Date e-mail with all these relevant information in it so that you can have it.

It's really taken us a bit longer than I had hoped for but it was this dependency on being able to actually be in close proximity in time and location with the Board that made it a bit more complex. We've done away with that. I think the Board is actually going to be in a different location in Europe, and that

location does not have the space that we need in terms of size and the timing of it to accommodate it. So they're going to be, I think, in a different location in Europe. We're going to be not too far from it, still a flight. So I'm still hopeful that we'll get some participation with some of the Board members which I think would be beneficial for all of us. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Cyrus.

Does anybody else – Sophia?

SOPHIA FENG:

Yes. Hi, Cyrus. A question. Is any plans for GDD to host in Asia sometimes later?

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Sophia. It's good to see you again. We left the choice of location of the GDD Summit to be decided based on a survey that we ran. I don't have any particular preference. I like going to Asia as much as I like going to Europe, but the results of the survey that came back for this particular one in May of 2017 somewhat overwhelmingly suggested Europe would give us the best and highest level of participation, and this is how we ended up with that location.

After the May of 2017 meeting, perhaps we can do another survey, or I think within the Stakeholder groups of registries and registrars you can decide and tell us where you think it'd make sense to host the next one and we'll be happy to do it. We don't have a preference from the ICANN side.

SOPHIA FENG:

The reason I asked this question is because I think GDD would be a good platform for the Chinese registrars, the Asia registrars, to participate. However, since the [participate] rate of the members, number of members in our ISGs from the Chinese community or the Asian community is less [represented]. So they probably won't be able to vote in the locations. However, when they host in Asia, I think that would increase the participant rate from the Asian registrars significantly.

So this is just one elements that I think that GDD team should take into considerations because I do think there are many Chinese organization would like to support to host or support the GDD meeting to held in Asia. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Sophia. I fully understand that. One clarification for everyone here – when we issued the survey to ask the preference for the location we actually e-mailed the survey to all of our

contracted parties so every accredited registrar, every contracted registry received a notification participate in the survey. And I think, if I recall correctly, we had about 160 responses. Did we publish the results of the survey, Jen I think?

JENNIFER GORE: We did publish the results of the survey.

CYRUS NAMAZI: And I guess to clarify just to repeat, that we did send it to all of our contracted parties. Like I said, we don't have a preference whether it's in Asia. I totally I agree with you. Obviously if we had it in someplace near China or someplace in Asia there would be more participation from that region of the world.

I would suggest that the ExCom of the registrar and the registry have this discussion and then decide which way you want to go and we'll be happy to actually consider that and comply with it.

SOPHIA FENG: Thank you for the clarification. My bad. [Inaudible] a little bit. But I think from the statistics [with] a 160 dimension maybe we should look at the statistics how many actually Chinese registrars responded or the Asian registrar responded. From my experience as a registrar a lot of registrar receive e-mail and

probably if it's English they just ignore it. They just probably don't look at it and they don't know what this GDD is sometimes. So probably the awareness of the GDD Summit and its purposes and what the benefits of the GDD Summit is probably is underawareness among Asian registrars. Just my personal observations.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Sophia. You raise some good points.

I see a hand from McKailey.

MCKAILEY NALEM:

Thanks. I think Sophia's point is well made. It's a bit of a Catch 22. The registrars who do not actively engage with ICANN are going to ignore a lot of the e-mails from ICANN, so getting more data via our engagement people in the Asia Pacific region, can they at least talk to those registrars, find out did they get those surveys, did they understand what the survey was about?

With all due respect, punting it back to the ExComs of the two groups that are actively engaged won't help because the issue we're facing is there are a lot of registrars specifically in Asia Pacific but not just in Asia Pacific who don't engage. And trying to improve that engagement is something which we have to

[tailor do] it collaboratively between both the registrars and ICANN GDD.

It's not going to be a [CPH] thing as much as a Registrar Stakeholder Group with ICANN GDD and the engagement team or something. Because it's the registries tend to be more engaged generally speaking. I don't know, I think Graeme would rather be able to speak to this further because we have been doing stuff within the Stakeholder Group to work on them and thankfully people like Sophia have been helping to bridge that gap but we have a huge cultural and linguistic divide.

GRAEME BUNTON:

It's probably a good time to point out I think we actually have translation services available today, which is a first for us and I think a really good step forward in especially trying to engage Chinese registrars and the brochures, by the way, if people didn't catch that have been translated to Chinese and Arabic.

Cyrus wanted to respond and then Jen, did you have your hand up?

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you. I just wanted to I guess respond to what McKailey is saying. I'm not trying to punt it back to the ExComs. I had every intention to actually rotate the locations at which we host the

GDD Summit following the format that ICANN Meetings Team follows. It was the request of the two ExComs to me to actually consider having it in Europe, and I made it conditional upon having a survey. So it wasn't me who decided to do this. It was really your request. So that's why I was saying if you'd like to change that I'm very open to it, but have the discussion among yourself. We want to make this for you. This is your GDD Summit.

You're right, it is a Catch 22. If you don't go to Asia then we can't engage with people that we want to have more engagements with us. I understand that. But I also wanted to accommodate the request that came from the ExComs.

MCKAILEY NALEM:

Ultimately, Cyrus, no matter what you do, we're going to pick on you anyway. You know that. That's part of your job title – punchbag.

SOPHIA FENG:

I just had one probably little recommendations or suggestions because you know [how Ali] is working the registrar [relations] in from ICANN in Asia. Howard is doing a really good job so maybe if he can actively inviting registrars to participate in the survey that would definitely help the results. Eventually if all Chinese

registrar would love to go to Europe for a Summit that makes sense as well.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

This is a very good suggestion, Sophia, and we'll definitely do that. The other thing actually that I wanted to highlight is that for the May 2016 GDD Summit, even though it was not budgeted, I managed to go find the money to actually fund 10 travelers chosen – five by the registrars and five by the registries – and I strongly suggested to the leadership to consider actually funding people who would not normally come to the GDD Summit.

Supposedly we will do something similar to this for the upcoming GDD Summit, and maybe this is another incentive to use to have people who are not either familiar or don't want to make the investment of coming to Europe from a remote place like Asia or other places, give that more consideration because I don't think in Amsterdam we actually had very many coming from those areas that actually we had provided funding for. For what it's worth.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Cyrus. I've got Jen and I was just getting reminders we all need to state our names.

JENNIFER GORE:

Thanks. Along the lines of communication and reaching out in your local languages, that's one of the areas that we're expanding our strategy in communicating with registrars. The [What's up] communication that came out for registrar sessions for ICANN 57 was translated in the UN languages and did go out to the respective registrars within that region, and we plan to continue to offer services in language moving forward related to important surveys and communications of that nature.

That feedback regarding the GDD Summit and offering that in language for the survey actually did come from Howard and we have that noted for the next iteration of the survey.

[GWEN]:

This is [Gwen] from [inaudible]. Nice to meet you again, Cyrus. I actually had an idea when you were talking about reaching out and Sophia said to collaborate with the current reach-out activities, actually I'm not sure how other regions work but in APAC region the APAC Hub organize online APAC webinars, and I think the attendance is really good [looking] considering the time is very [convenient] for the region. So if the survey is...I think is of high interest of all the registrars in APAC region, so maybe they could hold such a APAC webinar to collaborate with the APAC Hub.

Also there's the social media of, in our case is in China, we have a social media outlet that's WeChat. So maybe that could translate into Chinese and actually publish on that APAC China social media. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: This is actually a great time to mention that we're doing an APAC lunch tomorrow at some time. Zoe? Do you know?

ZOE BONYTHON: It's at 12:15.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great.

ZOE BONYTHON: Perhaps if you want to come if you're from the APAC region and you'd like to come, then send me an e-mail. Most people hopefully would have gotten invitations already, but just in case.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. So if you are a registrar in the APAC region and you don't know about this, absolutely get in touch with Zoe and we can have lunch and address some of these issues there.

[Sean]?

[SEAN]:

Thanks, Graeme. Zoe has sent me the e-mail and we were sent the e-mail to invite Chinese registrars to attend APAC lunch at noon tomorrow. And just to add – Sophia and [Gwen], my question for the GDD Summit location – my question is for Cyrus. Sorry I didn't say hello to you. My question is, it seems there is a conflict, the conflict between the principle of ICANN meeting location rotation and the results of the survey. My question is, when there is a conflict then how you decide between this? Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you and hello to you. I tried to explain to you the process that we followed by which we settled on Europe as the choice of location for May 2017 Summit. When we decided to do the GDD Summit – I think this was almost two years ago, maybe a little more – one of the principles of it was that we were going to design and essentially hold the Summit in very close collaboration with our contracted parties. And that collaboration takes place through the leadership of the two stakeholder groups that we work with – registries and registrars.

It was really through that mode of communication that the strong desire for having it in a place that they called central that was easy to get to from different regions overtook the desire to

move it from one location to another, similar to what ICANN Meetings Team does.

