EN

COPENHAGEN – GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting
Tuesday, March 14, 2017 – 09:30 to 13:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It is Tuesday, March 14, 2017 in Hall C1 for the GNSO for the GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting, 9:30 to 13:45.

GRAEME BUNTON: Good morning, everybody. Are we ready to go at the back? We are ready to go, let's get this party started, please and thank you.

All right, good morning, everybody. My name is Graeme. I'm the Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group; I'm from a company called Tucows. Thank you all for coming today. It's good to see so many friendly faces. Some of them look a little tired and weary. Don't worry, there's still a couple more days of this meeting to go.

We have a lot to cover today, it's a pretty busy agenda, and we don't have a lot of time to do it, which is also another thing that we'll talk about later on today. A couple general reminders for this whole session, which is say your name before speaking for the transcript, try and speak into the microphone so that the translators can hear you and everyone can hear you, and then

EN

speak slowly, which I'm not doing and I apologize, because we are having this meeting translated into Chinese, and it gives the translators a break.

So, with that I think let's do a quick round of introductions so that everyone knows who each other is.

BEN ANDERSON: Ben Anderson, Net Names, CSC, Treasurer.

THEO GEURTS: Theo Geurts, Secretary, Real Time Register.

MICHELE NEYLON: Michele Neylon, Blacknight, GNSO councilor.

JAMES BLADEL: James Bladel, Go Daddy and GNSO councilor for North America.

BOB WYGANT: Bob Wygant, web dot com.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Darcy Southwell, Endurance International and GNSO councilor.

ICANN 58 COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

EN

PINA ERDOGAN: Pina Erdogan, 1API.

LINDSAY HAMILTON-REID: Lindsay Hamilton-Reid, one and one.

NEIL MCPHERSON: Neil McPherson, one and one.

TOM KELLER: Tom Keller, one and one.

SOFIA FENG: Sofia Feng, ZDNS.

CHRISTIAN MULLER: Christian Muller, [inaudible].

ZOE BONYTHON: Zoe Bonython, Registrar Secretariat.

GREG DIBIASE: Greg DiBiase, Amazon Registrar.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible], registrar.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Eric Rokobauer Endurance International.

[LIMA DUE]:   [Lima Due, SDC] [inaudible].

SARAH WYLD: Sarah Wyld, Deluxe dot com.

WENDY SCOTT: Wendy Scott, Wordpress dot com.

KELLIE PETERSON: Kellie Peterson, Wordpress dot com.

SARA BOCKEY: Sara Bockey, Go Daddy.

VLAD DINCULESCU: Vlad Dinculescu, DNS Africa.

PAM LITTLE: Pam Little, Alibaba.

EN

TOM BARRETT: Tom Barrett, EnCirca.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible].

CHRIS PELLING: Chris Pelling, NetEarth.

FRÉDÉRIC GUILLEMAUT: Frédéric Guillemaut, SafeBrands.

JANELLE MCALISTER: Janelle McAlister from Mark Monitor.

RIEKE POPPE: Rieke Poppe from one dot com.

TOM SUMMER: Tom Summer [inaudible] euro.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Kristian Ørmen, Larson Data.

PETER LARSEN: Peter Larsen, Larson Data.

MARIKA KONINGS: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

GRAEME BUNTON: We do have a microphone in the sort of back of the room if anybody sitting in the back wants to introduce themselves and you're a registrar. Jeff Eckhaus, you don't want to? All right, thanks, everybody.

Process notes and things to do today, we've got a break at 10:30, we'll have a working lunch at 12:40. One of the things that I'd promised our, one of our members apparently at some point, and I'm now regretting this a little bit, was that we would try and keep the acronyms to a minimum today, so I'm going to try and not use those. If I had a buzzer I would do that. But let's all try and be conscious that especially for people who where English is not your primary language, your first language, acronyms cause pain and misery, so we're going to try and be nice and long-winded I guess by not using them so much.

All right, I think that's… Let's get started with some of the GNSO update from ICANN staff, Marika, if you would please?

MARIKA KONINGS: Thank you very much, Graeme, and thank you for inviting me over. I'm actually little bit confused what you want me to talk about because I was under the impression that I was giving a GNSO update, but I see that you actually on the agenda have as a Council, issues for the Council, so the slide that's up are some of the issues that the GNSO is considering and discussing during this meeting. But then there are also of course, a number of specific items that are on the Council agenda for Wednesday. So, what would you prefer me to talk about?

GRAEME BUNTON: My impression was that, sorry this is Graeme for the transcript, was that we are going to get a Generic Names Supporting Organization update.

MARIKA KONINGS: And I'm happy to talk about both, so maybe I will first talk about the first one and then if there's time left, but I know there are several Council members around the table as well so I'm sure they can speak about that as well.

So, on the screen you basically see some of the topics that are under discussion during this meeting, and they've basically been divided up into three different buckets. So first and foremost, the activities in relation to policy development processes that

are underway. I think probably with most of them you are probably quite familiar so there are four PDPs that are currently in the working group phase.

First one on generic top-level domains, subsequent procedures, the second one on the review of all rights protection mechanisms in all generic top-level domains, next-generation registration directory services to replace WHOIS, and then the international or the IGO INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms.

All… The first three of these groups are still in their deliberation phases basically leading up to an initial report at some point in time. They all actually had lengthy face-to-face meetings this Saturday, and I think several of them are having a follow-up meeting tomorrow. So, if you are interested in those topics please attend those sessions.

I also want to point out, as we have relatively limited time during the session, and I'm happy to take any questions, I do want to direct you to the GNSO policy briefings that were distributed in advance of this meeting where we provide a bit more detail on all of these initiatives, where they currently stand, which questions are they expected to address, what are some of the opportunities to provide input.

So, I would encourage you to review that and of course if you have any questions following that review do always feel free to reach out to me or any of my colleagues supporting these efforts.

And then in relation to the curative rights working group, they actually have an initial report out for public comment. They are having a session I believe tomorrow morning if I'm not mistaken, where they will be presenting their recommendations. So, if you are interested to hear what they are recommending or if you want to provide some input, you know, please attend that session or provide your input as part of the public comment forum.

So then in addition to the working group activities, there are also a number of implementation review teams that will be meeting throughout this week. And I'm actually assuming that my GDD colleagues will be briefing you were updating you on the status of those later today. But again if you have any questions about that also happy to talk about that.

There are also a number of non-policy issues that are under consideration. As you may recall, the Board adopted a little while ago, a number of recommendations in relation to the GNSO review. Based on that, there was a working group that developed an implementation plan. The Board approved the

implementation plan and now the working group is moving ahead with implementing those recommendations.

As it relates to the number of recommendations that will affect daily operations and the working of the GNSO, you are strongly encouraged to participate in that effort. I believe there are a number of Registrar reps that are in that group, but it's important to keep an eye on that as it directly affects how things work.

Bylaws updates that basically relates to the work that was undertaken to make sure that the GNSO has the processes and procedures in place to be able to work in the new environment, the post-transition environment of the empowered community.

So, a drafting team was formed to look at, you know, what changes if any would need to be made to the Operating Procedures or the ICANN Bylaws to make sure that the GNSO has the ability to make use or take advantage of some of the new powers that exist.

So, that drafting team came up with a number of recommendations which were approved by the GNSO Council and then directed staff or at least directed staff to develop language reflecting those recommendations.

So, staff went through the exercise and it's actually a pretty lengthy document, I think over 60 pages if I'm not mistaken, where we've gone through all the bylaws provisions and the related recommendations from the Bylaws Drafting Team and how we believe these can or should be translated into potential changes or in many cases as well, no changes are deemed necessary apart from any clarifying how decisions are taken.

So, we've now passed that back to the drafting team because there were a number of questions that we did identify and going through it, and as well a number of assumptions that staff made in that exercise. So, we hope to get some confirmation and feedback from the Bylaws Drafting Team on those open items. And any subsequent step once that has been, have happened, those proposed changes will go out for public comment. And I believe I think Darcy is on that, is there anyone else from the Registrars in that group or is it just you?

So, I think each stakeholder group and constituency have a representative in that group and they will be meeting tomorrow. It's an open meeting so if anyone is interested you can also join that effort.

Slightly linked to that, and that goes slightly already into the agenda for the GNSO Council are the discussions in relation to the creation of a Standing Selection Committee. I think as you

may have heard, there are a number of requests in relation to nominations or endorsements or selections from the GNSO for review teams but also some of the post-transition structures that have been created.

So, in order to have a more streamlined process for that, the Council is currently discussing the creation of such a Standing Selection Committee, which would basically be tasked to provide recommendations to the GNSO Council on who should be nominated or selected, and then the GNSO Council is expected to review those recommendations and act on those.

There is a draft charter for this effort. One of the main remaining items, and I'm assuming looking at James, but that probably is one of the things that you probably still will discuss as well at some point today, is in relation to the question of who should be members of this Standing Selection Committee? Are members selected per stakeholder group? Is it done for constituency? So, I think that's one of the main outstanding items.

And there is also I believe one question in relation to rotation of selections per stakeholder group so that there is, as nominations are made that there is a rotation or at least a guarantee that it's not always the same group that has their representatives selected, so that's also another item that's under discussion.

There are also a number of cross community working groups that are meeting and continuing their discussions. The new Generic Top Level Domain Auction Proceeds is having a meeting tomorrow. They recently started their deliberations. That group is tasked to develop mechanisms for how auction proceeds should be distributed or allocated. It's not talking about who or how to actually, who to give the funds to or projects should be funded, that's a separate or subsequent conversation. This is really focused on looking at the mechanism that should be developed or put in place to be able to allocate those funds.

And then there is also the cross community working group on the use of country and territory names as top level domains, they actually published I think an interim paper in advance of this meeting that's open for public comment where I think they've outlined a couple of options for taking this work further. I believe they haven't really come to agreement on some of the questions so I think they are now looking for guidance as to what should happen next.

I think that's in a snapshot what's happening in the GNSO throughout this week. And happy to take any questions.

EN

GRAEME BUNTON: This is Graeme for the transcript. Thank you, Marika. That is a lot going on. I saw a hand from James and then I'll put myself in the queue after that.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Graeme. Thanks, Marika. James speaking. I just wanted to highlight a couple, just one or two issues that I think would be particularly interesting to registrars. The first is the PDP, the next generation RDS, which is a PDP that's looking at top to bottom rethinking of WHOIS. We had a really great session yesterday with data protection officials and experts from across Europe.

And one of the things they kept emphasizing with us is that WHOIS needs to have a purpose and that purpose needs to be defined. So for those of you, do we have folks in the room who are participating on that PDP? I think Michele is one of the co-chairs. Yes, so a few folks.

I would encourage Registrars to please follow this at a minimum and get involved if you can and particularly in the subgroup that's defining the purpose of registration data and the uses for registration data because I think, you know, it's not necessarily

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

specific to European registrars, if any registrar with a customer in Europe or hopes to have a customer in Europe someday.

The next item that I just wanted to point out, as Marika said, the Standing Selection Committee, right now there is a discussion of whether that should be allocated per stakeholder group, which would mean Registrars would get one member on that committee or if it's per constituency, in which case we would probably get more than one like two or three.

I know we have a challenge sometimes finding volunteers for this but this will be a very important group because it's going to determine how the GNSO review teams and panels and empowered community and all these new things that we have to fill, it's going to determine what our slate of delegates look like to all those important functions. So, I would just encourage folks to follow that.

And then the other thing would be, you know, I think the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds could probably use a little bit more help. So if anyone is interested in that topic and wants to get involved, it's not too late I think to join that effort. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, James, for that input. I've got a question for Marika that's maybe a little bit nuts and boltsy but maybe to respond to James, I have some concern that the RDS is a black hole where policy people go to disappear for forever. And so, for those who are participating may be, so not just you, James, how can we make that experience a little better? Is that actually true?

Do we think this PDP is going to finish in the next three years? Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Graeme. Michele for the record. I'd love to say something really optimistic but I'm not drunk so I won't. I think yesterday's session with the data protection and privacy people should be taken as providing us with a lot of very serious guidance.

The reality is, if this isn't addressed in a timely fashion, we are all going to end up being fined huge amounts of money which means none of us are going to put anything into WHOIS, and ICANN is not going to be able to enforce anything on us because we will be in breach of local law, and by the way it impacts all of you. If you have any registrants in Europe you are all impacted. This is not a hypothetical, you are all impacted.

So, the problem we are having in the RDS PDP is that there are some people who want to have free and open access to everything and there are a lot of people who don't. And the two sides just don't seem to be able to get along, which is terribly sad.

And at the moment we are working our way through a very long detailed work plan. We have made some progress, but even the progress that we've made is being questioned by many people. So, in some respects, yes, I can see it as being a bottomless pit that could go on forever. And there is other WHOIS related activities that are still going on such as the review, there is the RDAP thing, there is the thick to thin, sorry, thin to, oh God, you know what I mean, the thick and thin WHOIS thing going on.

I don't know, I think keeping, there are enough registrars involved in it now, I don't think we need more registrars. What I think you need to be doing is interacting with those of us who are involved. We are not going to bore you to tears with detailed updates because it you'd just probably want to kill us all. We will have some kind of document ready, Marika, what did we agree on? We said we'd try for something after Johannesburg I think? And we are going to have problems as well because that group is going to need a new chair at some point in the next few months.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, and if I can, so this is Marika. I just may want to add so when Michele was referring to would be an initial report on phase one. So, this is a three phased PDP which after each phase has a kind of decision point built into it so that the GNSO Council can decide, you know, has sufficient progress been made to move to the next phase? And the first phase is really focused on developing and agreeing on the requirements for an RDS and then basically determining do those requirements, can they be met by the existing system or does the new system need to be developed?

So, that's really the question and the answer that's expected to be provided at the end of phase one and then phase two provided that the answer is yes we agree on the requirements and, no, the current WHOIS model cannot be adapted to accommodate those requirements, what are then the policies that need to be developed for any new RDS followed by implementation phase.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Marika.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] after that inspirational recruiting speech from Michele, I'm almost afraid to ask this, but what would be involved in getting involved in this process? As you mentioned, clearly it does have a significant impact on our business. We have about half of our registrants in Europe, although I suppose I could change that if I had to send our registrants are us. But it's not going to be pretty, as you outlined. So, what kind of a time commitment would be involved? What kind of frequency of meetings, etcetera, would be entailed in paying attention to this?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Michele for the record. The RDS PDP at the moment, we have one 90 minute per week, 90 minute meeting per week. For three of those meetings per month are held at 17:00 UTC and then the fourth one is like oh 05:00 or go 06:00 UTC. Depending on where we are with things, there have been a number of side groups and subgroups working on specific items, who've met or, you know, done stuff via email in between.

Just in terms of disclosure, the four chairs and the ICANN staff also have a one-hour meeting every week in advance of the actual weekly meeting. The volume of email on that list, I'm not sure, I think, it ebbs and flows. A quiet week it could be three or four emails mostly from Marika and other ICANN staffers. On a

crazy week you can have 600 emails mostly involving things that you may not care about what if you'd actually delve into it there sometimes are bits and pieces in there.

I mean in terms of time commitment, 90 minutes for the meetings, I don't know how fast you read email so I can't really answer that part of it. But if you want to sign up just email me or Theo or anybody and we will hook you up.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Michele. We've got about four minutes left with Marika. This is probably going to be a longer question but I think there's a number of members. Sorry, this is Graeme for the transcript, that are probably curious about this, which is in the Privacy and Proxy Implementation Review Team, we are expecting something back from the Board, I believe, as well as something from Public Safety.

I don't understand what the mechanism is going to be to integrate that advice or whatever it is we get from Public Safety, and I'm curious if ICANN staff has any insight on to how that's going to work.

MARIKA KONINGS: Well as I said, I think my colleague Amy is probably better qualified to talk about what's happening there but I can just

maybe talk at a general level. There are of course a number of processes and guidelines in place in relation to how implementation review teams are expected to operate and work.

And also, if there are issues that come up in the implementation phase that are deemed policy, how those can be channeled back to the GNSO Council. So, if there is a concern or an indication that whatever is being provided either by the Board or by the PSWG, that goes beyond implementation or beyond or in conflict or contradiction with the original policy recommendations, there are mechanisms in place for that to be channeled back and be dealt with.

And I see Amy is standing up so she may have more specifics on the question that you provided.