We never said that we would actually follow that format. I had just assumed that we would do that. But since this is a collaborative Summit in terms of the design and the planning for it, we listened to it and by virtue of conducting the survey it overwhelmingly proved that participation in the Summit would be increased greatly if it was held in a location in Europe.

So I don't see it really as a conflict per se. It's just something that collectively based on the data that was provided and the input that came from the leadership of the stakeholder groups ended up being decided.

I'm quite fine frankly for the following GDD Summit to move it to Asia or to move it to North America or any location that makes sense. For us it's the same amount of work. So we really don't have any preference. If we held it in Los Angeles, it would be less work for us but anything beyond that is the same amount of work.

I would strongly suggest that among yourselves and together with the registries you decide what you want to do. And we want to listen to you because the GDD Summit is for you. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Cyrus. I think we can move some of this discussion into the APAC lunch we're going to have tomorrow and address some of these other diversity issues as we cope with the growing geographic diversity of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and ICANN and the GDD and wrap our brains around the best ways to do things.

Jen?

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. I'd just like to reiterate that that luncheon is for registrars but also potential registrars, because I know there's quite a few new attendees to ICANN57 and I've been approached by many that I'd like to extend the invite to them as well that are currently seeking completion of their application as well as interested in inviting them to join the Registrar Stakeholder Group as well.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jen. I know myself and Tobias will be there and a couple other registrars. Jen will be there, so feel free to join us.

Anything else for GDD Team? Any other topics we wish to raise with them at the moment?

Great. Thank you, guys, for joining us today. Appreciate it. We look forward to seeing the Portal and getting more frequent status updates on that and holding your feet to the fire.

Departing word from Cyrus.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Departing words from me. I just wanted to thank you again, Graeme, Darcy, and the team, for having us here. Really just to repeat and reiterate the fact that we're here to serve you so if there are times in which something that should be done by us is not being done or if it should be done differently, you should certainly feel free to reach out obviously to Jen and her team or myself to be able to resolve it for the – the objective here, the overarching objective here, is for us to provide the right service for you. Thank you again for the opportunity to be here.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Cyrus.

Right. Feels like we've been sitting for a little while, but we're going to power on through. We're going to get a – what we typically do is we go through the current PDPs that people are working on to get some feedback and discussion going on about how those are proceeding, and we have some more of that coming up this afternoon. My name is on far too many things,

and we're running about still 15 minutes ahead of time. So we'll get an update from Sara Bockey on the RDS PDP, and then we'll have a break.

Before we get that far, is there anything particular to our break? We don't have our own coffee or tea or anything? Okay. So it doesn't matter when we take that.

It's the normal break time so we might end up being a little bit ahead of that.

If I may, Sara, are you ready? Great.

SARA BOCKEY:

My name is Sara Bockey and I'm a member of the RDS Working Group which is the Registry Directory Services Working Group, and this is a GNSO Policy Development Process to define the purpose of collecting and maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data and considering safeguards for protecting data.

The working group began its work at the beginning of the year 2016 and the work itself is going to be divided into three phases. We're currently in phase one which is defining requirements. Phase two will be more technical – signing function. And phase three will be implementation.

During the first phase of this work the working group has been tasked with providing the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions, the first being: “What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data?” and two is , “Is a new policy framework and Next Generation RDS needed to address these requirements?” So we’re looking to see if we can work with the WHOIS system we have or do we need to just scrap it and start over?

When this working group began we divided into three small groups and reviewed a very large amount of documentation that had been identified as relevant in answering the Charter questions regarding purpose, data, and privacy.

To give you a little overview, for the purpose and users we’re looking at who should have access to gTLD registration data and why? For the data elements, what data should be collected, stored, and disclosed? And then for privacy, what steps are needed to protect data and privacy?

After reviewing all of these documents, we have a list of possible requirements that currently is exceeding over 1,000 items. Staff has been gracious enough to go through and code all of these to help identify which requirements each item can be put in that bucket, dividing them up to help us better process the information.

At our last meeting in Helsinki, some expressed concern that this enormous list of requirements didn't really define the problem and that we needed to first define the problem and then create requirements to solve that problem. There was also concern that the current course of work was just too big to digest. And so from this evolved the idea of a problem statement or statement of purpose. This is intended to help the working group have an effective deliberation on possible requirements that we are going to be reviewing.

The working group has basically been working on the statement of purpose since Helsinki. We also have done some reviewing of use cases, but for the most part we've been working on the statement of purpose since Helsinki. The week before we came here Chuck Gomes is the Chair and he just drew a line in the sand and we just stopped talking about it I think for a bit. It's still not I think 100% complete.

We had a face-to-face meeting on Thursday and actually began to have some preliminary deliberations. We're basically systematically going to be going through and considering this enormous list of possible requirements that we've identified and determining if that possible requirement does indeed relate to the Charter questions and if it should be kept as something that we're going to review later on and deliberate further on or if it should be just kicked out and not considered.

That is where we are currently. As you can see it's not been moving very quickly. If anyone is interested in joining, you haven't really missed a whole lot and it's probably going to be going on for a really long time. I'll probably retire before it's done. But we are always looking for new blood and new ideas, so please if you're interested, join us.

Does anyone have any questions?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Sara. I appreciate that. I've got a question from McKailey in a sec. My impression is this thing will [generally] go for forever, but is there anything that you've come across so far that requires more attention from the Registrar Stakeholder Group?

SARA BOCKEY:

I personally don't think so. No. Because there hasn't been much really substantive deliberation. It's all been gathering information and sorting and nothing I don't think really substantial has taken place that anyone should be concerned about.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thank you. First before we get to McKailey – sorry, I’m making you wait. A) I think we all appreciate you and whoever else is in the RDS PDP because I think that’s going to be a really long haul, staying in there and fighting the good fight. Because in theory the output of this could be extremely impactful to our businesses. It’s just going to take a very long time to get there. So hang in there please and thank you. Let us know if there are things or information that is useful for the Registrar Stakeholder Group or if you’re looking for information back from us, that would be useful.

McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM: Thanks, Graeme. I’m one of the Vice Chairs of that PDP. In terms of number of registrars involved, I think we’re okay for now. But I think we will probably need to look at almost rotating people through that group because it’s going to be there for a very, very, very, very, long time. The other problem we have is that there is the WHOIS Review that’s kicking off now and at the moment pretty much every registrar representative who has expertise in WHOIS is already in the RDS PDP. The WHOIS Review, unlike previous reviews, has been given a narrower scope and they’ve also tried to narrow the timelines down so that it would be, I think it’s six months – somebody can correct me. Marika or

somebody if I get it wrong – but we will need to have people who know what’s going on with WHOIS, peel off RDS for a period of time or swap out or something because the two are hugely impactful for us.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, McKailey. The WHOIS Review, and maybe I think Marika is still in the room and she could answer this for me is, is it a nomination process and so does it end up falling on the RDS ExCom to put someone forward for that or is it anyone can apply? Do you know off hand?

MARIKA KONINGS:

It actually falls under the new process as outlined in the Bylaws and I think it’s currently under discussion as well for the SSR Review Team. So as far as I know I think the call for applications is open. People I think are expected to identify by which SO or AC they want to be nominated. Then that SO/AC has to decide how many people they nominate. I think if you nominate three you get a guaranteed seat. If you nominate seven, you just have to wait and see. And then it’s up to the SO/AC Chairs to make a decision on who gets on the Review Team. I think it’s up to 21 maximum. Basically if everyone would get three, each gets their guaranteed seats but if some people appoint less, there’s room to appoint others. My assumption is that same process would be

followed for the WHOIS Review Team but there are some discussions going on at the moment between the SO/AC Chairs on how their process would actually work in relation to deciding who would get on the Review team.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Marika. If only we had an SO/AC Chair available.

James?

JAMES BLADEL: Hi. I think Marika just covered what I was about to say. We had a meeting to discuss the process of this selection. I think we're getting close to a process. It is a new formula since the AOC doesn't exist anymore and we're now operating under the new Bylaws.

But generally I think the short answer is the GNSO puts forward three names, they're in. Anything beyond three is not a guarantee. So one approach might be that each SO and AC identifies three primary candidates and four alternate candidates, and then the pool of alternates would be used to balance any missing skill sets or background required for that particular Review Team or also hit the desired diversity for region, language, gender, diversity, issues that we'd be looking for.

That's generally the goal. We're going to try it out first on this SSR Review Team and then it will also apply to the WHOIS Review Team and I believe we've got ATRT3 coming up in the future as well sometime early next year so there will be more Review Teams. We want to get a predictable process in place this first time so that we can use that for future teams.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, James. Thanks for the update.

So there's no guarantee that we get a registrar into this WHOIS Review. That would seem like a bad outcome for us so we should think about who wants to volunteer for that and then we should make sure that we're putting them forward, that A) they're a good representative, they have the skills that this Review Team is looking for and we can put them forward to the GNSO and be as assured as we could possibly be that the GNSO is going to select them. So if you are interested in that Review, we should talk.