AMY BIVENS: And I think Marika has actually covered most of it. From the Public Safety Working Group we've requested a proposal that we are going to be working on within the IRT, so that's really all it is, a proposal and we will be working on it with the IRT.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thank you, Amy. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes, so I think for Amy, Marika and anyone participating on the IRT, the thing to be aware of is that that proposal coming back starts to have something in there that we can't support that's reopening policy discussions and then is accompanied by a GAC, a mention in the GAC communiqué that says, you know, we advise you to do this and it's at odds with the, you know, and then we are right back into the Red Cross IGO quicksand. So, just if you can keep us all informed on what's coming out of that and share it with the list as soon as you have it that would be great.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, James. This is Graeme. There is a good number of us involved in that implementation review team and it will certainly be a topic on our monthly policy calls. I should also add in there, there's been people using the acronym GPDR, I think, GDPR, General Data Protection Regulation, which is European legislation I believe, and it sounds like we are going to need to bring back up on one of our policy calls too because I think not enough people have been thinking about that and we probably should.

Do you have anything else for us, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: This is Marika. No, just as I said before, you know, please review the materials we've provided in advance of the meeting. If any questions always feel free to reach out to us. I think we realize that, you know, participation can require quite some time, obviously there are also other ways in which you can provide input or stay up to date.

I do want to note that although there was I think James mentioned or Michele, there is quite a significant participation in the RDS PDP, my colleague Mary just pointed out that there actually are relatively few registrars participating In the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP so if there is any interest there it would be good to get a few more reps from this community to participate in that effort. And I think that's all I had.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great, thank you for joining us. Moving back to our agenda, we are going to get, we are going to meet with GDD staff now, so I think we are going to see Jen Gore join us up at the table. While we are waiting on Jen to come in and set up, could I get a show of hands from all of our local Danish registrars? Is that it? Hey, guys. So there our hosts, they've been, oh yes, Ben beside me and have been very welcoming, and we all appreciate being in

your fine country. It's nice here. Thank you. Ready when you are, Jen.

JENNIFER GORE: Good morning, everyone. Graeme and Registrars, thank you for letting us come update you with some GDD current activities. I am Jennifer Gore, the Director of the Registrar Services Engagement from ICANN staff. I'd like to introduce Jamie Hedlund who is Vice President of Compliance and Safeguards? Safeguards. And he's going to give a brief update this morning, and I will follow him with a couple updates on key items.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Jen. Yes, I am Jamie Hedlund. I have the sexy title of SVP Contractual Compliance and Consumer Safeguards. And I'm the new Allan Grogan, and I'm very happy to be here. Thank you for allowing me to come.

Just had a few slides that I was going to go over, but by way of background, I've been at ICANN for seven years. I'm a lawyer by training, worked in government, worked in the private sector mostly doing public policy work in Washington DC.

I am still new to the job. And meetings like this are a great opportunity for me to get feedback from you and hear what your concerns may be about contractual compliance and consumer

ICANN|58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

safeguards. My door is always open and happy, grateful to hear from any and all of you on what you're concerned about.

So, next slide please. Is this me? All right, okay. So, early on one of the things that Göran asked for all the executives is to develop a short narrative on the purpose of their organization and why they exist. This little blurb here basically says that ICANN Contractual Compliance plays an important role not only within ICANN but for the greater Internet ecosystem where I think we are under even greater scrutiny now then we were when we were under the auspices of the US government.

There are three sort of initiatives that I'm focused on right now. One is to increase transparency in Contractual Compliance. As I'm sure you've seen in the CCT Review Team, the draft report, there are a number of recommendations going toward increased transparency both in terms of the way we handle complaints and in the rationale that we provide for them.

And what we are hopeful to get in response, you know, community comments, is more granularity about exactly what kind of data people want to see, what kind of granularity. It's one thing to say ICANN is not transparent, which doesn't give us a whole lot to work on, it's another thing to say, you know, we want to see this kind of data on this, you know, this frequency. That's much more actionable.

Another area is collaborating closely with David Conrad, the office of the CTO, and looking at ways that we might be able to help mitigate infrastructure abuse. This is like malware, phishing, botnets. It is not spam. It is not content. It is really, you know, related to what's within ICANN's mission and preserving and enhancing the security and stability of the DNS.

And so, and working not only with his group but also with third parties potentially, ensuring data, particularly with respect to areas that are outside of our remit. And then finally, soliciting feedback on the possibility of creating a communitywide ad hoc working group on contractual compliance and consumer safeguards matters.

The main purpose of this is to serve as a vehicle for transparency, for allowing for a forum where a lot of the current discussions on contractual compliance and some of the mythology are happening within silos, but instead have been happening in silos, you have them every once in a while communitywide so that there is hopefully a greater understanding of what compliance means.

Let's see, why is this not, okay. Oh it's not a, got it. So, last thing I'll touch on quickly is the consumer safeguards role. This is a role that's very different from contractual compliance. This is first and foremost an engagement role. This person will…

The idea is for this person to go out into the community and outside the community, to explain and raise awareness about existing consumer safeguards, facilitate discussions on their effectiveness and whether additional safeguards would be something that is worthwhile exploring.

In other forums, this person would not be responsible for developing new safeguards that would enter into contractual discussions but would be again, primarily serve education and awareness engagement role.

And that's it. Thank you. I'm happy to take any questions.

GRAEME BUNTON: This is Graeme for the transcript. Thank you, Jamie. Thank you for joining us.

It's… For those of you who haven't met you, it's nice for you to be here and introduce yourself. I think quite obviously registrars have a deep and broad interest in compliance and how it functions. And so, we are happy to engage with you and your team. And, you know, continue developing that relationship.

You mentioned increased transparency in there, and one of the things that was coming out of our closed session with Compliance on Sunday morning was, and, you know, Compliance will hopefully see this relatively shortly, is a request

EN

for data on abuse complaints that are submitted. And so we're going to get in the line for getting some data out of Compliance on that too.

Does anyone have questions for Jamie? We've got another about 21 minutes or so with GDD, and I think we've got you for another 15 or so. So, I think we have time for a couple. I saw Joyce. There's a microphone there.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Graeme, if I could quickly just say, I'm sorry I was not able to join that session, unfortunately it was above my pay grade decision. But I do look forward to working with you all on how to make things more transparent.

JOYCE LIN: Okay, I heard the consumer safeguards…

GRAEME BUNTON: Can you say your name?

JOYCE LIN: Joyce Lin from 007 Names. These consumer safeguards that's been all over the place, but I'd just like to know a bit how you categorize what areas of the safeguards that you're trying to educate the public, and how it's going to be related into the

contractual compliance and everything? It seems to me that since ICANN opened up the floodgate for all the new gTLDs, the safeguards, the public is suffering more than anything else with all the phishing and all the DNS abuses. So, I'd really like to know what safeguards, the items that you will be covering. Thanks.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sure. So, the most obvious area of consumer safeguards are the ones that are included in the new gTLD Registry Agreement. There are other, in the RAA as well, there are other provisions that are supposed to extend to consumers and I should point out that we decided not to narrowly define what "consumer" is because there are all different types of consumers and there didn't seem to be much value in narrowing that.

So again, we will talk about the safeguards that exist in current agreements. We will talk about safeguards that may exist elsewhere under other statutes or facilitate discussions about those if consumers can't get redress within ICANN, helping them find other areas where they might. But it is not, again, it is not the function of this is not to extend or expand any existing contractual obligations.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. Before we get to, you have got Michele, Stephanie and then Darcy in the queue.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Michele for the record. One of the things, Jamie, that you mentioned both in a blog post about a month or so back, and then in various other places, is this community across something other group, blah blah blah, to talk about compliance. And it sent a chill down my spine. Maybe you can assuage our views a little bit and explain to us exactly what you mean by that, because last time I checked, my contract was with ICANN, not with the rest of the ICANN community. Thanks.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks Michele. As I tried to describe earlier, the main purpose for the ad hoc working group, communitywide working group, would be for a forum for discussion on contractual compliance and consumer safeguards measures. There's a lot of interest across the community beyond contracted parties in what, you know, what these things mean. There is a concern that if ICANN does not have a credible contractual compliance function that we will, our credibility as a multistakeholder organization will weaken and national governments will step in to the breach.

So, the purpose of this is to facilitate discussions, debunk the myths, explain, you know, across the community rather than within silos where folks maybe just talking to themselves about what contractual compliance and consumer safeguards actually means. It is not an enforcement mechanism or a compliance mechanism, it is a venue, it would be a venue for raising awareness and hopefully understanding.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jamie. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Stephanie Duchesneau with Google. So, I appreciate the focus on transparency. I think that's something that we think can be done better. I think that something that folks on the other side of the community can be done better, and we have to kind of reach across the aisle and find those shared wins.

But one thing that I just want to put on the record is that for me, transparency about ICANN's compliance function and consumer safeguards function, it's not just about how you package and parse the compliance data. Like I don't like the slide either with all of the different notice categories and when it's closed. It's like also about the narrative that we are telling about our compliance function.

One thing that I've had a hard time with is that looking at that slide and looking at the compliance presentations it tells me nothing about what Compliance is doing to make ICANN a better place. It doesn't actually tell me about, there is such a ticket counting paradigm that I actually know very little about the kinds of problems that Compliances is fixing.

So, if as we look to increase transparency we are also looking to kind of changing how we talk about compliance so it's not just like numbers and we are debating the definition of what a first closure versus a second closure, ICANN coding, ICANN's fault coding means, and we are actually telling a story around what we are doing to make the industry better, I think it's important to not lose sight of that.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Stephanie. Putting that kind of data in context, I agree, could be helpful.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. I don't know if this is exactly a compliance thing or not, that the Internet by its very nature is a very fast moving, fast evolving thing. Policy, by its very nature, is a very slow moving thing. We have an additional lag in that once the community puts policy forward we don't really have a mechanism to

implement the policy until contractual renewal. And some of these contracts are rather long-lived, especially with the registries. And I'm wondering if we could look at perhaps modifying the next generation of contracts so that they include an ability for policy to be updated more rapidly without requiring a contractual renewal cycle for the policy to get implemented?

GRAEME BUNTON: This is Graeme for the transcript. I actually think you're incorrect on that. I believe there is a mechanism inside our current contract that doesn't mean you have to implement policy as it comes through the community, so it's in there already. If you're waiting for a new contract, you should not do that anymore. Tom.

TOM BARRETT: Yes, this kind of got me confused with the cross whatever working group. Is that a working group purely for our reach of policymaking? And if for policymaking, that must be in the remit of the GNSO and cannot stand freely. And as far as in our consumer safeguards haven't been in our contracts and aren't in our contracts and aren't even in the remit of a remit of ICANN at all. So I kind of wonder how all that fits into it.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, again, this cross community, ad hoc cross community, or not even, communitywide working group, it is not a policymaking vehicle, it's not a contractual requirement imposition vehicle. It is a vehicle for transparency, for awareness and education.

And I would, it doesn't really matter what I think, but I do think there are obligations in the RAA, and particularly when thinking about requirements that flow to the agreement with the registrants, that would be viewed as sort of consumer safeguards in terms of, you know, what they're supposed to know about and what their obligations may be as registrants. But this is, I can't emphasize enough, this is a forum for discussion, it's not a forum for imposing new contractual obligations.

GREG DIBIASE: So Greg DiBiase, Amazon Registrar. Did someone in the community request this forum? I'm just trying to understand the basis. Is this a response to a request from someone or is this just something ICANN is thinking is a good idea?

JAMIE HEDLUND: So this was an idea I floated in a blog. And it was an idea that I continue to try to get feedback on, whether or not it makes

sense to do it. So far, I have gotten a fair amount of positive feedback from other stakeholder groups, but it is very much in the idea formation stage looking for feedback.

PAM LITTLE: Pam Little from Alibaba. Hi, Jamie. When Maguy came on board five years ago, she inherited a staff of five and a budget of $2 million a year. Now you came to this job, you have a staff of 25, maybe even more, and a budget of I don't know how many times, three or four times, I don't know, maybe. So, I guess my question is, have you been thinking about what success would look like for you? And considering this really quite significant increase of budget or resources you have at its function comparing with five years ago. Thank you.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So thanks, Pam. I guess if we were trying to keep up with the amount of growth in registries and registrars in domain names over the past five years we would have grown much more than we have. But, I mean, we have a mission, we have specified functions that we are supposed to do, success is doing those while and that is defined by internal leave the ICANN staff, but as received by the contracted parties and the larger community.

PAM LITTLE: Can I have a follow up please, very quickly, Graeme?

GRAEME BUNTON: So we've got about nine minutes left in this chunk. We need to give five of that to Jen as well.

PAM LITTLE: Sure.

GRAEME BUNTON: So I've got four minutes with, you can have a quick follow-on. I've got James in the queue and if we have time we'll get to you, Joyce, but we might not.

PAM LITTLE: Okay, I agree with Jamie, it's not about numbers. But I think previously elsewhere when other stakeholder group was commenting about the compliance function in light of the budget, the financial year, the Compliance response to our query about efficiency and effectiveness to me wasn't really satisfactory.

So, I think yes, it should be matter whether you're efficient, whether you're effective. It shouldn't be just because oh we have now so many new gTLDs, more registry or more registrar, and we should grow so many more times. It shouldn't be in that

sort of ratio. So, I guess we can all think together how to make Compliance a success story, I guess that's my point.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Absolutely. And if this goes for you and for everybody, if there are areas where you think we're falling down on efficiency and effectiveness, please bring those forward and let's fix those together.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, thanks. James speaking. Two questions quickly for Jamie. One is that you've, I keep missing the name that you're referring to this group, is it cross community working group, community working group, does that mean we're going to see a charter come through the SOs and ACs at some point? Or is this just an informal… [CROSSTALK]

JAMIE HEDLUND: No, this is informal working group.

EN

JAMES BLADEL: Okay, I would then encourage you to brainstorm some different names so that we don't have collision or confusion with some of those animals.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes, just quickly, it was a sort of loosely based on Xavier's group on the budget.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay. And the second one and perhaps you covered it in an earlier slide and I just, it went over my head. But can you take maybe 60 seconds to talk to what you envision Krista's role being for this Complaints Officer? I mean, it's something that's been hanging out there for a while. I don't think the position was ever filled under your predecessor. What do you see that role doing?

JAMIE HEDLUND: So Krista is obviously much better place to answer that, but I can, you know, her role is not contractual based. She's not going to be taking complaints based, my understanding anyway, based on any of the agreements that we have with the contracted parties. She is going to be taking complaints from community members, from, you know, stakeholder groups

regarding ICANN and ICANN staff and what we are doing. I hope that's helpful.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jamie. Sorry, Joyce, I think we need to move on. Very briefly, and this is maybe a little nuts and boltsy for this session, is Compliance uses a ticketing system that we all loathe. It's not going away until the Registrar Portal is done, my understanding is that about two years out before we end up with the compliance function inside that portal. Maybe we should talk about that a little bit more.

But also, it's clear we have quite an interest in dialogue with Compliance, and so perhaps we can figure out a mechanism to have some more of this in the future, maybe jump on one of our policy calls… [CROSSTALK]

JAMIE HEDLUND: Absolutely with whatever regularity you all think is appropriate.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thank you very much for joining us, Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: This is still Graeme for the transcript. And I am terrible at saying my name. Back to Jen Gore. We've… I've left you five whole minutes.

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Graeme. Jen Gore, ICANN staff. So, thanks to Jamie for coming out today. I just have three quick bullets that I want to cover and if there is any questions at the end I will be happy to take them.

I want to make an announcement that in the coming nine to 12 months we will be putting out a data escrow proposal for a provider in the European Union. We will draft, publish and collect responses and we will be working with the Registrars on that proposal.

Another thing I wanted to mention was the naming service portal. We had a user policy group meeting earlier this week. We had a great turnout. I would like to solicit volunteers for that to make sure that we have global representation. The first phase of the portal, the timeline on that is Q4 of this calendar year, 2017, in which we will be soliciting feedback from the user portal group on the demo. It will not be in production, it's just a

staging environment demo. And that will include content management functionality.

So, similar to the function and roles that you're handling today within radar, that will be phase one of the portal, and from there, there are three more phases of which I do not have timelines associated to them. So, I ask if anyone is interested, especially beyond those people in this room with the newer registrar that uses the radar portal today, IT folks, compliance folks within your organization that will be using the naming service portal on a more regular basis, we ask them to join as well.

And then just the last point to note, we have a WHOIS validation working group meeting tomorrow on the cross-field address validation. I saw that it was on your agenda, Graeme, so just wanted to mention that, it's going to be held tomorrow. That's it. So, any questions?

GRAEME BUNTON: This is Graeme for the transcript. Thank you, Jen. And sorry for leaving you so little time. The European Union data escrow provider proposal, I am sure many of our members are super interested in that. Cheers from the audience for those who are online.

EN

I'm sure we would love to see if we can move data faster than nine to 12 months, and presumably it would not just be limited to European registrars, it would be available to all of us.

JENNIFER GORE: Oh, I'm sorry. It would be available to all ICANN registrars. We were looking for a DEA in the European Union.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thank you. And we circulated the information for the portal users group to the membership list yesterday I think, or the day before, so that should be available to everybody on the registrar stakeholder group mailing list.

Do we have anybody with questions for Jen? We've got about two minutes left. Wow. Oh, Christian.

CHRISTIAN MULLER: Christian Muller. If you say escrow service, are you talking about [funded like] currently Iron Mountain?

JENNIFER GORE: Yes, sir.

CHRISTIAN MULLER: Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: This is Graeme for the transcript. If you can't see it, Christian is beaming like he just had a child. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Michele for the record. Good, about bloody time.

JEN GORE: Thank you, Michele.

GRAEME BUNTON: All right. It's 10:30 now. We've got a break until… Oh, Joyce, Joyce, real quick.

JOYCE LIN: Just a quick question, I understand that your European escrow provide because the privacy issue that related to European members, but like a registrar in the United States that we have some European customers, how are we going to handle that?

JENNIFER GORE: How are you going to handle your data deposits if you're a North American based customer and a registrar? And you've got European registrars? Registrants? [CROSSTALK]

JOYCE LIN: European customers, European data customers' data. So, and then right now we are using the Iron Mountain and which is probably not complying to the privacy issues that European Union have.

JENNIFER GORE: Actually, Iron Mountain is in compliance with the US/EU privacy shield. My intent is to be able to offer another option beyond just the single provider that ICANN is contracted with today. As far as how, what your strategy is on your data deposits, as far as what provider you'd like to use, that's up to you. And ICANN will not require you to use one versus another or just one.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you for joining us, Jen. We appreciate you coming in. We'll try and give you some more time at our next meeting. But we really appreciated having Jamie come and talk to us so thank you for helping with that. Okay, 10:30, I believe we have a break until 11:00, which is quite a long break.

JAMES BLADEL: Hey, Graeme, just a quick question or comment for Jen…

GRAEME BUNTON: Oh sorry, James.

JAMES BLADEL: Sorry. If we wanted to divide up our portfolio and use multiple data escrow providers and since some of our domains have, that would be compliant with the data escrow program?

JENNIFER GORE: Well that will be part of the discussion as we draft the proposal, as far as what the strategy would be or data escrow.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay.

JENNIFER GORE: But that, my thought is, is that would be, if the community is accepted to that that would be the intent to be able to use more than one.

GRAEME BUNTON: Cool. Again, thank you. Right, break now until 11:00. I think there's coffee in the lobby as there normally is. And then we're going to dig into some PDP working group updates. I mentioned earlier we've got not a lot of time together today, and a lot to

cover so your promptness in returning would be deeply appreciated. Thank you. Get some coffee.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You can stop the recording now, thank you.

Just one separate thing, I'm going to stay in the room, so if anyone wants to leave their laptops and stuff, I mean, it's your choice, but yeah, I'm going to stay here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It is Tuesday, March 14 2017 in Hall C14, the GNSO for the GNSO registrar stakeholder group meeting, 9:30 to 13:45. This is part two.

GRAEME BUNTON: That sounds good. Hey everybody. We've got one minute. If you can take your seats, we're going to start, please and thank you.

Back of the room, you guys good to go?

All right, let's start this up again. Recording and whatnot and all of that. Go!

Okay. This is Graeme again for the transcript. Welcome back. I hope everybody found themselves a coffee and maybe a little

snack and is raring to go. You can see the agenda in front of you. We've got PDP updates, a couple other things, then we end up in our working lunch around 12:40.

I'm going to hijack the first bit of this PDP update for a couple other things. First, the RRSG has seen a bunch of new membership in the past six months or so and it's been exciting and invigorating. Welcome new members. Could I get a show of hands in the room for people for, who have recently joined the Registrar Stakeholder Groups in the past year? Hey, welcome everybody. Thank you for coming.

And for anybody who this is their first ICANN meeting? Awesome. Welcome. Thank you, thank you for coming. I hope you find this valuable and also we very much value your feedback as newcomers. So, if we can make this is a better experience for you and help you integrate into the Registrar Stakeholder Group, let us know what we can do for you.

So, here's a dilemma that we have right now is we have today for substantive discussion and updates about three and half hours at this meeting. There is no constituency day in the middle meeting of the year, so there won't be one in [Joburg]. And there is one in… Where's the last one? Abu Dhabi. Presuming that Abu Dhabi is much like today's session, it means that we have seven hours a year, give or take, in person to discuss issues.

That is not a lot of time. I think we're filling some of the gap with our monthly policy calls, which so far have been pretty well attended and I think right now is a pretty good success. If you haven't attended one of those, I would encourage you to do so. I think we're getting better at those as we carry them on, but pretty good so far.

In terms of maximizing our time in person, we're relatively limited in what we can do, and not all of it we can do unilaterally. And so, the conversation I want to have now, we can maybe take five or ten minutes to do, is I want to get a sense from the room about how valuable you find the joint meeting with the registries. So, we meet with the registries this afternoon for I think an hour, and then we move into our hour and half long board meeting.

We have the GDD Summit coming up in May. Everyone should know about the GDD Summit, which is where just contracted parties meet. That's happening Madrid, where registries and registrars can get together. I've heard mixed feelings from people about whether there is value or not in having a joint meeting with the registries at in-person ICANN meetings. And so, I'm looking to the room right now to see whether they find they time, you guys find that time, valuable or whether you would prefer to be spending more time with us discussing issues relevant to just registrars.

So, don't all put your hands up at once. But okay, Vlad, please?

VLAD DINCULESCU: This is Vlad Dinculescu. So, from what I've noticed in the past, we tend to walk into the room, we tend to start talking about stuff, they start talking about certain things. There's never really a sort of almost set agenda about what issues we want to address with them and what they want to address with us. So, if you can get that more formalized, if there was more structure to the meeting and then we can actually address issues deeply and them may get some outcomes out of it. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Vlad. So, I will say that we end up, and almost will certainly happen again today, spend the bulk of that session discussing what we're going to discuss in our subsequent board meeting. And so, we tried to get ahead of that for this meeting by spinning up a small subgroup of a couple registrars, a couple registries, to sort of brainstorm and make coherent some of the stuff we want to talk to with the board.

I would say that was not wildly successful. We just did not have enough participation and discussion. So, there are some questions we have for the board. We haven't quite divvied them up. We don't know who's responsible quite yet. And so, I think

we're going to spend the bulk of that hour on that particular issue. I don't personally think that's a wonderful use of time that we have with the registries, so I hear you.

But we collectively need to do some work on that too, which is I would need more registrars to step forward and be like, "Here's the stuff that we should talk about with the board, and here's also the issues that we want to see with the registries." And so, we tried to that on the list and it wasn't great, but we'll certainly try that again if we're going to keep our joint registrar/registry meeting.

Anybody else want to jump in the queue on this? No? Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: I'm probably biased but I do think there's value in putting meat on bones for the registry/registrar board session. The sessions are important. We need to figure out framing. We need to figure out the right subset of questions to be posing to the board. So, I don't find it to be a waste of time, but I agree that we can probably do a better job at how we prepare going into that meeting.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Stephanie. This is Graeme for the transcript. Do you…? I'm going to put you on the spot, Stephanie, if I could. Do you think that there is still strong value in having a joint meeting with the board?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Yes.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you for your succinct answer. Okay. And I'm not seeing radical disagreement there. Fred is grabbing his microphone like he has something to say.

FRÉDÉRIC GUILLEMAUT: Frédéric Guillemaut for the transcript. Yes, I would echo on what Chris just said, and if we move that to the GDD, all the things with the registries, maybe we can have more time for policies if we move that hour with the registries.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Fred. So, I think there is a dilemma here that if we're going to do the joint session with the board, which Stephanie felt there was value there, we need to spend some time collectively working on that. We can't just do it in sort of a small

working group. But we need to figure out how to maximize our time.

I saw Tom, please.

TOM KELLER: Tom Keller for the transcript. I think it's all about the proportion of it. Going to the agenda you can see I think we spent roughly two hours together with the registrars, talking about mainly preset issues, not really coming to turns with discussing them but basically getting updates them. So, we don't actually have any time we spent actually elaborating on positions.

And then we meet with the registries to figure out what we should tell the board, even though the registrars itself don't have firm standing on most of the issues. That kind of strikes me as strange. I think we need to make better use of our time. So, all of us fly out to all these meetings, which go on for five days, and we meet for two and a half hours effectively, and I think, you know, we should smarten up and actually, you know, spend more time actually doing more things, and maybe even introduce some kind of a system of straw polls or something to really arrive at positions.

Currently we're really just going back and forth on a lot of things that are mandated by ICANN. And there are many, many things

on the table and some of them will be touched this afternoon, which are really, really important to us and are really important to actually to make the domain world a better place. And we keep talking around that in the hallway but we don't make any progress on that. So I believe, you know, if I had the choice to either talk to the registries or the board or just spend the whole day with you guys in this room and debate things that are of need, I'd rather do the latter.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Tom. I think that's… Sorry, Graeme for the transcript. I think that's a pretty concise summary of the frustration that I'm hearing from some of our members. I've got Darcy and then Michele and then Stephanie again in the queue. Darcy, please.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks, Graeme. Darcy Southwell for the record. I agree with Tom. I think that we should dedicate our time to not just doing updates, we can do those by e-mail or any other forum. It'd be really nice to come into these meetings and talk about key issues and actually discuss them, not just provide updates. In order to do that we need more time.

So, I think a blanket rule of always meeting with the registries and meeting with the board together is probably not the best. There may be meetings where there is a crucial issue where we really need to spend a lot of time and be aligned with the registries and make sure our presentation to the board is aligned and presented as a contracted party house, but that can be ad hoc, it doesn't need to be every single meeting so that we can accomplish what Tom's talking about. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: There was some clapping. Graeme for the transcript. I think you raise a good point, Darcy, that, and Tom does as well, that we spend a bunch of time here doing updates. And we can do a better job I think of providing those resources ahead of the meeting. But it's going to rely on people participating for instance in working groups to be able to produce a readable substantive summary on what's happening in those places before a meeting.

So, it's going to fall on those of you participating in such things to do a bit of work so that we can make sure our members are up to speed ahead of time so that everybody's on the same page when we come into this room and so that we're all prepared to dig into some of those issues. And if there's interest in that, then

let's make that happen. Tom, you've got a follow on to my outrageous statement, please.

TOM KELLER: Tom Keller for the transcript. This is a very nice thought that people would show up prepared. The reality is this will never happen. So theoretically, yes, awesome. Practically, no. So, that's why I'm saying we need more time. So, this is an educational thing, as well as a debating thing. And I think we need to bring our people up to speed why they are face-of-face, explaining what the whole thing's about, getting to know all the acronyms and all the things, the ICANN mojo magic, whatever you want to call it, and then really have a debate about the things that are important to us.

And relying on people in working groups comes later. Once we have a firm position, we can go into working groups and do something in them. We can dedicate people to it. And then they can give us updates. Currently we don't even have position on anything and we leave it up to the people in the working groups to actually form their own minds and do whatever they like basically.

And we are used to be better than that actually. So, there has nothing to do with the current [inaudible]. It has been basically kept shut by the process over the last couple of years and I think

we have to go back to the days, you know, when we were just sitting in a room as likeminded registrars and trying to find solutions. And that means that you have to actually explain what you do.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay. Thanks, Tom. So, Graeme for the transcript. I don't think it needs to be an or, maybe there's an and. We're getting better updates to our stakeholder group ahead of meetings and then we have some more time to, A, update and then, B, discuss. You raise an interesting point there about whether we're actually, the people participating in working groups are doing so on behalf of their company or if they're doing so on behalf of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and I think it's generally their companies. But we can have people aligned and informed in a way that maybe those are reasonably synonymous a lot of the time.

I've got Michele, Stephanie and then Owen, right, Owen?

OWEN DELONG: Yes.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. So, Michele, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Michele for the record. On the meeting with the board, that's always been a bit of a kind of interesting and fun thing because the board support staff send out a request to the different stakeholder groups well in advance saying, "Hey, what do you want to talk about with us?" They rarely tell us in advance what they want to talk to us about, and often they have nothing specific to talk to us about but feel an obligation to have that meeting.

Over the last couple of years, there have been a number of issue which were of common interest with the registries, so having the meetings joint was something that the ExComs of both groups kind of decided on. This was back when I was chair. But it wasn't something that we said would always be that way or would necessarily continue that way forever. And we still have this issue when we meet with the registries and these meetings, that the entire meeting ends up being dominated by the conversation we're going to have with the board.

And while it might be interesting if we have much more time, I'd agree with quite a few other people that it's probably not the best use of our time. Now there is the problem, as Tom points out, around people coming prepared. The reality is a lot of people unfortunately don't. There's a huge volume of stuff going

on, that Marika and others in the policy team do a wonderful job with providing us policy updates so people should be reading those.

On our side, Zoe has been doing a fantastic job in helping to kind of organize things, so I think there are ways for us to do a better job overall but we do need to spend more time internally within this group to actually thrash out things like, say for example, I don't know, the charter, which seems to be going on forever, the anti-abuse document that is probably on its 20th iteration at this stage and other groups have stopped asking us for updates on them so they think it doesn't exist.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Michele. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Yes, I want to just agree with both Darcy and Tom about the point around updates. And one suggestion may be to get past that is like we don't have a lot of internal to the registrar groups. Maybe if we had many working parties that worked on this and discussed issues that they could about like I think the cross-field validation is a perfect candidate for that. It's not an external topic so there's no like designated representative yet.

We probably need to have people who are like dedicated week in or every other week to be discussing the topic and then providing updates within the group at a much more regular interval. I do, like I do still see a lot of value in the conversation with the registries. I think there's so much pathology within this community about how we interact with one another and I think that is one of the relationships that has gotten better and we want to keep that.

And especially when I look at like the board's priorities right now. There's a big shift from board just stating topical priorities, we care about new gTLDs, we care about WHOIS, to stuff that relates to organizational effectiveness, and I actually think that's a really good shift. I think there's a lot of problems in that and I'm glad the board is kind of shifting their focus. I think when it comes to those meta issues, we're pretty similarly positioned to the registries and there's value in bringing forward a common friend in talking about the meta problems, the strategic problems, issues around staff engagement, which does seem to be a big focus area right now.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Stephanie. Owen?

OWEN DELONG: Owen DeLong, Akamai. I'm pretty new to this group. I've been on the mailing list for about three weeks before the meeting so I can't speak to the history or what have you, but I will say that as to meeting preparedness, I'm certainly as guilty of being unprepared as anybody at this point due to recently. But I will say that in general in the various groups I've participated in, especially in the Internet governance area, people do what you communicate to them is expected of them.

So, if we create an expectation that we just anticipate people coming to the meeting unprepared, people will do that. If we create a well know expectation that people come to the meeting prepared and if you come to the meeting unprepared you're going to be behind and playing catch up and people aren't really going to, you know, do a lot to facilitate bringing you back up to speed versus the group moving on at the speed the group is moving, then people will start coming prepared.

So, I think if we do a better job of communicating that expectation that it's vital that you come to the meeting prepared, people will put more effort into doing that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Owen. That's a good point. I don't think there's any expectation that people can be prepared on every issue because many of us have different business models and different

particular issues that they care about, and certainly you cannot physically be engaged on every issue at ICANN, it's impossible. I think most of us pick and choose the places that we feel like we can be most effective. But if we're all doing that collectively I think there's room for all us to have some sort of expertise in different areas and share that and discuss.