Go ahead, James.

JAMES BLADEL:

Just that I was the registrar member of the previous WHOIS Review Team which had a broader scope and was a fairly significant undertaking. I think it would be great if we could have

not only a non-North American registrar representing this time around but specifically an EU registrar that has to deal with some of the privacy conflicts that we're seeing in the WHOIS conflicts with local law and taking a look at that process. I think that would bring a specific and localized expertise to this Review Team.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Great. Thank you, James. I see a hand from Tom. Briefly though to a point McKailey raised about how the heck to deal with a four-year PDP and not destroying humans. I think about this problem a little bit. It's a resource management problem. We have finite numbers of people participating in PDPs and burning them up inside of an epic one is not a great idea. I'm not sure it makes sense to swap people in and out of the PDP but maybe what we can do is figure out what resources participating registrars need to be able to swap meetings so that you can skip meetings. You don't have to get up at whatever time or something. You can give that to someone else. You set up an alternating schedule. If that's the case for this RDS one maybe we can look at the people involved and figure out how to do that.

Do you want to come back on that?

MCKAILEY NALEM: Just very, very, quickly. Sorry, Tom. That I think makes perfect sense. I think we informally did this on another PDP at one stage a couple of years back. But we're still dealing with a finite number of people and for people in Asia Pacific, for example, they are usually put at a distinct disadvantage for most of the calls because most of them fall during morning for west coast U.S. and late morning east and afternoon or something for Europe. Asia Pacific usually suffers except in those PDPs where they're rotating.

But if we could come up with some kind of way of managing that kind of cover type thing it would help a lot. Because I think Jeff Neuman brought it up in another thing is that a lot of the time you feel that you need to keep track of what's going on. I think also maybe that's the other side of it as well is that we get better updates on the PDPs from the people who are actually tracking them, so that we don't have to always feel that we have to be involved in every single one of them.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, McKailey. Tom?

THOMAS KELLER: What is being reviewed? I don't really get it. We went through it numerous times. I think I've been on one of these [years] back in

time basically. What is the supposed outcome of the WHOIS Review, the next one?

JAMES BLADEL:

Actually there's only been one other Review Team that reviews all of the WHOIS policy. The proposal is for this one to be scaled down and to have specifically a review of the previous WHOIS Review Team and how that work has been implemented and how it's been adopted. So it's supposed to be lightweight, streamlined, and a little bit faster, in recognition that the RDS is already ongoing and hasn't completed.

MCKAILEY NALEM:

Also as well, Tom, it's one of these stupid things where they're actually obliged to do it because it was under the AOC that they have to do these reviews. So that's why there's the WHOIS Review and there's two or three other ones that are on a schedule of every X number of years.

This one in particular should have kicked off – somebody can correct me but – it was nine months to a year ago, but we managed to push back and get it delayed a little because of the RDS one. It has narrowed in scope but it still needs to happen.

GRAEME BUNTON: Did you have a question for me there? I'm sorry I was distracted by James. Terrible person. Tom?

TOM KELLER: So what is the planned outcome of the whole exercise? I understand that the Review Team is to be reviewed and whether everything has been implemented and what's [yet] to be implemented. If there is finding that there was a flaw in the [process] whatever, what's going to happen then? Is that going to change policy? Is that going to open up new parts of [fund]? I don't really know what we have to expect from that.

JAMES BLADEL: The Review Teams make recommendations to the Board. The last Review Team made recommendations that resulted in the Expert Working Group and the RDS. So could this result in new policy? Potentially, yes. But I'm hoping that – and I think it's the hope of the entire community – that with RDS already underway that this Review Team would instead make recommendations towards that group or towards the implementation of things that have already been adopted and not start from whole cloth and make broad sweeping reviews or recommendations.

So that's the goal of the narrowed scope. Because I think nobody wants to reopen all of these discussions especially with a PDP already underway.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Anybody else have thoughts on RDS or that WHOIS Review?

I'll just put out there again that as James pointed out, perhaps if you're an EU registrar and you want to participate in that WHOIS Review, you should reach out to someone on the ExCom and we'll talk about that.

JAMES BLADEL: But anybody should apply for that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Sure. Right. Anybody can apply. It is open to anyone. That privacy implication is interesting, so reach out.

We are at 2:52. Next up is afternoon break until 15:15. I'm going to mix the way I tell time. So why don't we get an extra eight minutes into our break because my hunch is that a couple of those things on the afternoon agenda are going to be a little quick. So behold, an extra eight minutes. We'll see you back here and we'll get going again at 3:15 sharp. Thank you.

[Break]

GRAEME BUNTON: I'm going to give it one more minute for people to file back into the room after the break and then we'll get going again.

Okay everybody, I've got 3:17. We still have quite a bit of things on the agenda. My hope is that we're going to get through a bunch of that pretty quickly and hopefully have some robust discussion. So let's get started again. I don't know if we need to restart the recording or anything like that but let's do it.

Okay. So getting going again. The first thing I would like to bring up before we dig into cross-field is participation in Registrar Stakeholder Day. We often hear too much I think and from the usual sort of suspects – I'll throw McKailey and Tom and myself and Jeff under that bus – and so none of us bite even if we do seem surly sometimes. So it would be really great if you haven't spoken before at one of these meetings to do so. We want to hear and gather opinions from all of our members. So don't be shy. If you've got a thought and you want to share it, it can be a dumb question, a simple question, a comment, clarity, anything. So join us. Get in here. Participate in the discussion.

If you don't, what's going to happen at the next meeting is that I'm going to make everyone tell something embarrassing as we go around the table to break the ice and it's going to be silly, but we need to get everyone engaged. So you can do it yourselves voluntarily or I can make you do it. So that's where we're at. So please participate.

Cross-field validation – Here's where we're at with this, and I don't think this is going to take 15 minutes. I just wanted to make sure that this was on everybody's radars. So there is a session later this week and I should know when that is but I don't have it off the top of my head. I see Tom, is it?

TOM IACOBUCCI: That'll be in this room today at 5:00 p.m.

GRAEME BUNTON: Really? It's today? Okay, right. So cross-field validation is coming up. There's a presentation from ICANN staff. I don't have my head fully personally wrapped around the mechanics of how this works but I believe ICANN staff is obliged to produce a proposal for how cross-field should work and then I'm not sure of how the mechanics are of whether registrars need to agree with that or if we can – and maybe Tom or Amy can speak to what the mechanics of deciding how that's going to work or not.

I'm going to editorialize for a moment of my own self as a registrar and not as Chair just to maybe get this started, which is I think there are certainly many people in the community who would like to see cross-field validation. They talk about it like payment processing. For myself I don't think that makes any sense. I think you can have many contact details like your phone number for instance can be from Canada and your address could be in the States or vice versa, and we have plenty of people – my own company provides a mobile phone service in the U.S. We have many Canadians that live in Canada but have a U.S. phone number. It's not uncommon. It doesn't make any sense to me that those things should be the same.

And then making sure that those addresses make sense I think is extremely difficult once you're outside of a few countries and then it gets very difficult, especially as we talk about underserved regions and trying to get people registering domain names from outside Western Europe and North America, that cross-field validation becomes increasingly difficult.

Maybe Tom or Amy have some input here as well, but I would encourage registrars to show up and if you have a strong opinion on this to participate in that session. So I just wanted to really make sure it was on everybody's radar.

I see a hand from McKailey and a hand from Tom.

MCKAILEY NALEM:

Thanks, Graeme. I'm both surprised and quite disturbed that this is coming up again. There was a working group of registrars that worked with ICANN staff on this topic over a period of I think about a year or thereabouts and we ended up having to park it because there was no way to find a solution that actually met the criteria it required. In other words, that it would be economically viable for us to do that.

And just from a registrar perspective, several of the country code registries have over the last couple of years ramped up their WHOIS validation. And if you look at some of the things that they're doing, they're literally taking the daily registrations and manually going through them one by one. Now, if you're dealing with a TLD or ccTLD with a handful of registrations per day that does require a lot of manual intervention, but it might be possible at the registry level to do that. But it just doesn't scale.

In terms of the address validation systems that are out there – the databases and everything else – they don't work outside a couple of countries, as you said, Graeme. Every time I try to order a pizza from Dominos I have to manipulate my home address until I find a version of my home address that Dominos accepts – even though my postman has absolutely no problem in delivering my electricity bill.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks. I see Jen has her hand up. Jen?

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. I look forward to having you guys – I know it's a long day – but I look forward to having you guys participate in the review of the update on across address field validation today as well as public distribution to the working group on the strawman proposal. I believe – I'm sorry I was out of the room – I believe, Graeme, you asked the question as far as what's next. Can you put that context and elaborate so I make sure I answer that correctly?