So, I don't… Is there anybody else on this particular organizational topic? No, good. Okay. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: The ICANN policy team's pre-meeting guides are really great. Like so if people just made sure to read those and actually understand what is in like that, it's like a 20-page document, it's not short but it's not a huge commitment either, that would go so far in terms of removing just like the discussion around the status of the PDPs versus what we need to get out of them.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Stephanie. This is Graeme. That's a good reminder. Let's make sure to do that and certainly before the meeting we'll lean on everybody to participate in that. So, I think we're getting better. Certainly we're now producing daily updates of the meeting, which is great. We're putting some of the responsibility

on that of people who've received travel funding to provide those updates. So, I think that's a nice mechanism.

If we're helping you be here, then you get to contribute a bit back. And certainly the policy calls go a long way too. So good. Thank you for that. I think there was some good input there. We'll… The ExCom will take that on board and have some more discussions and see what pieces of this we can put in place and test out for the next couple meetings. And hopefully we can continue getting better and more effective.

It's now 11:19. I think we're going to move next into the privacy and proxy IRT update, which I think I put on Darcy. Darcy, if you would be so kind.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks, Graeme. Darcy Southwell for the transcript. So, this is actually one of the things where I think we should have a discussion, Tom, not just an update. I do have a brief update. I think many of you were in the session that was on Sunday. I'm losing my days already. Just generally speaking, the IRT has a lot of registrar members. We have sort of set a target, reluctantly so for some us, to be done with the IRT by the end of the year.

So, the idea is to have the draft, what do you want to call it, draft policy document and draft accreditation agreement, published

by September for completion by the end of the year. So, we had a session on Sunday. I think the critical piece there is the Public Safety Working Group. They have a sub team that they're working on recommendations regarding law enforcement submissions to privacy proxy providers.

They unfortunately didn't give us much detail of what they're working on other than some high-level bullet points. But I wanted to call those bullet points out for you because I do think it's something we need to be very sensitive about. Some of these sort of lean in the direction of possibly making new policy, or suggesting new policy I should say, because it is just a proposal they're putting together.

But they're working on things like what they, they say the definition of law enforcement, or defining the issue of jurisdiction, some of which is already in the policy document. They also want to define the requirement of what an acceptable disclosure request processing and prioritization. And then the final thing was about notification to registrants when a submission comes in from law enforcement.

And again, many of these things were included in the policy document, so they already exist. You've heard talk over, probably for years now about how we seem to have an overlap where you have a policy. The IRT, the Implementation Review

Team, comes in and somehow it has morphed and the implementation plan begins to start looking a little bit like new policy.

So, I wanted to point those issues out. Unfortunately, I don't have great detail because they haven't great detail because they haven't shared their actual material yet. We're hoping to have that in a couple of weeks, but I think it's a sensitive issue that we need to pay attention to. So, I don't know if anyone has questions or feedback or concerns, but.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Darcy. This is Graeme. I'm going to back up a little bit for people who are new, because there are some in the room. Starting I think in 2014, there was a policy development process spun up that came out of the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement to build a set of rules for how domain privacy works and how those services work.

That policy development process wrapped up last year. It was a long, hard fought, contentious working group that got to a reasonable place. And so now that the policy work is done, it's now moved on to what's called an implementation review team, where they take that policy and try and turn it into the actual nuts and bolts rules of how those services will work.

And so there are still questions that come out of that but it's not policy development. And so, Darcy's highlighting this interesting piece where public safety, law enforcement was not participating in the policy development but has sort of been encouraged by the board to put some input into this implementation review team. And I was asking Amy and Marika about this earlier about what does it look like when they bring that back to, which is likely to be policy back into an implementation review team. And I think that's going to cause some conflict.

I think there's also, if I can elaborate on some of Darcy's concerns, public safety is not sharing their, A, they're not drafting these guidelines they're going to give to the implementation review team in public, they're doing that behind closed doors, which is probably not ideal and a little bit contrary to the ethos I think of much of what we do inside of ICANN. Because we can't see that, we can't comment on that.

And they're also planning, from my understanding, and this is what I think Nick Shorey was saying in the session on Saturday, Sunday, whenever that was, is that they're going to complete their work, they're going to use their mechanisms to get it up and official Public Safety Working Group position. Then it goes up into the GAC, where the GAC will then approve it as an official

GAC position. And then they're going to feed it into, they're going to give it to the implementation review team.

So they're going to, have gone through a bunch of sort of checks and procedures to gift us with this guidance that from a process point we may not have the mechanism to implement inside that review team, and from a content point is not appropriate for that implementation review team. And so, I'm worried that there's essentially this, and that rejecting that is going to cause extreme consternation within the GAC and Public Safety and set us up for controversy similar to this IGO-NGO, sorry for the acronyms, problem that exists right now at the Generic Name Supporting Organization level.

And so, I guess that's mostly educational and thought for you guys. If people have insight or opinions on how we can avoid that and it's not just us, I think that's going to be, you know, a problem for the entire community. But I see this coming and it scares quite a bit. I've got Theo in the queue and then Elliott.

THEO GEURTS: So this is Theo for the record. I've been talking to a couple of these Public Safety Working Group fellows and from what they are giving back info-wise they say it's nothing going to be anything controversial. But like Graeme just pointed out, it is going to be the GAC that will actually define or accept what the

working group is going to bring to the GAC and that's the real danger there. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Theo. Elliott?

ELLIOTT NOSS: Yes, I think that if this is where we are now, you know, Darcy, thank you, just a question or two, you know, to proceed my comments so I can understand a little better. So, is this confidential approach public? Is what they're doing, which is we're doing this in private, we're putting it to the GAC, you know, nobody gets to see it, we're not sharing it with you, you know, until comes out through the GAC sausage grinder, is that public? Is that their public position?

DARCY SOUTHWELL: This is Darcy for the transcript. I would say yes. We encourage them to sort of step back from that concept, Graeme encouraged them I should say, to at least share drafts with us. And we're willing to accept that they're drafts, that's fine, but to not do these things in super secret and go all the way through the process and then come to us and so we're hoping that they will do that, but yes.

ELLIOTT NOSS: Yes okay. So, I mean this seems, what, fun and easy, you know, because this is implementation, you know, it's not subject… Anybody can correct me if I'm wrong. It's not subject to GAC advice in the same way that the output of a PDP is at all. In fact, you know, that line between law and regulation between, policy and implementation, is very, very important and need be protected at every opportunity.

So, I mean I think at this point we should probably put something out publicly. We should speak with them privately, share our concerns, and put something out publicly, just saying that the point of process we are, you know, and we can bend over backwards to be clear, we are not concerned, you know, to Theo's point, we're not concerned about what's going to come out on the other side, we know you guys are working in good faith, we're sure this is going to be fantastic and helpful, but.

You know, because I think we really want to head off that fight, you know, if and when it would happen. We do no not want GAC advice on implementation coming out and I think that, you know, there's two kind of side points here between, besides that line between policy and implementation that are very important that we need to keep reminding ourselves.

In terms of active participation in the policy process, the GAC are near rookies. I think that they are mostly trying hard to be constructive. You know, they've moved from shouting from the outside to being more active in the process. We want to encourage that. I think that's really helpful for everyone. So, this is a great learning opportunity.

Two, Public Safety Working Group, you know, if GAC are close to rookies, you know, they are real rookies. I think that they are mostly trying hard to be constructive. You know, they've moved from being more active in the process. We want to encourage that.

So, this is a great learning opportunity. Two, public safety working group. You know, if GAC are close to rookies, they are real rookies. They are freshmen. You know, they're just getting their feet on the ground as a group and I think even more so, you know, they need to be groomed into how the policy process works to make them most constructive. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Go ahead.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks, Elliott. I think those are really good points. I think one of the challenges is, and we talked a little bit about this earlier

today about how we as members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group participate in policy development processes and implementation review teams, and we each come to the representing our companies officially in an individual capacity but obviously keeping in mind what, you know, the Registrar Stakeholder Group may or may or may not be interested in or concerned about.

I think that's where they're different is the Public Safety Working Group members are not representing themselves and the way the GAC is structured is that the Public Safety Working Group can't really put out an opinion or a position without GAC approval. So, I wouldn't necessarily say it's GAC advice in the official capacity we think of as the communiqué, but they kind of have to sign off before the Public Safety Working Group can put something out there. Whereas…

ELLIOTT NOSS: So two things on that, Darcy. Sorry, I don't think that's technically right in two ways. One is the Public Safety Working Group, you know, that sort of characterization of the, you know, who you represent. You know, I think we all come to this as community members first and foremost, them too. And, you know, that kind of really strict siloing of their participating I think is very dangerous.

You know, it'd be great if they could participate on a regular basis in working groups actively. And there is nothing, thank you, there is nothing to stop them from doing so. We saw law enforcement participate sometimes in processes when they wanted to from the outside. This formalization, you know, has no limit to it that, you know, you've talked about. We're implying that limit, right? We can, well what they say, you know, what they say they can and can't do is really more what they will and won't do. And that's an important distinction.

And so, we don't have to accept that. It's like us saying, you know, we're going to close this room, we can't have this room open, something to that effect. It's we don't want to at times. And I really just think we have to be active and not just take something like that passively. Or at a minimum, if we do, let's do that very publicly because it really hurts the process.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Elliott. This is Graeme. I think that's a smart approach. So certainly, it will have some, I'll have other members in that implementation review team can as well have some sort of back channel conversations with Public Safety, but putting out that statement is something we could do if there's other people who think that's a great idea. And I think it could be, we can do that.

I think we could end up seeing this sort of double unpleasantness of, maybe it's not unpleasant, I'll withhold judgment, of where they produce that output from Public Safety and then also issue it as GAC advice. Mary was pointing out in the Adobe Connect that there are provisions within the Implementation Review Team processes for policy concerns to be filtered back to the GNSO. And I suspect that's where we're going to end up and I'm sure James is going to super appreciate it when it lands back on his plate.

Owen?

OWEN DELONG: Owen DeLong, Akamai. It seems to me that the best way to deal with the situation at hand would be to proactively reach out to the PSWG and the GAC and try to, you know, let them know where we are in the process and what constraints that particular position in the process imposes upon our ability to accept their assistance, for lack of a better term.

But I also think that, you know, we should look at why didn't the Public Safety Working Group and the Government Advisory Committee get involved in the PDP when it was still a PDP. And if it's because they weren't really structured and organized enough to do so and didn't understand that that where their input needed to go at the time, we should do everything we can

to be as accommodating as possible within the confines of where we are in the process to whatever input they want to provide.

But at the same time, you know, decisions are made by those who show up and they failed to show up, for whatever reason, and we are where we are now and I think that if we proactively communicate that to them, they're certainly perfectly capable of driving the effort to spin up a PDP revision process.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Owen. Those of who participated in the initial policy development process are probably a little bit loath to jump back into that, having spent a couple years in the trenches there. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Just a note of caution. I think part of what is driving this is the fact that PSWG and GAC right now are not behaving in a unitary way. On other issues we've seen PSWG engaged. It's like they're not perfectly aligned with us but we've made a lot of progress in conversations with them. We've come closer together. And then it's when the product gets taken back to the GAC, they're actually different representatives with different priorities and there's, the rift between those two groups is growing bigger.

So, I just caution us against like treating it like it's a unitary they because I think there's actually a growing rift, and that's what's creating a lot of this back channel stuff that the PSWG is having its own challenges in terms of how it assert itself vis-à-vis the GAC.

GRAEME BUNTON: That's a good point. Thank you, Stephanie. Does anybody else have thoughts on privacy and proxy? Greg?

GREG DIBIASE: Greg DiBiase. So, changing gears a little, one of the things they asked for in that session was what the requirements for a valid abuse report. That is contained in the first half of the abuse reporting document that we've been working on. So, my question to the group is should we take that part out and finalize it and give it to them? Is that something to get this abuse reporting document that's kind of been in limbo forever, you know, a way to start it and have something final?

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Greg. This is Graeme. Greg is referring to a document that registrars have been bouncing around for probably a bit over a year now and it's gone through a good number of iterations between sorry, it's a document about abuse reporting

and practices around that for registrars. And many of you… Anybody who I think was interested should have received an update about two or three weeks ago now on the most recent version. You should check your emails for that and check it out.

What Greg is talking about is it's sort of in two sections. One is the requirements for an actionable abuse report to a registrar. If you fill out all of these things, you're going to have a much better time getting a response from a registrar. They can actually do something with your abuse report. And those pieces of that are not rocket science.

I think if most people read them, they would go, "Oh yes, those are straightforward. Those are the things that really make getting an abuse report better." And then there's a whole bunch in there which is not so straightforward, which is how should we respond to these abuse reports and keeping that generic enough that it fits in all of our different models and ways we like to operate. And finding agreement on that piece is considerably more difficult.

So I think, Greg and I have talked about this previously, but I think it's maybe a good idea is to carve out just the submission requirements from the rest of that document and we can continue working on whether we have agreement on responses. And this isn't necessarily everyone in the RSG, this is sort of a

voluntary project for people who wish to participate. So, it's not an official RRSG document.

But I think carving those abuse submission requirements out, putting that out to the RSG and then the rest of the community saying, "Hey these are like great things that everybody can use for abuse reporting and helpful" is probably a good idea, and certainly will make us look a little bit better and we can continue the discussion about the other half but feel like we've made some progress elsewhere.

Thoughts, comments? No? Pam?

PAM LITTLE: Pam Little, Alibaba. Would it be possible to circulate that draft or the latest version? We, as newcomers, haven't seen it. I would love to see it, see what's in it. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Sure. Thank you. I'll make sure to do that. Okay. So, I think that's where Privacy and Proxy Implementation Review Team is at and some of the thornier issues inside. So, I hope that is a good discussion for people and a good update and they have a good sense of where that is now.

It is 11:40. We're running a glorious five minutes ahead but that's mostly because I cut out PDP working group updates. We'll move some of that to our regular policy call. And if you have particular policy development processes you would like an update on, maybe put that in the Adobe Connect or back channels. Skype that to me and we'll see if we can fit those into any other business. Please and thank you.

Next up on the list is Cross-Field Validation. Do we have someone for this, Zoe? No. Who is…? I'm going to give a bit of background and then, Theo, are you, how up to date are you on cross field?

THEO GEURTS: Actually I'm, this is Theo for the record, I'm not way up to speed with what's actually going on there. I'm observing it but I'm not engaging it.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay. Well hopefully I'll give a bit of background and see if I can kick of that discussion and someone who's hopefully a little bit more integrated and up to date on that than me can take over and add some more context.

So, this is another piece like the privacy and proxy rules that comes out of the 2013 RAA, registrar accreditation agreement,

where there's a bit about when it becomes, I think the language is commercially and technically feasible, registrars will, and I see Jen Gore is in the room too so I might pick on you a little bit, implement what they call a cross-field validation, which is making sure that the fields inside WHOIS makes sense.

So, that could be that the, you know, on an address field that the number match is, exists on that street, that street exists in that town, that town exists in that state, and that state exists in that country. And then there are less sensible aspects of that, that the phone number matches the states or something like that, the area code makes sense. But.

So, this process had started a few years ago after the 2013 RAA negotiations and then it was sort of put on a break because there didn't appear to be an obvious way to move forward with that. But it's come back up over the past, say, six months or so and there is now a registrar-only working group that has had one meeting so far, Jen? We've had, there's been two. And there's another tomorrow. Do you want to join us maybe and you can give us a little bit of, talk a bit about this please, Jen? Actually, why don't you carry on with that update on what it is. Maybe that's a little bit better from you, please.

JENNIFER GORE: Okay certainly. So tomorrow we have session on it. We've had two meetings. Tomorrow will be our third meeting. It is a registrar-only session and it is a closed session. Just a couple updates that I'll also be giving tomorrow is that the transcripts and recordings will not be published. They will be available from a transparency perspective on an ad hoc basis, in which both parties will reach an agreement on the way that those are disseminated.

The intent is that we work with the working group to establish a criteria that both parties agree to, determine if there is a solution that is commercially viable, and it will require two-thirds vote by the registrar group in order to move forward and support the initiative to move into implementation.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jen. I should probably also point out that this is not a Registrar Stakeholder Group, it's open to any ICANN-accredited registrars.

JENNIFER GORE: That's correct.

GRAEME BUNTON: Bob, please.

BOB WIEGAND: Bob Wiegand. I think that the, from the registrar perspective, we look at something like that, yes there's the language in the RAA, we understand that, we're concerned about the cost, right? If you did somehow figure out, well first of all, it is even possible, especially when you look at the global address validation. That just is a, how would you even do that, right? So is it really even an option.

If you could figure it out, what would the cost involved with that be? We, for the larger registrars, we have millions of records that potentially would have to be run through that process. So, there's additional cost there. So those are some of the things that we're all, as registrars, we're looking at this saying, "Whoa, this is Pandora's box, this is, this makes us nervous." And so for the newcomers in the room, that's where at least I'm coming from. I think a majority of the folks in the room are as well, and maybe James you want to comment as well on some other concerns.

JAMES BLADEL: Sorry, my Adobe crashed. So, thanks for acknowledging the actual hand as opposed to the virtual one. So we've kind of I think captured a pretty comprehensive list of all of our issues and really all of our threshold questions that need to be

answered before we can proceed, like what is an acceptable rate of false positives, what impact is this going to have on emerging regions, you know, that don't, in countries that don't publish their address formats and does this create a barrier to trade if registrars in one country get free access to a postal database and others have to pay 10,000 Swiss francs a year or something like that, all these questions that we keep sending back to ICANN.

So, my question is, hypothetically, if we decide on the registrar side of the table that this not technically or commercially feasible to proceed, what happens to this? Does this finally go away or does it just come back again six months later and six month later? Who at ICANN is driving this and kind of resurrecting this zombie thing? Has the technology changed? I mean I really am trying to figure it out how it keeps coming back. And/or what do we need to do on our side to say that this has to come out of the contract, you know?

We had during negotiations with the 2013 RAA. Jeff was there, Michele, Volker was there, you know, some other folks, you know, Matt Cern and Rob Hall, they're not in the room. You know, we told them at that time this is not something that we can go forward with. And the can was kicked down the road to well if we can figure out how we do it, we want to do it. I don't

think we figured it out in four years since 2013 and I don't think we're going to. So…

JENNIFER GORE: And that's part, Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff. And that's part of this exercise obviously to develop a criteria that will address the pricing component, that will address whether it's feasible in certain regions or certain countries and not in others. But it is a contractual obligation, so therefore…

JAMES BLADEL: No it's not. It is a contractual conditional obligation if we find it to be feasibly and technically possible. And I guess at what point do we say it isn't and do we get ICANN to agree it isn't?

JENNIFER GORE: I do not have the answer to that question.

JAMES BLADEL: And I'm not picking on you, Jen. I know that this was waiting for you when you arrived on the scene and, you know, but I think we need to get some sanity about this, you know? I mean we can send you all this information, all these questions and…

JENNIFER GORE: If you could… I mean as a request, if you could send me the list of questions, that will be helpful because I don't believe I have a consolidated list from the registrars with the questions.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes, I circulated that to some folks. I don't know if it went to just the ExCom or if it went to the whole list or something. We'll send you that.

JENNIFER GORE: Okay great.

JAMES BLADEL: I mean we'll package it up. But I think the answer can't be well we found something that kind of works and it's $5 a name and it only takes 150 milliseconds per check, you know, and just all kinds of, and nobody, you know, outside of the U.S., Europe and Canada can use it, so go do that. You know, this is your new obligation. I think what we're going to say is that's something you guys think is a reasonable approach to this, because we don't.

JENNIFER GORE: Well that's the purpose of the two parties coming together and in a contract it's got that the criteria for the two-third vote in

order to support to, if there is a viable solution, that vote will be needed in order to move forward on it.

JAMES BLADEL: The second question, I think it's a little easier, what are you guys doing to reach out to accredited registrars who are not part of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and have not been following this at all? How much success have we had getting a hold of those folks?

JENNIFER GORE: So we have sent emails to all 3,000 registrars in existence today. We have not had as much success as we'd like to have. We will continue to reach out to them.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you, Jen.

JENNIFER GORE: You're welcome.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yes and thank you, Jen, for allowing us to pick on you a little bit here.

JENNIFER GORE: Sure.

GRAEME BUNTON: So just so everybody's on the same page on this, the requirement would essentially mean technically that we would need to be able to verify every physical address in the world inside the purchase flow for a domain name. And that, as James I think alluded to, is, A, that database doesn't exist. It has to be fast. It disproportionately would affect the developing world. And then how do you also do it in multiple languages and character sets? So, I think we have some pretty deep technical problems with that.

I've got, sorry, Michele, Darcy, Owen, Stephanie, Joyce. Michele, please.

MICHELE: Yes thanks. Michele for the record. A couple of things. I do like the way James refers to this as a zombie. It's probably the best way to look at it. We need from, Jennifer from your side, it would be very, very helpful to know exactly who we, has the final say on the ICANN side to accept that it is not viable or that it is viable, that somebody who has the ultimate say on that. Is that the CEO, is that the board, is that the head of Legal? The buck has to stop somewhere on the ICANN.

The reality is this. From our side, speaking as a registrar based in Europe, which some people seem to think is an area of the world where doing this will work, we have an obligation with Nominet to do this. Nominet are incapable of validating Irish addresses. That means as the last time I checked something like 15% plus of the registrations from my non-criminal registrants, which are basically most of my registrants, have, as far as Nominet are concerned, are not valid because Nominet is not capable of looking up Irish physical addresses, Irish company names, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Ireland and the U.K. are in Western Europe. We are considered advanced. Now I would hate to think what would happen if I was left in a position where I would have to go through this process for my registrants in other parts of the world. I mean essentially the Internet is global.   ICANN is meant to be recognizant of that, and this obligation needs to go away. As far as I'm concerned, it's a nonstarter but we need to kill it and we need, it needs to be gone.

Because ultimately if you cannot do it for 100% of addresses in a technical matter and an economical manner, then you're talking not about five or ten domains or five or ten registrants, you're talking about millions and millions and millions. So basically, it's like okay you want to play on the Internet, well you're going to have to move to the United States and maybe one or two

other countries. Now many that might suit some people but I think for a lot of us it really doesn't.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Michele. This is Graeme for the transcript. So, I think the room should be hearing that there's a good number of registrars who find this requirement pretty problematic from both a technical and commercial feasibility standpoint. If someone disagrees, I would encourage you to be brave and express that you don't think this is problematic because it would be good to hear that voice in the room if that's the way you're approaching it.

Darcy, Owen, Stephanie, Jeff.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks, Graeme. Darcy Southwell for the record. So, my comment, question also is for you, Jen, and I think James sort of asked this but I didn't hear an answer. So, in 2013 we wrapped up this working group and decided that it was not commercially and technically feasible to do this. And then suddenly in late last year at the Hyderabad meeting all of a sudden it sort of resurrected itself out of the blue.

And one of the questions we asked in that meeting was, has this changed? And we were told it has and we were promised some

information about what you think exists out there, not the slide you presented, but explaining to us how something has actually changed. And I'm still not hearing that and I guess then to kind of follow up on that, my other concern is, are we doing the same exercise again? So.

JENNIFER GORE: So the exercise that took place prior to my joining ICANN from what I understand was five sessions, where you looked at various vendors. And I sent a summary out to the working group as far as what work took place then. This exercise is very similar to that to working with the registrar group to develop the criteria. There have been some changes as far as services and solutions out there, and that information I'm going to be presenting in detail tomorrow in this session.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jen.

JENNIFER GORE: Did I answer your question?

DARCY SOUTHWELL: The first part. The second part then is I feel like we're just going through the same exercise. So, it feels like I mean honestly we

could do this every two or three years for the rest of our lives. So, when do we get to the point where we've made the decision? Because we did, I was on the working group the first time. We made the decision. So, I'm just trying to get to an understanding of how this cycle works.

JENNIFER GORE: I'm not aware of a vote taking place, where there was two-thirds vote, the first go around.

GRAEME BUNTON: And so if that two-third vote happens and it's a no, this goes away forever?

JENNIFER GORE: You asked me that question earlier, and I said I do not know the answer but I will find out for you.

GRAEME BUNTON: You do not know, okay. That would be a good one to like, because, you know, I don't think we have any interest in voting on this every three years.

JENNIFER GORE: I acknowledge that.

MICHELE NEYLON: Sorry, this is Michele briefly for the record. You know, there was no vote. There was no discussion of a vote. We just hit a complete impasse the last time round. All progress, all work on it was suspended because we were going nowhere, so it kind of went off into a corner and died and then arose again. I come from a Catholic country so I've got all sort of things with rising things again. It's just not good.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Michele. Owen?

OWEN DELONG: Owen DeLong, Akamai. I had an informal conversation on this topic with Bobby Fling yesterday and I think part of the source of this being resurrected is that there's certainly some fraction of the public safety sector that would like to see it happen. In talking with Bobby, and there happened to be a lady there from I think Interpol next to him when I was having this conversation, she chimed in with, "Well can't you guys just validate against what you can find in Google? That would be better than what's happening today."

And I didn't go into trying to address all the reasons that's just completely silly at the time, because I wasn't sure how to do it

without insulting her intelligence, and I couldn't think that fast on my feet. But I think that if nothing else it would be wise for us to come up with a polite way of expressing why it's not technically feasible and why you can't just, you know, search all the fields on Google and see if Google finds a match and use that as a criteria.

Because this is the mentality that we're kind of faced with on the other side of this issue when we peel back all the curtains and whatnot. And so, it might be worthwhile to get at the crux of the matter there and try to find ways to say, you know, this is what we would need in order for this to be feasible and if you governments want to go produce that for us, then maybe we can find a way to use it, but right now it doesn't exist and without it it's not viable. And, no, the Google thing doesn't work for the following reasons.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Owen. This is Graeme. I think what you're talking about there is close to what James was suggesting we produce to Jen, and we had I think the second longest e-mail thread in RRSG history on this relatively recently. I believe it was second only to the great lunch debate of 2014. So, I think there does need to be some sort of work product out of the RRSG that highlights these issues for people.

I'm going to editorialize for a sec as Graeme from Tucows and not Graeme, stakeholder group chair. And this is a point that I hear made quite a bit on this issue and I like to share this, is that people conflate verifying transactional data with WHOIS data all of the time and they're saying, "Well Amazon does this and e-commerce does that all the time." But they are not the same thing and they're deliberately not the same thing. And so, whenever someone says X, Y, Z can do this, they are not doing this, they're doing something very different.

I believe I've not got Stephanie, then Joyce, then Jeff. Sorry, Joyce, I couldn't see you earlier. Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: I just want to make sure as we keep the conversation going about what is commercially reasonable or commercially feasible, that we force a conversation around whether we're actually solving any problems at all. I'm squarely in the camp that this isn't going to make anything more contactable. If you look at the WHOIS accuracy pilots, there's like virtually no relationship between syntactical accuracy and contractibility of the registrant.

So, it could be true even if we were able to get all of the metrics in terms of speed, in terms of converge, in terms of accuracy that James was talking about down, like there's going to be false

positives, there's going to be issues. And if there's no articulated benefit, I've not seen anyone able to convince me otherwise, like any cons are a problem. Any cons push up against the idea of whether or not it's commercially reasonable because I don't understand the purpose. I don't understand what we're accomplishing here.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Stephanie. That's a good point and we'll have to make sure that we drive that benefit piece home especially because, as you mentioned, we can do that in a relatively data-driven way and that's I think pretty powerful.   Joyce?

JOYCE LIN: Sorry, Jennifer, I didn't mean to beat you up, I did not. But I think the whole crux here is validation. It's ICANN's mentality of the feel-good mentality. And it's a problem that that mentality is under the umbrella of the consumer safeguards, okay? So just ICANN's trying to show the world that they have done the best, trying to find out the bad guys, the bad apples, the bad players in this space but let's say that if one day the technology is there, let's say today everything is available, and we present everything 100% correct validate data, what can ICANN do? What can the law enforcement agency do about it, right?

So, there are more urgent issues. Yesterday when I went the presentation, it really scares me when they did the analysis, DNS abuses. VeriSign has 140 million names. They've ranked top one for abusers, malware, phishing, you name it. Do you know who's the second one? It's [inaudible]. It's a new gTLD and all the remaining other new gTLDs. So there is more urgent, more important issues that ICANN has to deal with, but ICANN's just hiding underneath their so-called validation, so-called consumer safeguards, that big umbrella but they couldn't do anything about the more important, more serious issue there.

So to me, it's really a feel-good approach, the mentality that ICANN has and I'm absolutely against that at all because they couldn't do anything about 100% validated data. What are they going to do, right? So Graeme, I have a suggestion. When you take the vote, two-thirds vote, we might want to say that we do not like to see ICANN raise this question again, this issue again forever.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Joyce. You raise a good point that, this is Graeme for the transcript. That this is certainly not the lowest hanging fruit within this space.   Jeff, who do you work for again?

JEFF ECKHAUS: Jeff Eckhaus, Rightside, Name.com and a few other registrars. So I'm, well, one, apologies for being one of the people responsible for capitulating on the 2013 RAA with James, no. We have to, this was one that we had to put in at this point to get pass and sort of, as James says, kick the can down the road. And I think it's about time that we just sort of need to crush that can and I think sending lists of issues and questions and points of why we think this doesn't work and let's try and do this, I think, I don't think that's going to work, or why is this needed and how is it going to help, and if we send data that shows contact-ability doesn't mean anything, I think none of that matters.

You have a group on the other side that has nothing to lose by, to keep on pushing this forward and I think we just need to end it. And the only way to do that is for us to officially take the vote that we want to do, say we don't believe that this is commercially and technically feasible, full stop. We just don't believe it. And then the agreement states, you know, the registrars in ICANN have to jointly agree. If we disagree, there are mechanisms in there for next steps and if they don't disagree, if they don't agree with us, then there are steps and we should go down that path.

But I think right now we're just talking around it and we're trying to come up with here are issues, here are other ways, like let's just take a stand and see what happens next and let the chips

fall. Because right now I think it's just going to be and endless debate that's going to chew up e-mail cycles and maybe one day overtake the lunch debate e-mail, which I hope will be the winner forever. So, I would like to just end this and let's listen tomorrow. I think we can listen to it. I mean they could surprise us with some crazy solution that we didn't expect and they say it works for 100% of the countries, even Ireland with no postal codes and, you know…

MICHELE NEYLON: We do have postal codes now, Jeff.

JEFF ECKHAUS: And let's see what happens. But after that, let's take the vote. We're all, I mean we can't take the vote here because it's, I believe it's two-thirds of registrars, not registrars in the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Yes, the registrars, right. Two-thirds of the registrars, so. And I know that there are certain large registrars with over a 1,000 credentials that are not here.

So, either way, let's just take that next step, let's move forward. Because if not, I think we're just, we're going to keep discussing it in circles. And let's take that step, hey listen, I might be in that smaller one-third and two-thirds agree the other way but I think

let everyone's voice be heard and let's take that vote and see where it stands. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jeff. This is Graeme for the transcript. I think that's a good point that we need to keep move forward on this. I think we're really good at saying how much we dislike it and generating really excellent points about how bad it could be. Let's get that in one place. Let's get in the room. Let's get that done. And we can free up more time to discuss other fun things.

And I think it's, just on the technical voting issue, I think it's two-thirds of the registrars participating in that group in that day, and collapsed by family too. So, if you have 1,000 creds, you don't get 1,000 votes, or members, if you're feeling crazy.

I think I've got Darcy, Stephanie, and James in the queue, although Darcy and Stephanie's hands might be old ones.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: I'm old.

GRAEME BUNTON: Darcy's hand is old too. Stale hands. James, I think is new.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes, I just wanted to respond to something that Stephanie had said, and I see Jen is back in the room. I thought you'd left. Wouldn't miss it for the world. Yes, a good point about the problem that we're going to solve. I mean I think we articulated, we haven't had a call in a while in this group but we did have a call where we explained that, you know, a true criminal, or someone who's actually doing something wrong, will have a perfectly pristine validated address that resolves to a car wash in Indiana or something like that. You know.

We said at that last call, ICANN the next time we get together on this, please come back to us with a problem statement. Is that a part of our presentation on Thursday? So, you have a defined problem statement and how this cross-field validation is going to address the problem statement?

JENNIFER GORE: Yes.

JAMES BLADEL: I am not going to miss that session for the world then because I want to see how you've solved cybercrime. Thank you, Jen.

JENNIFER GORE: Hopefully you like the problem statement.