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jen. Just what the process is – McKailey said that he was disturbed that this has come up again. My understanding is then ICANN was essentially mandated to make this come up again. And so in theory I think ICANN is pitching a potential, a strawman, or something like that for how this might work and then I don't know if it's the registrars approve it, the community approves it, how that happens, is what I was looking for clarity on.

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. My former predecessor Mike Zupke worked with the Registrar stakeholder Group and they both agreed to an extension to put the project on hold for a period of one year, and that year has come and gone and I can provide the communications on that.

In the recent six months the community has asked for update on the process and what's happening. Therefore, upon the one year anniversary, we took steps to set up this session as well as to present the straw man proposal which basically identifies what ICANN staff has done over the course of the period of this one year related to proposing criteria and research and due diligence on vendors, understanding local/regional/national law, so those various activities will be identified in the strawman proposal as well as a very hopefully short presentation with a long Q&A session today on that initiative.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jen. I've got Heath in the queue.

HEATH DIXON: Just a question for Jen. The transition addendum specifies – and this is partially an answer to Graeme's question – that the registrar WHOIS Validation Working Group is the one that needs to agree to and approve any tools that are going to be adopted.

Can you confirm that that group is still in existence and who's on it?

JENNIFER GORE: Absolutely. Your statement is correct that the working group would have to confirm, approve, accept, agree to proceed with, the high-level proposal in the strawman, and I've included a slide during the session that has the members of that working group on it.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. I'm not sure who can remember, it's been a while I think since that got together. My name might be on there. I'm not sure.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Mine is.

GRAEME BUNTON: McKailey is.

JENNIFER GORE: I recall McKailey, Sara, I think I was on it at one point.

MCKAILEY NALEM: I think Jeff Eckhaus is probably on it.

JENNIFER GORE: No, I don't think so.

MCKAILEY NALEM: I think he should be on it.

JENNIFER GORE: It is up to the registrars to determine who should be on it.

GRAEME BUNTON: Fair enough. Thank you.

Does anybody else have any thoughts to share on cross-field? We're all prepared that that's coming up? I'm not going to be able to attend myself but we should make sure we've got a strong showing there.

Jen?

JENNIFER GORE: I understand that, as I said previously, that it's been a long day and a long week thus far, and I will be more than willing and happy to provide another webinar or a series of webinar and represent the materials and host Q&A sessions in the coming

weeks or whenever you desire. Just let me know what works best for you all.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks, Jen. I think I saw Tom raise his hand and then McKailey.

THOMAS KELLER: Thank you, Graeme. I think it would be interesting for all of us to get a little rehash where that comes from and why we have to do that and what's the intended purpose of it. I know that I had some look into that before it was stalled basically, but this was a long time ago so I think it would be a refreshment for all of us and a big help. I think the webinars are greatly appreciated.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Tom. McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM: Thanks. I'm also agreeing with Tom plus the other thing is, with this kind of operational type of thing, [it] more are operational developers, the people who are going to have to actually do these things or tell you politely but firmly that it's technically impossible to do. Those are the people who need to be on that kind of webinars, so I think doing a webinar in a few weeks' time

would be ideal and also giving us enough advance warning so that we can actually make sure that it's running at a time of day that makes sense and since we're trying our best with the Asia Pacific region, maybe if you could possibly run it on a couple of different times so that those of us in Europe don't have to get out of bed at 3:00 in the morning and those people in the States don't have to either, that would be helpful. Thanks.

JENNIFER GORE: Thank you. I believe when I said a series of webinars – I'm sorry, I should have clarified – one or more webinar in every...most of them major time zones, absolutely. I am in agreement with you that I believe that having technical and operations presence associated to that will be very helpful.

GRAEME BUNTON: Heath?

HEATH DIXON: I'm planning to attend so if anybody who is here can't attend but has questions that you'd like to have asked, I'd be happy to ask those questions and bring you the answers.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you very much for volunteering that.

MCKAILEY NALEM: And expect your inbox to explode.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay. Any other thoughts on that before we move on?

Delightful. Okay. Unified approaches to abuse documents. There's a bit of a mea culpa here from myself. We've been talking about this for far too long. We had a number of registrars agree to say, "Hey, let's see if we can work on a process that we can all agree to," – or maybe not specifically process but something that may be a bit broader than that – around abuse reporting. The goal there was to set some expectations for people who are submitting abuse requirements to us and to make sure that we have some sort of unity in how we approach and respond. It was a proactive registrar activity.

It's gone through three major versions. The first one was expansive and unwieldy, the next one was maybe too high-level, the third one was generally kind of crappy, and now we're working on a fourth that I think is not bad.

I don't have it quite in a place to share again yet. I hope to do that very shortly after this meeting. It's on my list of things to do on a long plane ride home. The reason I bring it up here, though, is I want to make sure that people are still engaged on it, that we

haven't let that drop, and to reinvigorate a little excitement – this may be the wrong word – but interest in that and so we can get people paying attention and I want you to know that the new version is coming. I would love to get lots of registrar input and then share it with the community again and see what kind of feedback we get. And then in theory it's something that we can all begin to operate on those principles.

I think it's hard to have a lot of input back on that without a draft in front of you, so apologies. Again, this is largely my own fault for just not getting it done.

So I guess if you have any questions or comments on that, I'm happy to take them now but heads up that's coming.

BEN ANDERSON: Was that the one with John Berryhill?

GRAEME BUNTON: Yes, that one.

Greg?

GREG BEBIOSKI: Is this from a perspective of what needs to be in an Abuse Report, or how the registrars will respond to a report?

GRAEME BUNTON: It's a bit of both. The general setup is for any sort of abuse requirement these are the things that we would need to see in order to be able to address it. And then assuming that you have met those requirements, then here are some of the responses that you could expect from a registrar. So you meet these things then you can get this sort of thing back.

GREG DEBIOSKI: So I guess off the top of my head it would seem like it would be easier to find agreement on what we would want from the community than try to figure out how we would respond. Does it make sense to start with that, that we can show – here's what needs to be in an Abuse Report before we move on to all of us deciding together how we would respond?

GRAEME BUNTON: Yes. So I think the actual abuse submission requirements are relatively straightforward and I think captured reasonably well in the document. The goal is not to dictate at a micro level how registrars are going to respond because everybody's going to be approaching these problems differently. But I do think there is expectations that can be set. You submit an Abuse Report with those requirements met then you can expect to be notified that

it's been received. And if there's an investigation on that, approximate timeline for that sort of investigation.

To me the process is about setting expectations for abuse reporting. That's where that's at at the moment. But we don't want to try and dictate how individual registrars are going to respond each way. We want to make sure that there's guidelines in there that gives everybody the discretion to operate how they so choose.

McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM:

Thanks. Just on Greg's point, just the genesis of the earlier draft of this document was based on speaking to quite a large number of registrars to collect what they were actually doing and both what they were looking for and what they were doing based on what they received. So that's what Graeme's saying, it's both sides. The idea, as Graeme says, it's setting an expectation. So if you send in an Abuse Report which doesn't contain enough information then a reasonable expectation would be that the registrar would send it back asking for more information.

The other thing as well is that this project has been going on for quite some time and there are quite a few people outside this room – well, there might be in the room, I haven't seen them –

who are very, very, interested in seeing progress on this, and actually seeing this document come through because we've been speaking about it now for 18 months plus I think or thereabouts. So there's a lot of interest obviously from, on the GAC side it's the Public Safety Working Group members are very interested in it, IPC are also interested in it, and then on the other side there's a certain amount of interest coming from the Non-Commercial Stakeholders who have concerns about matters around due process, etc. etc. etc.

So there's a lot of interest from the community on this, so we are coming under a reasonable amount of pressure to produce something. What is currently drafted is, as Graeme says, not bad. It's pretty damned good. So I think really what Graeme's hoping for is to get input from people maybe. I don't know. I'm not sure what his next steps are. Graeme?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Next step is for me to get a few more pieces into this current draft and share that with registrars. I'm planning on doing that in the next week. I think I've said that before, but I'll try and for real do it.

Heath?

HEATH DIXON:

To Greg’s point and then to McKailey’s point, it seems like the best way to do something quickly so that we can be responsive to the community that’s looking for it is to narrow the scope down to the thing that’s the easiest for us to do, put that out, get comments on that – “This is too much information” – have that so we can at least start the conversation there on the easy part while we then decide on what’s the right amount of information to put in the second part. Because as far as the second part goes, it seems to me that a better deliverable would be something that we could share amongst ourselves to say, “Hey, if you get an abuse complaint, here are some things that registrars have tried that have made it easy to process them,” or, ‘Here are some resources that you can use to test whether or not a claim of abuse is real,” “Here are some ways that you can validate if a law enforcement entity is approaching you that it’s the proper resource.”

It seems like we could really deliver two different things on that second part. One is an internal document that we could use amongst ourselves to help each other out, and the second would be a very limited scope document that would address some issues of what the response is going to be. But given that we originally did poll registrars to say, “How are you doing this?” And you’re going to get a lot of different answers. Putting those

different answers together in the internal document would be helpful for us. But it seems like it'll just take too long to ever get it.

So I'd propose breaking it up, just put the first piece out as quickly as possible, and then we can decide about the second piece at some future point.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Heath. That's certainly what I heard was you volunteering to help work on this document and that's greatly appreciated.

HEATH DIXON: As soon as you get the first draft out, or the next draft out.

GRAEME BUNTON: So part of that though, that second piece you talk about that internal document I think is interesting and important and brings us back to something I've been thinking quite a bit about which is that the Registrar Stakeholder Group needs to do a better job of showing its value to the members. And some of that value could be documents like that and we can do a much better job of sharing best practices and approaches to different problems and that's a great place to start.

HEATH DIXON: I would be happy to participate in that. We, as most of you know, are relatively new to the registrar business but we've been handling lot of abuse issues through AWS and other businesses, so we've got a lot of ideas but it would be interesting to see what people are doing with respect to particular registrar domain name types of abuse complaints compared to what we're doing, and then we and I think other people in the room who have other businesses can bring our input on what we're doing in those other areas.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Ben?

BEN ANDERSON: I definitely advocate that way of doing it – having a public facing one and an inward facing one – purely because I know there's a lot of expectation building around this now. So with my Registrar Stakeholder Group hat on I think that's the right approach. I guess from my day job point of view there's stuff that I would definitely want to see in there, as you know. And so I think as the expectation grows around this document, it's probably best not to shoot ourselves in the foot.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks, Ben. I'll take that piece on board and we'll loop some people in and we'll keep working on that. I'm pleased to hear that there is still continued interest and we can move forward with that.

Close that off unless there's anything else.

No? Good. Okay. Next up on the agenda is – what time are we at? We're about 15 minutes ahead which is excellent. So before we get into the Charter Drafting Team, maybe I'll grab a piece from AOB.

There was a discussion on the list recently on the RSG mailing list around insurance requirements and how that's changed at the registry level but we haven't necessarily seen that filter down to the registrar level. I was talking with a couple registries about this and for them solving that problem is awkward because the insurance requirements may be built into their Registry Agreement. Going through that process for them is quite problematic. It opens it up to public comment, etc. etc. And then they have to file a RRA through the registrars which we would then need to approve.

And so we were talking about a process where collectively registrars and registries can write a letter to ICANN and say – especially in the interest of helping underserved regions – that maybe we can come up with a process or mechanism for

addressing insurance requirements specifically. There would have to be some mechanism within ICANN to allow especially legacy TLDs to address those components of their RA very narrowly, just the insurance requirements, without having to blow those open into giant comment periods, etc. And then we would need to agree to do something like – for any RRA coming through that is addressing insurance requirements specifically, we would give it a blanket pass. I think that would go a long way to helping resolve some of those issues, but I thought I'd bring that up here to see if there was any feedback or thoughts on working with the registries to try and make that happen.

I see a hand from McKailey.

MCKAILEY NALEM:

Thanks, Graeme. I keep on raising my hand. It's terrible. I'm actually doing a high-interest topic with the GAC this afternoon on the underserved regions so this particular discussion is timely. Personally, I don't have any problem with us coming up with some fast, simple, light, way of addressing this. But if we are going to look at insurance requirements, I think it might be interesting to also look to see if some registries have a similar issue with deposits for registrars because – two things – that causes pain for pretty much all of us, and two, for registrars in developing/underserved regions etc. etc. etc. it's a pain point if

it's within their contract. Not in the kind of [separatist] outside the contract, but just in case it is. I also don't know if it is in many cases. But just thought I'd raise that. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, McKailey. I don't know enough about how those are implemented. I'd be cautious about trying to bundle those two issues. If it's make or break and we're trying to make a change on insurance requirements then I would just keep it bracketed to something small.

Are people interested in this? Can I get a show of nods?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We are absolutely interested in a discussion about pre and post payments.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay. That other piece.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Coming from an underserved region, both of those are actually a [pain] point for us. Originally I know that ICANN took away the insurance requirement for registrars as part of the accreditation. We're exceptionally happy with that. But then it came to [inaudible] with the registry and they have the insurance

requirement. Okay, that's fine. We had to go [overseas] and I should get an insurance policy from there because from our side in our country there's nobody that actually does that. They don't understand the domain name industry that can say, "Alright. I'll give you insurance for this type of business." So we had to go a whole bunch of other places for that.

Then we got back were integrated, and then we came to the second registry and they had a different requirement for an amount, so we had to amend that policy and that whole procedure was a schlep as well.

And then on the last point about the deposits, some registries have small amounts and we're happy with that. But as a starting registrar when you get to a bigger registry that has, for example, let's say \$2,000 or \$2,500 minimum deposit amount, that was...we're just starting out. We can't exactly just throw that in. There's a huge amount, and say, "Have that there. Have that as a deposit." And we might sell five, six, maybe 10 domain names of yours in a month or something like that while that money is just being held in their account and we could do something else with it. So both of those are very, very, important to us.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Jeff?

JEFFREY ECKHAUS:

I would very much not want to bring up that second part with ICANN because that opens a door to a business relationship between two parties that is not covered in any of the agreements, and I don't think ICANN's going to be able to do anything because it's not in any of the agreements and I think that's something you could negotiate specifically with the registry if you wanted to. I think it's not worth us bringing it up. I don't think it's going to go anywhere and I don't think it's in ICANN's remit to even look at that at that sort of business relationship between a registry and registrar.

Me personally, I'd strongly advise against it. As far as the insurance, if it pertains to anything in the contract then it's worth going after. I'm not sure that ICANN can again say if a registry says, "Hey, we need this insurance," and ICANN to say, "Hey, that's their business. They've decided that." Then there's not much we could do.

I don't personally just like expanding ICANN's scope in asking them to bring things into business relationships that don't need to be and I like to just [think of] the contract to look at it as narrowly as possible and not letting them into business relationships. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Jeff. I think you raise a good point and I am super cautious about bundling those two issues. I don't think we had clarity – if those particular pieces are outside of the Registry Agreements then maybe they don't belong in that discussion, but I certainly hear the pain that causes. It did seem like there was rough, fuzzy, general, agreement if we can work on that insurance requirement issue, we should. So I'll take that back to the registries and we'll have a conversation with them about seeing if we can try and move that forward.

Any other thoughts on that? We're five minutes ahead of schedule but I think we then move in to Charter drafting.

Theo, are you online?

Zoe?

ZOE BONYTHON:

Because the audio isn't amazing, Lindsay is actually going to do this update. But I'm just going to precede that by saying I am going to be putting up the draft document. This is not for distribution now. This is just for the purposes of if we need to refer to it during this update, okay? So it is going to be up there but just to let you know this is not the point where we're sending it to you. Thanks.

LINDSAY HAMILTON: I will point out now I am just reading out Theo's e-mail. This is not coming from me. Just to give you a sort of overview, the new Charter was not written by the RSG members. It's a mix of the old RRSO Charter blended with the BC Charter, and then it's had various input from – I don't know – the RSC and ExCom and a variety of other people.

Currently the Charter is about 70% done and we expect to finish it before the Copenhagen meeting next year, hopefully. It's going quite well at the moment.

We think the Charter is now easier to read but there is still room for improvement. The Charter is up to par with ICANN requirements.

A quick overview then. The mission and principles have been expanded. It's now clearer what the mission is, and we think our principles are easier to understand. That means that members, regardless of what your position is within the RSG, will have a better understanding of what's expected of you.

We also looked at eligibility and elections. We spent quite a lot of time on this. There aren't any major changes, although the term of the ExCom officers has been expanded to two years. We've also cleaned up the language and how we should operate where there are vacancies within the ExCom.

ExCom duties – ICANN has suggested a lot of new language here. We have spent a lot of time again making sure the language reflects what the ExCom is actually doing at a basic level.

The membership section – We’ve had a lot of discussion on this. There’s a lot of new language and it’s much more realistic now when it comes to composition of the current situation of the group.

Decision-making, elections, and policy positions – we’re currently working on that. Something that did become clear during the last few months in relation to elections is that the old Charter is very clunky around that. This has also made our work much easier as we’re very aware of the limitations of the old Charter. We’re currently addressing that and it should make things much simpler.

The current Charter has been translated into Chinese. Sophia Feng was kind enough to check it for us. Maybe we want to discuss how we go about making sure the translations are being done correctly.

That’s it at the moment.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Great. Thank you, Lindsay. I think we all look forward to seeing this, and hopefully it’s out far enough ahead of Copenhagen that

we can have a pretty robust discussion on it in Copenhagen before we then get around to voting on such a thing.

My question, having run into this a lot and I think we talked a little bit about it in Helsinki, is to try and capture how we mostly operate already which is more or less around a consent agenda which is we can bring up an issue and talk about it and take action without having to vote, but still give people the opportunity to disagree and then figure out if they disagree in a way enough to trigger a vote.