GRAEME BUNTON: I mean this is a momentous day. It's the 14th of March, 2017 when Jen Gore solves cybercrime. I think we're all very excited. I saw Tom's hand and then I feel like we might be able to move past this topic.

TOM KELLER: Tom Keller. Thanks, Jen. This is really great. I really like what Jeff was saying about, you know, getting the whole thing to a vote and maybe get it over with or not. But I think one thing we need to do in this situation where we have issues at hand that are not really solvable that we have to, you know, define the next steps to move forward, right? I mean it's the same, this can be the same issue in WHOIS, which is probably never be fixed, but it can go on forever and ever and ever.

So, I would suggest, you know, that we basically ask the ExCom to actually come up with a set of a possible solutions and a way forward and then we as a constituency vote upon that here and then take action. I mean we have to do something. I mean we can talk about sense or nonsense, whether it's feasible or not feasible and what ICANN wants to do or not to do, but there's a resolution to it. That's a vote. The question is, do we want to actually prepare for that and we need to do some lobbying

around that? And if we all say yes, let's do it, right, and quit talking about it.

JEFF ECKHAUS: Graeme, can I add two more points. One today is, for all in the U.S. convention or reading things, is 3-14, which is Pi day so I don't think it's going to, Jen will overtake Pi day as today is 3.14. But on Tom's front, thank you for reminding me of something I forgot to say with going through on that vote. I think another path we could take is, and this hopefully would appease some folks, is think about as a group if we could come up with some voluntary steps that we said we would take to help on some of the issues.

Because from what law enforcement and others want, they're, you know, sort of like the, hey, why don't you look it up on Google or something like that, like there is a gap there but we could come up with some voluntary sets of standards that we said, you know, they're not standards that we guarantee we would adhere to but something that we would call best practices that it just completely voluntary. That could help bridge that gap when we say no on the other front.

And I think maybe that is another way to do it versus just being adamant and saying no and saying that's it, but saying something that is not a hammer that's a part of the contract that

if we fail this on a contractual compliance basis we can lose our accreditation versus something we will try to do to make the data better to work towards it and put that hand-in-hand with our no vote, or maybe a no vote. We'll see what comes out. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jeff. This is Graeme. That's an interesting idea. I think we'd need to sort through a little more. It could be just as simple as, say, putting your own address in there, like Jeff Eckhaus and then just all domains 100% verifiable Jeff's house. Please?

LUCIEN TAYLOR: Lucien Taylor, Netistrar. We've been building our own control panel from the ground up on the 2013 RAA. We've tried to bake in validation right from the start and, reflecting Michele's view, it's rubbish. It's really hard to implement. It's hackable. We couldn't, we use kind of address validation APIs that, they're high quality APIs but they're not exhaustive. We couldn't find our own business in there so we just phoned them up and put our business in there. Then we could find our own business in there.

I think there is a sense of desperation here and I support the last view that we don't actually just kind of just say no, it's not going

to work and we say no here. I think we should try and sound a bit more helpful and willing to try things. We've ourselves implemented the Nominet system, which is kind of pretty poor and we've explained to Nominet how it doesn't, it's not really good, what Stephanie was saying. It doesn't actually lead to any kind of valid lookups of people. And they're happy with that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. Luchen, was it? Lucien. Okay. I don't see anybody else in the queue. I think we've hit this pretty hard. Thank you very much for the good discussion on that. There's a couple concrete steps I think we can take and there seems to be a real desire to move forward, put this behind us, great. All right. So, we can do that. Let's do that guys.

Next up is a topic that was floated on the list relatively recently. I'm not super up on it so I can't speak to it, although I know it's certainly very important to my company but I'm far too policy focused and not operational enough to really tackle it. And I think Tom on the spot for queuing this up. So, Tom, if you could. [BTAPA], bulk transfers, take it away.

TOM KELLER: Thanks, Graeme. Tom Keller for the transcript. I have to admit I'm not so much more prepared than you are. I'm knowing

about that now since a couple of minutes that I'm on the spot. But I think it's a very interesting idea to actually talk about the bulk transfers and how we can make that better.

I'm sure you're all aware of that there are different kind of schemes how you can bulk transfer a domain name from one to another, and they're very restricted and they're very pricy, depending on how you do it and depending on the registry and whether they really want to play along or not.

So, the good thing is that this is one operational issue that has to do with our contract and doesn't have to be resolved by policy. It could be resolved by policy but it doesn't have to be if the registrars really come to terms and come up with something they want to do and then talk to ICANN about that and talk to the registries about that.

We're currently in an environment where we see a lot of consolidation ongoing and it makes complete sense to get away from this very old and awkward processes we have, and find a new framework to make that easier for all of us.

There's another aspect to it as well which you might tackle at the same time. If you talk about bulk transfers, there's a regime with the registries currently that they can switch providers whenever they want basically and the registrars have to take on the burden of all the transitions from one registry backend to

another registry backend, which effectively it's a bulk transfer as well, which is not regulated, which is not priced, we're not getting any money for our efforts, but we just have to do it because the registry wants to do it and save some money most of the time.

So, that's two things. And I think the question we have at hand is whether we actually want to address it as a group or not. We as a company are one of very interest into that out of obvious reasons, I don't want to hide them, but I heard that other people in the room are likewise very interested. And so, I think the discussion we're going to have today in the next 20 minutes is not so much about whether we really want it or how we want it but whether we want it and how we want to tackle it. So please help me figuring that one out. Jeff?

JEFF ECKHAUS: Go ahead.

GRAEME BUNTON: Oh sorry. Before we get to Jeff, and James is also in the queue, I just want to make sure that everybody understands what bulk transfers are. Does anybody, be brave, throw up your hand if you're not sure what we're talking about just so we're…

Everybody's clear? Good, great. Okay. Carry on. Jeff and then James.

JEFF ECKHAUS: I'll defer to James. Go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks. Yes, just to build on Tom's comment, I think that, but I do want to disagree with one point, which is I do think we need policy. The good news is I don't think it needs to be a controversial policy and I think we can probably expedite it because I think that everyone is in agreement that this would be a useful thing to have.

There is a concern I think, a small concern, that we would have to steer around, which is that the transfer was, the transfer policy is meant to ensure healthy competition. So, we wouldn't want to introduce accidentally any anticompetitive elements by making it too easy or taking the registrant out of it.

But I think it particularly in cases where we're moving a bulk transfer from one affiliated registrar to another affiliated registrar as part of the same family, I think that's a really important. and this is not just to reflect consolidation, this is just generally when we talk about things like backorders, you know,

or aftermarket transactions that occur on one registrar and need to move to another registrar.

I think that this would be a useful to have. BTAPA is there. It sort of works sometimes. But, you know, if we could get something that's standard that all registries would adopt and that has some sort of uniform and predictable fee structure that we can work with, I think, yes, let's, you know, let's work with that.

JEFF ECKHAUS: Thanks. Jeff Eckhaus here. So, I would say in the past 60 days I've worked on four separate bulk transfers, BTAPAs, and they are an incredible pain to go through, and incredibly expensive. So. But I do think that there are two separate things we need to think about when talking about the bulk transfers because if it was for, within affiliated registrars and two separate nonaffiliated registrars. Because two separate non-affiliated registrars, it is part of the policy and is an RSEP for the registries that they have to get it added to their registry agreement, the BTAPA. So, there is specific policy around it.

So, I don't think that somebody, I think Tom you said it's up to the registrars, it's in our control. I'm not 100%, I'm not expert on that part but if it's in their registry agreement and it's part of an RSEP, there may be some other policy around it where we can't do it. But I think that, yes, simplifying it, hopefully lowering the

cost because $50,000 is incredibly expensive for a transfer where the actual registrars are doing all the work, preparing all the lists and getting everything ready.

But I think with, I would say if we want to do it within affiliated registrars, that's a different conversation, possibly easier, and I think that might be an easy one to pass and to get through. So, we might want to think about it in two separate tracks as we go forward, or bulk transfers between affiliated registrars and non.

Because especially, I know it's going to be an issue for, as we said, there are some registrars now, between 500 and 1,000 credentials, and some of those would like to move some of the domains very easily between their own registrars as some of them pick up in the credentials in the drop. So, I think you'll have a lot more, I think it will be simpler and you'll have a lot more support on the affiliated side than between competing registrars. And it also helps on the competition part as well. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jeff. And so many this is like a two-stage process, where we, if we're going to tackle this we start with the affiliation first because we think that's a little cleaner, a little simpler, and then move to the non-affiliated. I have Tom Barrett and then Michele.

TOM BARRETT: I actually would speak out against this particular proposition. I certainly do not want to start with helping out registrars that 100 or 1,000 creds and prioritize that over bulk transfers between unaffiliated registrars. So if you break it out, I would oppose it. I don't think we should make, do special favors for people who have 1,000 creds. You know, that's a business model. We have no reason to make their life easy. I think if we're going to do it at all, it's one process for all.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Tom.

JEFF ECKHAUS: Can I just… One thing to be clear on that, that just was one example. Another one would be Graeme who's' up there, for example, they recently purchased [Enom], right, so they might want to be moving two names between [Enom] and Tucows and that would be something between affiliated registrars. And that's not necessarily their business model but I think somebody else had brought it up there, it's consolidation in this industry. It's definitely happening and it's not to make people's lives easier who have a large number of credentials. I wouldn't want to frame it like that.

And also I, so that's why I think that it could be a simpler process for because it's within the same registrar family and not two separate registrars in two separate entities. So, think about it that way, not trying to do favors for somebody with different business models. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you both. And thanks, Tom, for being a contrarian. It's not always the easiest. Speaking as myself, I do take Jeff's point, I think we have three creds but certainly bulk transfer is suddenly very important to us. Next in the queue is Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. A couple of things. I mean the moving of the domains between affiliated registrars, I agree with Tom to a point in that, sure, it's their business model but I mean, as Graeme says, they've got two or three creds, they don't have thousands of them. So, it makes sense to be able to move stuff around without having to jump through too many hoops.

The other thing is, and this is just from my own perspective, when dealing in the ccTLD world, you go from being an agent/reseller or something to becoming accredited. And in many cases there is a clear relatively straightforward process which allows you to do that so that you can actually have those

domains move directly to your, under your management. In the ICANN space, it's a total bloody mess and there's no way to do it.

Now obviously, we probably don't want to be kind of, you know, helping our competitors at a ridiculous level, but from a practical level it's an absolute bloody mess. We as a company have ccTLDs spread across multiple registries and registrars and we move stuff around and that's fine.

When it comes to the gTLD stuff, up until the change in the transfer policy we were trying our best to move stuff away from one particular registrar we'd been dealing with to ourselves but there was no simple way for us to kind of go write, dear registrants, this is what we're doing, do you have an issue with this? Because I think, you know, informing them is very, very important, especially with all the kind of jurisdictional things.

You know, there's some way of actually, you know, processing that and moving it forward as we have in the Cs would be really handle in the Gs. Now I can see WordPress dot com obviously would have an interest in this, and I can understand why, and you're not the only ones. There's a lot of us who have this kind of situation.

And again, it's just not covered by the current policies and processes. And then you end up with kind of weird, funky things where some companies manage to get some weird side deal

with a registry behind closed doors, God only knows how, and a bunch of domains get moved between one registrar and another. And if you're the registrant, you might find out accidentally somehow by accident but they're completely ignoring the actual policies and processes. So, I agree with James. There needs to be policy. It doesn't need to be really, really complicated. If the ccTLDs can do it, why on Earth can't we?

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Michele. Kellie?

KELLIE PETERSON: Michele's absolutely right.   At WordPress we have a very significant interest in this. You know, we happen to have had a long and wonderful relationship with the folks at Go Daddy, but we are an accredited registrar and we want to make sure that our customers have a unified experience. I personally have been on the other side of that as well during my time at Neustar and, you know, we would get accredited registrars going through the same thing.

You know, Jeff's been on the other side of that, you know, with his relationship with [Name Cheap]. Business evolves and we need to be able to help our customers and work together,

registries, registrars, the ICANN staff, and make sure that we're taking care of the end users. So wholeheartedly in favor of doing this, you know, addressing all of the various business models accordingly but this particular one is of great interest to us.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Kellie. And nice to have you in the room. Welcome to the RRSG automatic.

KELLIE PETERSON: It's good to be back.

GRAEME BUNTON: Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Sarah Wyld. I just want to also emphasize we should be focusing on the end user. I think what if a customer has a thousand domains across five different registrars, ten different TLDs. There's no good way for them to bring them all into one provider, which I know a lot of customers want. So they can't use the BTAPA in that process. We should give them something that they can use.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Sarah. So, what I'm hearing? I'm hearing that there is a pretty reasonable interest in this and that is, you know, not just about consolidation either. There's plenty of good practical reasons, and from a whole perspective, if I can, again, editorial as Graeme Tucows, not RSSG chair, we certainly see scenarios where resellers have grown and built the scale as automatic as to become, switch from being a reseller to their own accreditation and then they're in all sorts of pain making that happen so, although they're perfectly welcome to use our hosted registrar platform if they so desire.

So, I hear everybody. This is clearly something. It does still I think feel like two different mechanisms or there's an easier problem we can solve and then, which is the registrar family and then the inter-registrar. We don't we don't necessarily have to tackle them in that order but we can tackle them as slightly different problems. And I think how mechanically that's going to work is probably that the few of you that care about this need to put your heads together and we can help facilitate that to figure out what that solution looks like, what you'd like to see, what the best way to pitch that to the registries, what's the best way to put that to the community is. So, if this is important to you and you like it, heads up. We'll start trying to put that together in the near future.

Michele, you had another thought here?

MICHELE NEYLON: Yes thanks, Graeme. Michele for the record. I think maybe what we need to do then is to try to kind of draft as list of the scenarios we're trying to deal with because like for me personally I have this kind of you big guys going off buying each other as you like to do, giving you, making yourselves more powerful and making us feel smaller. That's nothing something we're involved with.   But we as a company obviously are interested in some of the other things.

But I think one of the things we… Sarah mentioned, I think it's really important, we do need to make sure that the registrants, our customers, are informed or at least kept in the loop because I can't stress this enough, the jurisdictional thing around this is going to become a bigger issue. I mean let's call a spade a spade. You know, we have clients who have extra language in their contracts with us for hosting that we, that their servers have to be physically located in Ireland and can never be outside Ireland.

And I think the same kind of thing happening as we move forward with the changes with both in Europe and in other countries where registrants will want to be sure that they're dealing with the data and, you know, that the registrar they're dealing with is in particular jurisdictions. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks, Michele. That's a good note and we should make sure to feed that into the people who are going to tackle this soon. And I'm sure Zoe is adding a, captured a note that we're going tackle this and look for an e-mail probably to get some volunteers.

12:30. You've got more on this, Tom?

TOM KELLER: Yes just one more question. We will have time in the GDD to actually talk about that in length? I don't know about the [inaudible], but maybe that would be one of the discussions that a few interested people could have face to face instead of going to an e-mail list again.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Tom. This is Graeme for the transcript. That's a very good point, that this is a pretty good topic for the GDD Summit and so that schedule is sort of a draft is done. If people haven't looked at that, it's on the GDD Summit website. You should go and take a look and give us some feedback actually to see what else you would like to see happen at the GDD Summit. But that is a good topic for that, especially to see what the registries have to say. Cool. Thank you.

Anybody else on bulk transfer. Tom?

TOM BARRETT: I don't know if Sarah made this point. I do think the, we have to make sure we frame this from the perspective of benefits to the consumers and so it doesn't look like we're solving a business problem among registrars and registrars and registries, but in fact this is beneficial to consumers. And so, you know, that might be the best use case to start with. But, you know, I'm concerned about us forgetting about the role of the consumer and whether or not they would need to opt in to a registrar bulk transfer and so on and so forth.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Tom. This is Graeme. I'm hearing that pretty clearly from both you and Michele and Sarah. So, we'll make sure, well the people who are going to tackle this topic will have to make sure that that's accounted for. I see Jeff at the microphone. Jeff?

JEFF ECKHAUS: Yes, for those who have not gone through many BTAPAs that I have in the bulk transfers, there is a 30-day notification to the registrant to let them know that if they don't want to go to the new registrar, they are free to transfer away at, I think it's at no

cost to the registrar of their choosing. So. There is that built into the current process right now.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jeff. And we would make sure to include something like that. Kellie?