Under our Bylaws currently we're supposed to vote on all sorts of stuff, and members may have noticed we don't actually do a lot of voting. It's typically because we just don't have enough time as issues arise to respond in that way so we fast-track almost everything. It's an unfortunate way of doing things but being able to pitch stuff to the Registrar Stakeholder Group, say "We're concerned about this issue. Here's kind of where we're at. Does anybody disagree? And is your disagreement enough that you think we should trigger a vote on this issue? Otherwise, we can move forward as a more or less consent agenda item and take action and file comments and endorse letters, that sort of thing." Which is a very longwinded way to say, "Hey, is that in there?"

LINDSAY HAMILTON: What we're trying to do is get the Charter to reflect what we actually do, because currently there's a lot of stuff in there that I don't think we do and it just isn't practical. So insofar as we can, we're trying to reflect what we currently do, or maybe even look at it and say, "How could we do it better?"

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thank you. I see McKailey's hand.

MCKAILEY NALEM: This is great [some of this]. This is wonderful this is moving forward. Graeme mentioned it earlier today that he's run into the frustration I used to have. I was Chair of the Stakeholder Group for three years. During that time, my biggest struggle was trying to understand what the hell the members actually supported or didn't support, what the position was on some things, and as others have pointed out, the current official way of doing it – clunky is a polite way of describing it – unworkable and logistically a – “hellish” is probably a bit more realistic. So you do end up with a situation where at times as a group we come across as being disorganized and unresponsive, whereas that's not the case. It's more that we're being hampered by our own stupid rules.

Just a note of warning, other groups within the ICANN space are a lot more agile and they come across as being better organized. So if we can fix this, that would be great.

LINDSAY HAMILTON: That's kind of what we're trying to do just so that it flows better, we are more agile, and not seen as completely disorganized and a nightmare.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. That sounds very positive. Anybody have questions for Lindsay on where this is going?

No? Awesome. Lindsay, you have a question for yourself?

LINDSAY HAMILTON: No, I was just going to say obviously everyone's so excited about this they can't wait to read it when it's done.

GRAEME BUNTON: Excellent. Thank you for the update. We're blasting through our afternoon agenda. This is good.

Now we're actually into AOB about 20 minutes ahead of time. We've got a few things in here – Thick WHOIS, new gTLDs, PPSA IRT, and insurance requirements – I already talked about

insurance requirements. Maybe because I'm still talking and I just can't get enough of hearing myself, I'll briefly talk about the PPSA IRT just to make sure everybody is up to speed on that and see if we have any questions.

As I'm sure most of you know, the Privacy and Proxy PDP wrapped up earlier this year. The Board in August I think approved the final report and that's moved into implementation. We had our first meeting for the Implementation Review Team about a week ago. There's going to be another meeting here. I think there's some 40-odd people involved in that Implementation process.

I learned a piece the other day that I was unaware of, that the GAC is still expecting a letter from the Board on the direction the Board is going to give the IRT to try and address some of the GAC's concerns. And the GAC had filed advice, and the Public Safety Working Group had filed a comment on the initial report. So there was a couple pieces that Public Safety essentially wanted to address. They were sort of a mix of policy. We pushed that into implementation as much as possible. And that's sort of the recommendation from the Board, is to address the Public Safety/GAC comments as much as possible in the Implementation Review Team and then any policy questions should go back to the GNSO.

So we haven't gotten to those pieces yet because we've really only had one meeting, and I think it'll be a little while before we get there. I think optimistically they're aiming – and Amy's in the room and maybe she could talk to this a little bit more. I maybe should have asked you to present but here I am doing it for you. I think optimistically this is done around 2019. It might take longer. It depends on how much the IRT ends up rehashing policy discussions. And hopefully we do that very little. It's going to have implications for quite possibly the structure of the GNSO for instance. It could generate a new contracted party. We don't know what that looks like yet. I see Jen raising a hand. I'll come back to you in a sec.

I've spoken with some of the Public Safety Working Group members that will be participating in the IRT, which in general I think is a pretty good idea. It'd be nicer to have them in there rather than outside. I asked them to, when I was speaking to them, to see if they can build strawmen for their concerns to see how those might be resolvable sooner rather than later, and also to think pretty far forward about what it looks like for Public Safety and/or the GAC if they don't get everything they want inside the IRT because I think it's possible that they won't and I don't think they have robust processes for dealing with not succeeding, and it's possible that they might not. And so they need to figure out what that looks like and how they would deal

with that ahead of time. I don't know that they super-enjoyed hearing that, but that was us just sort of talking about it.

I think there's lots of registrars involved in this IRT. There should be lots of registrars in this IRT. It's going to take a long time. It's important for a lot of our businesses.

Right. That's more or less it. I think I saw Stephanie's hand, and then Jen's hand?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: I just got overly excited because I thought you were talking about the Thick WHOIS IRT.

GRAEME BUNTON: Sorry. I pushed that off because I don't know anything about it. Jen?

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. We heard Göran talk about ICANN staff being around servicing and supporting, and we also heard it again today in the Board session. [I] obviously appreciate your feedback on that one.

This IRT is going to be very complicated, and it's going to take us some time and it's going to affect probably every registrar in this

room. I commit and my team will commit to raising issues where we believe that there's gaps in the policy. And for that reason alone and taking it back to the IRT and the Working Group to determine how to fill those gaps will more than likely extend the timeline. I know that we've gotten feedback that it is aggressive, but we also know that more than likely the timeline will be extended.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Jen. We talked a little bit about the Interim Spec on Privacy and Proxy already, but for context if people haven't been paying any attention to this there will be an accreditation regime for Privacy Services, Proxy Services, many of which many of us operate those. It will change how that works, and so we need to be participating in this pretty closely.

I'm not sure I have anything more for the Stakeholder Group on this other than there is a meeting coming up. If you run a service, you should think about participating in that IRT and/or talking to some of us who are. There's quite a few of us in there.

McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM: Thanks, Graeme. Just very, very, very, briefly. The difference between what the GAC Public Safety Working Group were looking for and what's in the final recommendations, I'm having difficulty seeing how all of those things can be addressed in the IRT because it's not a question of a mild difference of opinion. It's a substantial difference. They basically have huge issues with a few things that we had agreed on.

Your comment there about how they're going to deal with that – is this something that we need to be engaging with the GAC on now or how would we deal with this? I have this concern that they're going to try to push very forcefully to change policies that were already decided on, and I honestly don't know how on earth we can deal with that because it was decided. It was discussed. It's the consensus. It's a consensus document. I'm just a bit confused by that.

If it was just a matter of as other's said, gaps – sure, fine, no problem with that. But there's a few things that I've got the distinct impression that we had a huge difference of opinion on.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, McKailey. I saw Heath's hand. But briefly for those who didn't participate in this PDP or have read the GAC advice – the GAC basically had three issues. One was the use of Privacy and Proxy Services for commercial websites. That was discussed ad

nauseam in the PDP and it was decided with consensus that there should be no restriction on that. Reopening that issue inside the IRT I think is totally a no-go. There's no confusion about that topic. It is extremely clear.

They have an issue with jurisdiction, and they have some concerns that Privacy services will not have to respond to law enforcement from outside their own jurisdiction. This is another one that I personally – and again, this is me as a registrar, not as Chair or previous co-Chair of the PDP – is I think it's totally unresolvable. There is almost no way. There is no way that ICANN can compel me as a Canadian company to obey law enforcement from another jurisdiction. You may do so voluntarily and I think that's fine. But let's pretend Canada is a totally evil country that murders journalists and does all sorts of horrible things. You just can't make that work. There is no way that they can force that unless they try and narrow that to a few countries they pick that they think are okay. I think it's completely unresolvable.

The last issue they have was around notification. Law enforcement wanted to be able to submit a request for information and not have the underlying registrant notified. That one is maybe discussable in implementation. There might be a place to figure that out. And maybe the framework that was built for Intellectual Property, we can take some pieces from

that and apply it. But those are the three core issues, and only one of them do I think has a real implementation, narrow, possibility of really working out.

Again, my own opinion. I could be totally wrong. Amy or someone else might have more insight on that.

Heath?

HEATH DIXON:

I considered actually bringing this up today in the Registry/Registrar Meeting before we met with the Board because I think it's exactly the same issue as we raised on some of the areas where we've run into problems in Implementation Reviews with changes being made at that stage that weren't discussed at the Policy Development stage. And I think that the message that we gave to the Board with, we are willing as a GNSO to reach out to the GAC and get GAC input on things, is valid and we're going to do that. But the Board needs to stand behind us and defend us when the GAC tries to disrupt the Policy Development Process by interjecting policy issues too late in the process.

So I think it's incumbent upon us, all of us who are participating, to make sure that we resist those policy changes and it's incumbent upon the ICANN staff that's actually going to be in

there to back us up on that because the ICANN staff is the right gatekeeper in that IRT process as the party that is running the process to make sure that the process is honored and that the GAC does not make policy changes at that point.

So I was a little concerned when Jen talked about filling the gaps. I want to make sure that when we talk about filling the gaps what we're talking about is implementing the policy that was agreed upon and not making changes to the policy just because the GAC feels like there are gaps in the policy.

So it's incumbent upon us to make those points. It's incumbent upon the ICANN staff to take their role seriously. And then we need to make sure that, to the extent that the GAC does provide resistance and doesn't want to follow the process, that we encourage the Board to take its role seriously to defend the policy making process. And it's unfortunate that the GAC has decided that they don't want to be involved in the policy making process. They want to reserve the ability to just make a decision at the end. But we don't need to fix that problem for them, and one learning that they will be able to take away from this is that they need to get involved early if they have concerns.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Heath. Those are good points. We're going to have to be pretty vigorous in our defense of the policy in this IRT.

I see Jen.

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Heath. I completely agree with you and I just want to clarify that ICANN staff's position will be to identify where there may be gaps and then provide that back to the IRT.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jen.

JENNIFER GORE: Based upon what's in the final report of the working group. What happens after that is not up to ICANN staff, but we're here to facilitate and support that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. I think it's Amy who is in the room who is running this IRT. So everyone take a look. Wave your hand, Amy. And so we'll be working with her pretty closely as this moves forward. And again, if you're interested there's another session later – Amy, when is the Working Session?

AMY BIVINS: It's on Wednesday morning. I think it's at 11:00.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. You'll see many of us there.

So that's the PPSAI IRT issue. Tom's laughing at me hilariously. I don't know why. Any other issues with that? Anybody need more context or update on that particular piece of work?

Jen?

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. I just want to offer up that we will send out the presentation of update that took place on – what day did we do that, Amy? Saturday? Friday? Thanks. I forget what day of the week it is. On Friday we'll send that to you, Graeme, so you can distribute that to the Registrar Stakeholder Group for the ones that missed that session.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thank you.

Okay, let's move on in the AOB list of things to do. We've got new gTLDs and Thick WHOIS left, and we've got about 35 minutes or so. I don't know a thing about Thick WHOIS and I think Theo was going to give the update, although he did send an e-mail to the list the other day that my understanding has captured most of it. And I think he's having audio troubles so he may not be able to

join us remotely. Stephanie, you care a lot about Thick WHOIS, can you give us a sense of what's going on there?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: I have an update specific to the comment period. If there's someone who's better equipped to update on the status of the working group I'll defer to that first.

Then we'll just leave it to Theo's e-mail and I'll pivot to the comment period.

GRAEME BUNTON: Tom?

THOMAS KELLER: Yeah, Toby and I had accidentally run into Pat Kane yesterday and tried to engaged him to what's happening there because none of us is really participating in that process. He told us that, in theory there is [now all of this] policy made up that we will have to start shipping over data [early as] next year at the end of 2019 or something. But that Verisign is going to file something – which I didn't really get. They don't want to receive data at all but they want to resolve the issue by actually switching or waiting for RDAP so there's a [data status for this].

RDAP in case you haven't heard of that can relay requests basically. It could be used for that, but there is no [really other] protocol. There's other protocol but it's not the profile and we wouldn't know how to do it and so. So there seems to be some [tendency] Verisign to actually to not agree with what they discussed and it would be tremendously interesting from any insider of the [group] because [it] was completely new to us whether there is any update on that or not. They're very open about it so maybe if Verisign is in the room they can talk about that.

This could really change how that whole working group works and the outcome.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Tom. That's interesting. I don't think we have anyone in the room who can speak to more from the working group. If you know anything, Stephanie, you can share that as you talk also about the comment period please.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU:

Maybe a little bit on the timeline. If you'll recall, maybe about six months back there was an initial public comment period where – it was either an initial public comment period or two parallel periods – where RDAP and Thick WHOIS were put forward for

public comment at the same time. At this point there was still going to be a requirement because the Verisign registries were going to be Thin, that registrars were going to have to implement the RDAP in addition to that. We coordinated comments and several other folks submitted comments in response that stated that the timelines for these two things should be better synchronized such that the transition happens before implementation is required and such that there's this carve-out created – and that's what you see in the policy now – so that registrars are only required to implement RDAP for Thin registries but that the Verisign registries are specifically carved out of that.

Separately, I know Verisign has been very strong on the fact that they're not sure whether it's commercially reasonable at this stage to be implementing RDAP. We come at that with a different perspective, but I can pivot to that. Do you have anything?

KRISTA PAPAC:

Hi, everybody, Krista Papac, ICANN staff and I'm the Director of Registry Services. The Thick WHOIS policy implementation is being led by the Registry Services Team so I'm happy to share with you if you want – it's not really my meeting so I didn't want to interfere. I just want to make sure – I think I understood the

question to be more about the transition from Thin to Thick rather than the [consistent] – Let me just back up.

The policy recommendations that were sent to the Board and approved basically said two things – That all gTLD registries need to be Thick and that they should do so with consistent labeling and display, and that consistent labeling and display should be using the WHOIS Spec that’s in your 2013 RAA.

So we took the work and we’ve been working on it for a few years now. We separated it into two tracks – one to address the consistent labeling and display requirement and one to address the transition from Thin to Thick requirement. The rationale or the reason behind that – and this is all in collaboration and coordination with the IRT – but the rationale is that transition all of that Thick data is obviously a much bigger animal than the...there’s pretty minor adjustments in the scheme of what adjustments could be for the consistent labeling and display track.

So just to build off of what Stephanie was just saying, with respect to the consistent labeling and display track, we did develop that policy with the IRT, published it for public comment, and actually announced the implementation of it. However, there was a reconsideration request that came from the Registry Stakeholder Group that took issue with some of the

language in the policy which was requiring implementation of RDAP.

So we rescinded that policy and reissued it recently with the deletion of the RDAP requirement, and have put it back out for public comment. And that was like October 21st and it closes I think December – I don't recall the 5th or 9th or something along those lines.

So that's the consistent labeling and display track. Everybody looks really confused so should I stop and take questions before I go to the transition track or keep going?

I'll keep going.

Alright. So that's going on. The consistent labeling and display track doesn't really affect registrars so much but the transition one obviously does. So the transition track, what we've been doing there – and there are registrars participating in the IRT. We've got parties from GoDaddy certainly. Theo has taken a very active role. And I'm trying to think – Dennis who was the project lead. Can you think of other registrars off the top of your head?

Okay. I think there's a few others – Frederic. I'm so sorry.

That said, the transition, the way that that's going to work is, the draft consensus policy has also been published for public comment, came out a couple days later than the other one so

October 26th and it's open until December 5th or 9th. And the way that policy is set up is that there's two "implement by" dates. The first one applies to new registrations and the second one applies to existing registrations.

So what would happen is, it goes through public comment, we'll do the summary and analysis – we have no idea what's going to come out in public comment – but assuming all of that goes smoothly, by January 31st of 2017 you would get an announcement from ICANN saying, "Hey, this policy is being implemented. For new registrations," – and this mostly affects the registry in this case...no, I'm sorry it affects both of you – "For new registrations those must be Thick no later than March 1st 2018 for the three registries .com, .net, and .jobs."

The second "implement by" date in the policy will say, "By February 1st 2019 all of the existing registrations must be transitioned to .com, .net, and .jobs."

One final thing I just wanted to comment on with respect to Tom's – the information he shared – I haven't had that conversation with Verisign personally. Maybe others in staff have. I'm not sure. Just to recap what Tom was saying, if I heard you right, Tom, Verisign was suggesting that maybe rather than transitioning the data they would actually just use the RDAP protocol, assuming it was activated, to display the data. So it

effectively looks like you're getting Thick WHOIS data from those registries but it's really just using the protocol to pull it from the registrar.

That hasn't really been discussed in the IRT that I recall. So I'm not sure how that would work. I don't know either. I do know that in the final recommendation report, while the recommendations don't specify what constitutes thick WHOIS – it says "Go be Thick" – when you look at the way the working group discussed Thick WHOIS, the discussion appears to be and the way they wrote about it in the final report, it sort of works under the presumption that it's duplicative data, it's redundant data. The registrar has a set of data and the registry does, so that would be a question for the IRT is ultimately what I'm saying.

Sorry to be so longwinded. I hope that was helpful to you guys, and if you have questions I'm happy to answer them. Thanks for letting me butt into your meeting.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Krista. Does anyone have questions for [them]?

Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: Dennis Chang, ICANN staff. Just to let you know that we do have a Thick WHOIS IRT meeting coming up on Tuesday. So please come join us.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. Stephanie, did you still have thoughts on the comment period?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Yeah, and this is brief. This is just focused. We've gone through several different comment iterations and have focused on different issues. I think this is the third. Specifically this time the comment period is dealing with the issue that we raised earlier today in the staff session how, independent of the community and not requested by the community, staff developed an independent set of additional operational requirements in the form of an operational profile for the RDAP. And via the Thick WHOIS policy [and] implementation of the consistent labeling and display, that all registries were going to have to undertake [endeavor] to not only trigger the RDAP requirement which exists in the registry contract but also require this additional profile which there's no basis for in our contracts and there's no basis for in the consensus policy.