KELLIE PETERSON: This is Kellie Peterson. One of the things that I think is great at about the BTAPA is it's an opt out. From a perspective like ours at WordPress, we might like to talk about the potential because we've always been the interaction that the customer has. It would be fantastic if we could simply send them, you know, a notice. So, there is a difference between a BTAPA situation as it stands today, which is you're actually changing who a customer goes to for support and billing, whereas with us it wouldn't necessarily do that. So, that is a point of differentiation that I'd to at least consider.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yes. Thank you, Kellie. Tom?

TOM KELLER: Sorry. This all goes around the question of changing from one registrar to another. So, another topic I brought up was about

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

registries changing their backend providers in that way, having bulk transfers done as well. So just a question in the room whether someone would be interested to talk about that as well.

Because from our point of view, it becomes a very, very big annoyance that every registry provider who wants to save a couple bucks is changing the registry provider as soon as they can, and this doesn't stop. And this is part of the flood of all the changes we've seen coming in from the registries which is causing a lot of work for all of us because, at the end of the day, we have to do to just negotiate with someone.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Tom. That's a whole juicy topic I think we could tackle maybe as part of the conversation around RAA amendment two. We've got about six minutes before lunch and I think it's ready and hot, so I don't want to delay that.

Do you have that list? Can you put that on the screen? So here is something that we need to do it more often I think, which is recognize the work that lots of our membership is doing around the ICANN community. Because there are some of us who are out there all the time on calls, and if you haven't done it it's not always a wonderful party. So, this I think is a list of all the different groups that are going on around ICANN right now, how many members are participating in all of those.

And it's, so at this moment right now it's us recognizing those who are participating and meeting. Thank you to all of you because it's a bunch of work. It's not always fun. Thank you to your companies for allowing you to participate in this sort of stuff because it's not all immediately business relevant and we've got some pretty wonderful participation out there. You can see a list of names of people dying in the RDS working group.

And then we get this wonderful list here with the number of groups and things that people are participating in and the list. So, I think this is the Theo, Sarah, and Volker memorial lunch we're about to have. So, thank you to those people for working so hard and committing so much of your time to registrar issues and, you know, not just Theo and Sarah. I'm not going to read the whole list, but thank you to all of those people. Your commitment and participation is greatly appreciated.

So thank you. Now we're going to take a, we have… We're going to end this session about five minutes early. You've got 15 minutes to get some food and get back to the table. We're going to start again for a working lunch in 15 minutes. So, I think that's 12:50. Thank you everyone.

ZOE BONYTHON: Thank you. You can stop the recording.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry, can I just make other mention, polite request please. The lunch that is on the side is actually just for RSG members. So, could I please ask that if you're not a member, to not take any lunch. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Awesome. Thank you. All right everybody, welcome back. The lunch is pretty good. Thank you to Zoe for organizing that, and the people who made it.

So, we've got about an hour now before we then go and meet with the registries.   And we're going to be talking about compliance, and we're going to be talking about the charter. If I can queue this up for Theo while he gets comfortable.

I don't know if everyone here has actually read the Registrar Stakeholder Group charter. I kind of, I should encourage you to do so, but I do that with some hesitation because the existing one is complicated and wordy and kind of incomprehensible. And it's certainly difficult if English is not your native language. It's difficult for me, and it is.

And so, we have begun the process to revise our charter and Theo has been spearheading that. And he… I'll actually let Theo cover the rest of that. I think we're making good progress. It's almost done. He just put something in his mouth.

So, I think the intent is to have this ready for the [Joburg] meeting and then I'm actually not sure what the process is for ratifying it. Maybe chewy Theo can inform us and let us know how we're doing.

THEO GEURTS: So thanks Graeme, and this is Theo for the transcript. So, in terms of progress, we actually went a little bit backwards. We were done and we had a few open items. They are on the screen there.

And I also made a request to ICANN staff, who are assisting us regarding this charter, to make the charter more readable and de-ICANN-ize the language a little bit, because we're always facing the issue that there are non-members who want to become a member who are not up to speed with the ICANN language, are looking at our charter and our current charter is a perfect example of it, how clunky the wording can be.

So, I made a request like can you make this more readable for everybody and anybody inside or outside of the community?

And ICANN staff came back with massive edits and a lot of rewording. So, we need to do that. And that's going to take more time than anticipated. So, we're still shooting for Johannesburg, but I'm not 100% sure if we reach that state.

In terms of process for adopting the charter, from my understanding is it will go to the ExComm first so they can have a first shot at it. Then it goes back, and then at a certain point it will go to the members and I think there is going to be a vote after we process all the comments and suggestions because I assume there's going to be some significant discussion on that subject. Any questions so far?

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks Theo. Just for entertainment's sake, because many of you are still eating, I'll share with you this is Section 4.3.1, which is around eligibility for elected office. This is from our current charter.

"Any representatives of an ICANN recognized gTLD registry in the possession of or with access to registry proprietary information or registry sensitive information as defined in the relevant ICANN registry contract is ineligible to represent the Registrar Stakeholder Group as a whole either as an elected officer," blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

And it keeps going on like, oh, here's the other good one. "If a member services registrar with no unaffiliated third party registrants was under common ownership with an entity that in the last 12 months has voted in another SG or any constituency of another SG or holds a signed registry contact with ICANN that includes an exemption from the registry operator code of conduct specification 9 2013 standard registry context that prohibits a registry to directly or indirectly show any preference providing…"

It carries on like this for quite a while. No one know what this means. It's super problematic. So, making the language readable on the new charter is extremely important, especially as we're translating it into other languages to be a more global organization.

So, I guess my own question for Theo would be has there been any sticking points in the processes or any places you think we're going to see discussion or controversy or friction?

THEO GEURTS: So, and this is Theo for the transcript. So, the section you just read out to the public here, that has been removed. The charter team looked at it, and we couldn't make any sense out of it. So, anything that we couldn't make any sense out of it, we simply removed.

What this in front of us here are questions and I hope I'm not going to be doing all the talking here because these are the sticky points that we as a charter team do not know where to go with. So, we need to have answers on these questions in order for us to progress.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you Theo. Sorry, mouth full. This is the down side of a working lunch. 2.1, ExComm, solved. So, it's probably a little bit hard to have some substantive discussion on this because people haven't seen it. So, I guess this is just really heads up, this is coming.

It's really important to our organization that we get this right, that everybody has a good hard look at this and that we can live with the results of this process.

So, for context, that piece in there about registry sensitive data that was never defined in our charter has excluded many people from holding office and has made electing the ExComm quite difficult, especially over the past year has generated lots of problems and some anxiety that I would love to avoid in the future.

So, we need to be careful about the provisions we put inside of our charter because we're going to presumably live with it for

quite a while. And also, for example, the mechanisms by which we vote are captured inside the charter, and currently they're very clunky.

We don't do a lot of voting aside from the vote for office. The most recent one was around the extension of the privacy and proxy spec. And we had to fast track that because of time constraints. And if you'll recall we were splitting into two separate fast track motions.

So, it required some jumping through hoops and being very careful because a full regular process to vote on an issue essentially takes a month, given our current charter, and that's very slow.

So, heads up, this is coming. Spend some real time on it, maybe chuck it to a lawyer if you have one inside your company. And give us some real good feedback on this and think about how, those of you have experience in history in the Registrar Stakeholder Group, think about how we do things, how this might make those things better, what this is going to look like in practice. Is that a hand Tom?

TOM BARRETT: Yes I guess I would caution against taking out sections because you don't understand them. They're put there for a reason.

Maybe they need to be better explained or separated into multiple points.

But I wouldn't simply eliminate sections because the current team cannot understand them. So, I would caution against that and try to understand more about the history behind some of these.

THEO GEURTS: Thanks Tom and that is a very valid question. So, in terms of process, we have a charter team. We are being assisted by ICANN staff. Two of them are right over there if you could maybe raise your hand a little bit. Thanks.

So in this process, ICANN has reviewed the language of our old charter and it proposed new language. And every time we go through a section, there is the new proposed language and there is the old language. And then the charter team discusses what is the best language here, what does capture our intent for the members here.

And there are sections which we had, after long discussions, still had no idea what the purpose was. And one of the problems we are facing is there is no collective memory from people who wrote it ten years ago with a certain purpose, and we can't ask these people any more what was the spirit.

But it is language that is non-usable because it has no meaning or it doesn't capture the intent any more. So, what happens in that process is we review it. Then there is a decision that we strike the language, which is being marked as being stricken.

The next charter meeting we revise the language again. Do we still feel the same about this? Do we still need to strike the language? So, there's a thorough process there of removing language if required. So, in terms of process, there's a little bit of what we are doing or what we were doing because we are actually past that stage.

Of course, if you want to compare it Tom, there's always that option to go back to the old charter because that will be part of our discussions. Thanks.

TOM BARRETT: Yes there actually may be some historical information that you can draw on. Maybe the current group doesn't have access to it but it may be in the archives of the mailing list. So, I can certainly help point you in that direction. We can have that conversation.

THEO GEURTS: So what I will do here Tom, and this is Theo for the record again, I will check with staff what we actually removed and I will pass it

on to you. And if we can set something up, going through these archives which go way, way back, we can actually see if it really needs to be re-entered into the charter. But my gut feeling is no, but we can surely do that. And I think for transparency sake, that is perhaps a good idea to do, so thank you for that.

Another thing I wanted to highlight, and this is important for your membership status, is all these practical issues like on the screen for example you see, picking a random one, yes, 2.6.2G, should there be a penalty system?

Now why is there language like "should there be a penalty system"? Because we as the ExComm, we are sending the invoices every year, and we also deal with the fact that for whatever reasons, people are paying late.

For us registrars, it's pretty normal to add an extra penalty fee or some kind of interest for people who are paying late. So, the suggestion was made should we do something within the Registrar Stakeholder Group? And that is why the question is up there because we as this charter couldn't come to full agreement there.

And it could be that we don't come to full agreement within the stakeholder group and then it would actually I assume mean that that section will go.

Could also mean that during the discussion people come up with better suggestions than a penalty system. But that is just something practical that will affect you all if you are a member and if you are renewing your invoice when it gets sent out again. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks Theo, and we certainly appreciate the work that the team is doing on this, and I feel personally pretty confident that if the team is looking at the old charter and doesn't find the section incomprehensible, that it's probably pretty incomprehensible. Stephanie, I saw your hand?

STEPHANIE DECHESNEAU: Quick point, I support Tom's ask for context but I caution that we not take it to the extent that we're considering anything that was once decided so is still the best model for the group. I think we need to actually think about it in our current context because there are probably, even there are probably decisions that we would come to differently today than whenever we last looked at the charter.

GRAEME BUNTON: Agreed. Thank you, Stephanie. I see a hand from Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Michele for the record. This is the… This will be the third version of the charter that we've had. So the first, there was an old one under the old pre-change the GNSO structures, yada, yada, yada.

And then when we moved to the one that we currently have, ICANN staff, Rob and his team, helped kind of translate the old language into something that was compatible with the newer one.

But we didn't really do much in terms of dealing with these stupid issues we have like the voting processes, some of the stuff around the budget, some of the titles around members of the ExComm.

There's a bunch of weird legacy things in there that they don't make any sense. In 2001, 2002, 2003 or whenever the hell these things were decided on, they probably made perfect sense. But in 2017 they just don't. I would… I can understand, I mean, Tom's concerns about, you know, just removing something because people don't understand it is a little bit dangerous. Totally get that. But I'd agree with Stephanie and others, you know, that just because something was there doesn't necessarily mean that it needs to be there.

As a group, being able to vote or at least get the backing, the support, or the lack of support or whatever it is of the group in a quick fashion is really, really important.

I chaired this group for three years, and it was one of the biggest headaches I had with trying to understand how on earth to get that. So we really do need to fix it because there are issues that arise and we're expected to react quickly and we can't, and that's a problem.

THEO GEURTS: So, and this is Theo for the record, so my experience as the chair, and I haven't been doing this for years, but more like eight months or seven months actually, it's been a wonderful experience because we're making so much progress and the language is getting so much clearer and we're tackling all these problems like you just described on doing a fast motion setting up of it and doing the voting positions.

That is being tackled in a magnificent way I think. So even though we still have some work ahead of us, I'm pretty sure that a new charter will be workable in a lot better fashion. I mean, I've been there in the old charter many, many times now as secretary figuring out like how do we do this and how do we do that. And the old charter is like a nightmare to find stuff in.

And given that experience, I've been hammering on to getting these issues out of the way in a new charter because I definitely want to see them again and I definitely want to go through that process again in the near future if I'm still an ExComm member. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you Theo. Do we actually need to tackle these questions in front of us here today and now? So, is that the intent?

THEO GEURTS: That was the intent or we're taking up some considerable time here. And if… So, let's turn this around a little bit. Is there anything that people want to discuss now?

GRAEME BUNTON: Tom is that an old hand? Michele that's an old hand too. Right so I suspect there's not, because I think people are really going to need to see the whole thing and see it in context, so it's probably a little bit hard to tackle these as a whole.

They're interesting questions though like 2.6.2C, what 10% of budget means. That's good that we should figure that out because that came up very recently when we were talking about

EN

a white paper on cross-field validation was, if this costs more than 10% and what is it 10% of.

So good, I think we… I'm very excited to see the outcome of this process. So, who else is participating in this? Luc. Zoe. Janelle. Great. Oh, Joyce, awesome, so thank you guys. This is important work you're doing. I'm sure we're all super excited to rip into this new charter.

We can put these questions, I don't think we have time to really go through them now, but we can certainly put them on the list and discuss them there. And there will certainly be more questions I'm sure. Great. Thank you for the update. If there's anybody, and no one's got anything more on that? Awesome.

Okay next up on our list of things to talk about today is ICANN compliance issues. So, I'm going to again editorialize a moment. I was pretty disappointed that Jamie Hedlund had not joined us in the closed session with compliance on whatever morning that was earlier, Sunday, thank you. Time has no meaning here.

But it was good that he showed up today and had a bit of time for questions and did apologize for missing that and apparently was not his fault. Most of you I think, or many of you anyway, were inside that compliance session, and I would describe it as spicy. Disconcerting.

And so, I think we have some sort of structural and relationship problems with compliance at the moment. There is certainly a lot of dissatisfaction I was hearing from registrars around the audit process.

And so, we should probably have a little bit of a conversation about how we want to think about repairing our relationship with ICANN compliance, the best way to move forward with discussing these issues with them, collective pain around the audit process.

And then also out of that session came a commitment from us to ask formally of ICANN a report on abuse complaints by number per reporter so that we can get some insight into, so it would be a rank of individuals or entities that are submitting complaints to ICANN and the number that they submitted. So, I don't think we're actually going to get details on who they are.

We can probably guess in many cases. But it's going to give us some insight into what that compliance load looks like. Is it like 50% of complaints are coming from a single actor? How many complaints are submitted by like single complaint individuals? So, that's something that we need to put forward.

But now I guess is the moment for anybody to weigh in if they have thoughts about compliance, how we're interacting with

compliance, how we can start to rebuild some of that. Stephanie and then Fred and then Michele.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: On the audit, which was my particular compliance pain point this year, I think there was a common thread in a lot of the issues we were experiencing. And I would suggest that we maybe prepare like a quick postmortem about what went well, what we thought was terrible, just to have a bit more of a structured conversation.

I think, I don't remember if it was the last meeting or the one prior, we spent a little bit more time in advance of our compliance session preparing some of the issues. And I thought that was really helpful. And I think providing the issues in written form to ICANN, I know they were taking notes, but just to make very, very explicitly clear the items that we expect some sort of response to in relation to that.

I've used the tactic before on individual issues we've worked on with ICANN and I've found it helpful.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you Stephanie. And the process we used before the Hyderabad meeting was intended not to be a one-off, that it would be a recurring process. I did ask for feedback on the list

and got some, but probably not enough to bake something out of that. And then it was also the holidays in between.

But certainly, that is something we should do prior to Johannesburg. It does come up very quickly though that we need to gather that. And the tricky bit about that process is that it's helpful to get individual ticket numbers, which not everybody feels super comfortable sharing.

In, you know, I guess back to me or whoever is going to be compiling this list of issues that, and it's tickets where, and we can do this for the audit as well, is individual instances where we think compliance is doing a poor job.