The good news is that this comment period removes that text. So within the registries, we've put together a comment that is strongly supportive of the change to remove the operational profile while preserving some of the criticisms that we've had about the process to date, because this is feedback that was provided pretty clearly at earlier intervals and not really taken into account and not even really reflected in the staff analyses of the issue.

But given that I think this is like the reverse of what you were talking about earlier, Heath, whereas this is a registry implementation problem that doesn't directly affect the registrars necessarily, I think there's similar principle arguments and principle considerations to be made. So I'd be interested in potentially forwarding the registry comment to the Registrar Stakeholder Group and seeing if there was interest in potentially jointly signing on to the position.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Stephanie. Please send that along and I think we have a few interested members and we'll take a look at that.

Does anybody have questions for Stephanie or Krista or anyone else on Thick WHOIS? We're getting late in the day. You guys are hanging in there. You're serious troopers. I appreciate it.

Okay. I think that's it on Thick WHOIS.

The last thing we have on our list of AOB is new GTLDs, and I have no idea who put that on the agenda. I'm pretty sure it was not me. Does anyone know?

Guys, so there's this thing called new gTLDs...

[JENNIFER GORE]: I thought it was the Subsequent Procedure meeting.

GRAEME BUNTON: Was it? Do you have something, Stephanie?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Not quite. I have something about new gTLDs. I remember in our last call James had raised the fact that there was the correspondence from the new gTLD Subsequent Procedure Working Group that went out to each of the communities, and he had some concerns that the registrars hadn't responded and that in this particular issue there was a registry response that endeavored to narrow the scope of the PDP.

And I think this is one of the points that was raised earlier where part of the issues that we cited in the Board session earlier around volunteer fatigue, they don't just have to do with staff. There are things that are being put on our plate by staff but then

there are things like the Subsequent Procedure PDP where we as a community have undertaken – I think Avri used the phrase yesterday – that for this Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process she said every line of the Applicant Guidebook is in scope. Everything is revisited. Everything is being revisited. And this is hundreds of pages long.

We don't think that's necessarily practical or that it's a good use of resources, so one of the things that we've been looking at in the registries is to do, as an input to the Policy Development Process, do a little bit of a prioritization exercise and triage some of the different topics that we encounter during the application process as people who experienced it directly along two different parameters. One – whether we think it's a change in policy or one in implementation, and two – whether we think the issue should be gating.

So there's all things that should be fixed, but the question is whether they actually have to stand in the way of a Subsequent Procedure or subsequent application process or whether they could be addressed iteratively but not necessarily have to stand in the way of that.

We addressed some topics along four different streams and triaged the issues. Everything that we said was policy and was gating. We provided back in our initial correspondence to the

Subsequent Procedure Working Group the things that we didn't believe were gating. We documented them and then we forgot about them forever. And then the things that fell in the middle or where we thought there were minor implementation changes that could have made for significant improvements but weren't necessarily reflected in their original 2007 GNSO Policy. What those changes were – not that that would be the defining position – but to come up with constructive strawmen for easier things that the PDP could look at to narrow the scope while still taking into account places where there are easy wins.

We've kind of tried and failed to coordinate an ad hoc meeting during this Hyderabad session, but I will take the task of, where it's appropriate and potentially interesting, providing correspondence back to the registrars on that just to see if there is parallel or there is shared interest as Bladel indicated there might be – and it might kind of fork on different issues – in some places there might be and some places there might not be. But that's a kind of action item to me.

I had promised to let people know when a meeting was scheduled. It wasn't. That's why I haven't let you know.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Great. Thank you for that update, Stephanie. I see Alex has raised his hand.

ALEXANDER SCHWERTNER: Just one question because I haven't followed the process at all right now. What can we expect in terms of the subsequent round? Will the process be entirely different? What's the sentiment in the community?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Maybe I can turn it to Sara who I know is engaged more directly in the working group itself.

SARA BOCKEY: Repeat the question.

ALEXANDER SCHWERTNER: The question was, in a subsequent new gTLD round, would the process to introduce a specific TLD be fundamentally different to what we had in the past round or is the sentiment that the process actually works more or less? That is like, in the community right now – what could we expect as an outcome of this?

SARA BOCKEY: I'm trying to think if we've discussed that yet. I don't know that we have. And so I don't know that it would change or not. I'm sorry I don't have a better answer for you.

GRAEME BUNTON: I see Frederic Guillemaut [inaudible] with his hand up.

FREDERIC GUILLEMANT: Frederic Guillemant, [inaudible] France. Just to be [inaudible]. I also follow this working group on the new TLDs. We don't even know what it will look like. As Stephanie said, everything is questioned and might be a round, might be not a round, but an ongoing process. But [as] it was scheduled to be a round you have to start a round and then in order to be able to ask [inaudible] as an ongoing process question everywhere and it really looks very complicated to me that we can manage to find a consensus within one, two, three years. That's my feeling. Maybe I'm not in a good mood. It sounds crazy and there are people from all the constituencies of ICANN, they all have something to ask for whereas we just want to have predictability and something which is organized because we will be the ones who have to implement all these new TLDs. But [no], everybody just asks for new things and questions things and so, Alex, no idea.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Frederic. Anybody else have questions or comments on this?

No? Great.

That, I think, brings us to the end of today's agenda. We've got still 15 minutes. I don't want to keep anybody any longer than we need to. I will remind you that Bruce's reception is where and when, Zoe?

ZOE BONYTHON:

I literally just got an e-mail from [Tanzi] saying can you confirm it's in the Ballroom? I feel like that was a mistake. It's supposed to be on the Novotel lawn at 6:30. Hang on, let me see if [Tanzi] came back to me –

GRAEME BUNTON:

While you look at that I'll raise a brief issue, which is I know Chuck from Verisign is going to do a bit of a talk because he's worked with Bruce for so long. Is there anyone who wants to volunteer to say a few words on the Registrars' behalf about Bruce and working with Bruce? There are many people here who have been working with him much longer than I have. I will do it if no one else steps up, but I am looking to people who have been around like Tom and/or Jeff. Does someone have some good words to say about Bruce?

TOM KELLER: You will do a great job.

GRAEME BUNTON: Come on. You people. I'm looking for someone to volunteer who's worked with Bruce over the past X number of years. I'm glad he's not in the room.

MCKAILEY NALEM: I would love to say James would do this wonderfully. Is he even in the room? Damn. That's being unfair to James. Ultimately, Graeme, I think you as our Chair and as our glorious leader, it is up to you to take on that mantle and to take on that task. Just don't embarrass us.

GRAEME BUNTON: I won't. I'll do it I think Bruce is a great guy. I've learned some interesting things from him and his service has been exemplary.

MCKAILEY NALEM: We don't want a 25-minute speech. We just want to have a couple of drinks –

GRAEME BUNTON: Maybe someone has a hilarious anecdote that I don't have that they want to share. I'll take this on. If anybody has a tidbit that

they think would be great to share about Bruce, please come find me and soon.

Have we heard back?

ZOE BONYTHON:

I'm e-mailing right now. I said to her it should be the lawn unless they come back and say it absolutely has to be the Ballroom I think, let's say the lawn. I'm saying the lawn. I will send an e-mail if it's not the lawn. I've already asked for there to be millions of signs up because there has been this back and forth with the venue. So there is going to be signs. The signs are going to be correct. Please assume for now that it's the lawn.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Zoe is getting wonderful insight this week into an ICANN meeting.

Great. Okay. Does anybody have anything else they wish to raise or share with the Registrar Stakeholder Group while we're all still sitting in the room together?

McKailey?

MCKAILEY NALEM:

I just want to say thanks to Graeme for chairing us today. Well done.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. I appreciate it. It was nice of you all to vote for me.

Thank you all for participating today. I know it's a long day. Still not enough of you quiet people got up to the mic so I'm going to make everyone do something dumb in Copenhagen. Heads up. It's coming.

Right. At 5:00 today is the cross-field, and the other one – the high-interest topic on DNS and content regulation. So those are good places to go shortly. And then –

MCKAILEY NALEM: I'm speaking on the DNS and content regulation in case anybody cares.

GRAEME BUNTON: So am I.

MCKAILEY NALEM: Excellent.

GRAEME BUNTON: So those two things are happening and then Bruce's reception, and then the rest of the ICANN Meeting. Jen, are you waving your hand, too? Okay.

So thank you, everyone, who joined us and participated and thank you for GDD staff today. You were quite helpful in this session. Thank you, everyone. If we don't see you for the rest of the meeting, we'll see you again in Copenhagen. You are free. Be free.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]