When we see that across members now we have a pattern and we can produce this to ICANN and hopefully they can improve those. And so, we've done that once already. We now need to go back to that list of things.

We need to assess our collective experience to see if those things have materially improved. And if they haven't, hammer that home again. Take a pretty strong stance on that. So, that's going to happen again in the near future. Stephanie, you got a follow on this?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Quick response, yes. I think we can just treat it like a living document rather than having a single deliverable because we're all busy in advance of ICANN that we prepare for compliance and we go into the sessions. Just make sure we're tracking in a more organized way the problems that we encounter.

We can discuss them on our calls also. And then there's less of a sort of scramble at the end where we're trying to do ten other things and organize our teams in advance of ICANN. If we're just documenting the problems we're encountering as we go, it'll be a lot easier.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you Stephanie. That's a, this is Graeme for the transcript, that's a good suggestion to keep that out there and just as a live document. And it is, like I think we've already captured the sort of categories of misspent compliance time and, you know, where they're looking at things that are outside the contractual scope and, you know, failure to respond, insufficient response, issues like that.

So great, let's do that. Heads up, that's coming, and the more of us that participate in gathering that information, the stronger the case we have. So I would encourage people to help dig in there.

I have Michele in the queue. Sorry I skipped Fred. Fred was first.

FRÉDÉRIC GUILLEMAUT: Yes please don't skip me on that date. Regarding the audit things the discussion we had on Sunday I really had the impression that everybody is talking about something and nobody understands each other.

So maybe the best thing to do would be to join with compliance, pretend like face to face. Pretend we make an audit and then we can see what their replies are. And we could just tell them that this reply is not sufficient. We can't understand. We don't really know if that is helpful.

Because there was some comments from people that maybe you, that whatever the problem is you get the same answers. So maybe we could just work with them like to establish a workflow, to improve a workflow so that their answers from compliance would be easier to understand.

I know I have offered that last year for the GDD Summit and like you were called that fake audits. I would be ready to work, you know, with compliance on some kind of things even like presenting and being audited.

Just to show them are we supposed to answer to the question and then maybe they would understand that they need to

improve the clarity of the questions and the clarity of the specifications and answers. I don't know if I am clear.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks Fred. I think that is a reasonable idea. Compliance's response in that section to improving their responses was that it was too expensive. And you could see that ripple around the room of getting registrars backed up.

Stephanie you wanted…

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Yes, I have another response to it and it is actually not related to that point. But I actually think yes [Yan] understood perfectly clearly what I was referring to and the response from ICANN was just completely inadequate.

Separate from that, I actually disagree that we should have to have things like tutorial audits so that we better understand the questions. In something like a compliance audit ICANN needs to be explicitly clear in what it is asking for and it is not.

And the problem isn't that like we need to have some special training so we can read between the lines and like understand what they are not telling us. They need to be explicit in what they are asking for.

FRÉDÉRIC GUILLEMAUT: May I, I am not saying we should be trained. I just saying that we should show them what we are, what kind of data we have for answers so that they can improve their questions and answer. I am talking about training them.

I mean we can complain about them being bad or not clear or so on. Okay but what should we do now? This is too expensive to change? Okay but we could give them a few hours of time and it would save us like all those [inaudible] sometime.

I mean if it doesn't work okay fine. But we should try I guess.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you Fred. I think out of the… So, we need to spend some more time with compliance. That is pretty clear. Jamie I think offered his time to come and join us and we should certainly take advantage of that and maybe there is a piece of that that can involve what you are suggesting.

I am sure, no Michele was in the queue. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yes thanks. Michele for the record. Okay so the contract states that ICANN has the right to audits. And nowhere in the contract does it describe exactly what that audit is.

With other companies, other organizations with whom we have contracts have some kind of audits right as well. So we just went through the one from [Omnius]. They went off and they audited us and reviewed us and then following through on various parts of their contract and everything else that has any issues.

And the only time we heard from them was when there was something that they were looking into that they couldn't find the answer for by themselves. They came to us for that. They didn't send us like this long list of questions or vaguely worded things that you don't fully understand. They have their contract. They have certain things in it. They go off and they check them by themselves and then they come to you when there is something that they are unclear about.

It was painless. It was so much easier. Now this is me being logical. Oh my god can you imagine an audit that didn't actually, you know, cause you to break into cold sweats. Now that would be nice.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks Michele. Does anyone else have thoughts on this issue, process, problem? Things they need to tackle maybe unrelated to audits? Stephanie?

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Another issue that I encountered in the audit this year and the same issue has come up in ticketed cases is being asked for information that we are not required to collect per the contract.

And when we pushed back against that and said we don't collect it, we are not required to. Can you point to where this is actually required? Getting answers back like other registrars do it. You should too.

Like that just does not belong in the audit. I don't think we are going to find an answer here but I am curious if other people have similar experiences, similar answers. Because, Bob.

BOB WIEGAND: I will jump in. Bob Weigand second that. So, there has been a number of times where they will say, well this is best practices.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Right.

BOB WEIGAND: And I will say okay well I conversed with other members of the registrar stakeholder group and they are not doing it that way so it is best practices with who? You know not that I really care. It is not in the registrar accreditation agreement.

We have talked about this before with Allen Grogan. Is to be careful about unilateral interpretation of the accreditation agreement. If it is not a defined term it is open to interpretation.

So and they are good. I mean once you educate them like hey that is not in the agreement, it is not a best practice. Usually it gets them to go in a different direction.

But I do worry that some of the smaller registrars might get railroaded a little bit into doing certain things that maybe they don't have to.

The other thing is that sometimes we will get a follow up saying, oh well that's, you are not doing that. Will you consider doing this? And I am like, well no we don't want to do that.

There is a reason why we don't want to do that. Why are you even asking? It is not a requirement. It is weird. It is an awkward cadence.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Even if it was a requirement, or sorry even if it was a best practice I would argue that it doesn't even matter. Like best practices do not belong in audit. If ICANN wanted to have a parallel set of language beside the audit call it something different.

Where they said, oh by the way these are the actual issues we encountered. We would also like these kinds of things. Other registrars do this and we think it is good practice.

I mean that is fine. They can do that. I might not give it the same caveat but I might not give it the same consideration as the actual problems but they are totally welcome to do that and I don't necessarily think it is bad. But when those two things are conflated like that is not what belongs in an audit.

GRAEME BUNTON: Tom?

TOM KELLER: Thank you. Tom Keller for the transcript. One of the issues we have seen in the recent audits that there has been behavior as it comes to sending out notices and raising the level of notice. It goes from the first to the second to the third and then it comes [inaudible].

That was always our impression that as soon as we respond and are engaging that there should not be not the second notice. And I heard that from various registrars so I moved up to a third notice just because apparently ICANN was under the impression that I should [inaudible] the process.

So, you know, debating that was, you know, helped registrars for others it didn't work. And what I find particularly interesting is that the re-audits that might happen the next years is based on the level and the mind of the third notice.

And this is not only due to the big audit but there is some issue with regular like requests as well, how you can accumulate this kind of notices. And there is absolutely no regime or whatever of they give you second or third notices there is no way for actually for them to take it back.

This is very interesting because this is the unfortunate regime and the unfortunate regime ends with bridge at the end. And the question is whether there are some mediation before that or not? And we talked about that as well and hadn't really found a solution that you can talk to ICANN staff.

And then they say well from our interpretation you are in breach so you are in breach. What comes next? [Inaudible] probably, but, I don't know.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks Tom. I think there are in general a whole bunch of questions about what that notice process looks like. What stops the clock reasonably what doesn't?

Is there any internal to ICANN escalation? So does management need to get involved to escalate past third notice or into breach? Who is looking at those tickets?

And that is probably a conversation we need to have amongst ourselves to make sure we are clear about what behavior we are seeing. And again maybe we provide those tickets to ICANN and say these things are being done inconsistently.

Can you clarify what your process is? Can you apply that then consistently? They can take a third notice back. We got an accidental one recently. Marta?

MARTA BAYLINA: Hi, Marta Baylina on behalf of COREhub. We have gone through an audit process for the first time this year so it has been really a learning process for us. So I am pretty sure some of the things were just new in the process.

But I just want to share that our main concern or our main problems have been the procedure and as you have discussed here how fast it escalated without really feeling that as each.

I mean for example in the first notice there were some things that still were unclear to us given the response. So thankfully I am the one dealing with compliance for COREhub on a regular basis.

EN

And I found quite a different standard between the regular compliance cases where in my opinion is quite reasonable. You say look I am taking care of it. I need more time. This is happening.

And frankly I think, you know, ICANN's response it is reasonable and it allows some I have this question, this follow back. Then you don't normally you get just follow up questions.

We were missing maybe because we were new and we didn't know. But we totally missed or we expected that with some issues especially that were misunderstood because the, for example like in a sentence sometimes it was verification and validation in the same sentence. So you could not really even know whether it was one or the other.

So you would reply and say what is this about? But then if it was like the last day of responding then it would escalate to the next level.

So I guess I agree with what has been said here. But it would be nice first to have the same level of response and standard in terms of positive communication as in normal ticketing.

And have a little more clarity about you know when you have five issues and there is one pending. Whether you escalate on only that issue or, you know, a little bit on the procedure. So

that is from our constructive perspective what I would hope for. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you Marta. We have about 10 minutes left and so I need to get to our AOB. It really feels like we need a whole bunch more time to talk about this topic to me to collect some of these issues.

And then we need to get probably between now and Johannesburg into a Webinar with compliance and share some of this and talk some of that process out.

And I can see some of them in the room and I am sure they wholeheartedly agree and would be happy to be there. Anybody else have anything brief on compliance?

Lickety-split. Sub 30 seconds. If you are not I am going to just cut you off. Please and thank you. Chris then Joyce.

CHRIS PELLING: Chris. Maybe might be worth finding out how much KPMG are being paid to bring it in-house. They also takes out half the security issue of data being sent between ICANN and KPMG and all be it they mentioning [inaudible]. Mentioning about what security really is in place.

And actually taking it away from KPMG, bringing in-house, getting staff and taking the anxiety away of waiting three months before a single reply is done on audit data that is supplied.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks. Thank you Chris. I am going to keep that thought to myself. Joyce.

PAM LITTLE: It is Pam.

GREME BUNTON: Sorry Pam.

PAM LITTLE: No problem, okay, it's after lunch. So, I was wondering whether this audit have actually been really achieving what they were intended to achieve? This is the fifth year we are going through those registrar audits. The first three years was about I believe the first three year cycle on 2009. Now we are going to 2013 RAA audits.

Instead of doing the whole contract audit within the scope I wonder if we change to say just audit everyone on a particular chunk of obligation. For example WHOIS verification and then

we can see whether who is really doing verification or doing suspension and all that. Would that be more helpful and be effective?

Rather than doing audit this registrar and to see whether you are from A to Zed or in compliance. And it appears to me it is not really all that effective because we still have 75% of WHOIS inaccuracy compliance they are processing every year, 15% of transfer issues. So what are we doing with these audits? Is it really useful or effective?

GRAEME BUNTON: That is a good point thank you. All right AOB time. And I hope everybody feels what I feel right now which is we have had some very good discussion so far today.

You know there are clearly more to be had and so we do need to resolve the timing function that we have here that we just don't have enough. And here I am droning on instead of solving stuff..

We have got a few things that we are going to try and tackle in six minutes. Public comment triage team, RySG issues. I am going to go first with RySG issues which is, does anybody have anything on their radar that is not the board meeting?

That is not BTAP or bulk transfers sorry that they want to discuss with the registries in that session?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In that session no. With registries in general yes. Which would be around prepayments.

GRAEME BUNTON: Around what sorry?

MICHELE NEYLON: Prepayments.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay.

MICHELE NEYLON: It is an issue for a lot of us. Do I have to explain that? Well this is the problem everybody keeps saying, punt stuff to GDD but there is only going to be so many hours in GDD as well which is…

GRAEME BUNTON: Sorry there is some off mike talking. Michele has raised the, and Bob are discussing about what topics are we pushing into the GDD Summit in May? And is there time in the GDD Summit in May?

EN

And I actually got a reminder to make a point for everybody to go look at the draft agenda for the GDD Summit. If you are planning on attending go look at that and…

MICHELE NEYLON: Where is this?

GRAEME BUNTON: I am sure if you search for GDD Summit ICANN.

MICHELE NEYLON: So it is on the ICANN Web site is what you are saying.

GRAEME BUNTON: It is on the GDD Summit Web site which is somewhere. Because… What?

So go look at that because there are priorities and there are issues that we want to tackle. And maybe it is best there. Maybe we don't have time there. But we need to set some priorities on that list. And so definitely go look at that.

Does anybody have anything else for the registries? Fred was that…

FRÉDÉRIC GUILLEMAUT: I just wanted to say that we send the link of those drafts of the GDD to the registrar.

GRAEME BUNTON: I think it has gone out. We can send it out again for sure.

Okay but no one else has any registry specific stuff for this next session. Dynamite. All right five minutes left.

Public comment triage team. Actually, before we get to the public comment triage team I would like to say thank you to everybody who has participated in the RAA amendment team.

I know Neil is in there. I know [Seaman] is in there. I forget who else is participating in that. I think Jeff Newman has done some work in there too. Apologies if I have missed your name.

You guys are doing good work. There is a lot of those coming through. It is I think a pretty reasonable process and I think adding, I think reasonable value to members of the stakeholder group.

They are seeing those summaries that come out and they can make some choices from there. So thank you to everybody participating in that.

Public comment triage team update. Who is doing that? Is that you Zoe? Please.

ZOE BONYTHON: Hi this is Zoe for the transcript. I am going to kick it off. I was going to start with describing the process of how we are doing things but in the interest of time because we have some actual questions to put to members. I am going to go directly to, well Stephanie and Eric you want to start Stephanie? Thanks.

And just to say, what I can do is if people are interested I can put on the list what our process is at the moment. Thanks.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Sounds great and I am covering the, I guess the eldest two topics of the public comments that are currently open. Being the At-Large report and the IGO curative rights report.

We are not at the stage of having a current draft for either of these on the At-Large report side. My recommendation and I participated heavily in drafting the registry comment which is now being published is that we submit a comment with similar positions to that.

I think the central thesis of that comment is that end user participation in ICANN is very important. We need that feedback. But right now the mechanism we are getting it through is broken.

And we are generally supportive of the fact that the report is taking, going to a lot of lengths to try to propose pretty structural reforms to the At-Large that we would think would make improvements but some further suggestions for items that we think could be addressed.

Usually I would think that this is a good comment for registries and registrars to just submit a single statement because I would imagine we would be closely aligned on that point.

But in this particular context since it is through an external contractor I would suggest that there is value to having separate independent support statements. So please take a look at the issues I have raised and a summary that went out to the list.

And thankfully Reg has volunteered to help I think reframe a draft that could go out from the registrars.

On the IGO list I don't necessarily know that there is value in us filing very, very lengthy individual comments. But Darcy and James and others on the list noted the importance of supporting the work coming out of the policy development process and emphasizing that we as a stakeholder group stand behind that work.

I think that is important and I also think that we should take opportunities to reach across the aisle when there are pieces of

work like I think what we have seen come out of the IGO report that we can all agree on.

I would strongly encourage now that we have had somewhat of a deadline extension to, and I can take the lead on working on this. A very short statement of support for the proposal that we could potentially shop around to the other stakeholder groups and have a comment that was signed off jointly by many of the different stakeholder groups.

Because conversely, I think this is one where it is more important to show solidarity within the GNSO than to get individual words in. I think we just want to be supportive of the proposal.

But if there is anyone who is not supportive of the proposal we can raise those comments now.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you Stephanie for that update. We have got a minute left.

ZOE BONYTHON: Graeme, sorry we have got one more from the triage team.

GRAEME BUNTON: Oh real…

ZOE BONYTHON: We have got five minutes so the tech has given us five more minutes.

GRAEME BUNTON: I think people also need a bit of a break too before you carry on for the rest of the afternoon.

So, I guess maybe we can talk about it from a slightly higher level which is that the public comment triage team exists. It is doing good work. They are looking at the stuff that is coming through the public comment period.

They are doing a quick review to see if there is a place in those things for registrars to comment that it is appropriate that we do so. And then providing a summary to the list.

And then from there we are going to be picking people or hopefully having lots of volunteers to begin drafting the larger comment. So that is the process we are trying.

The goal is that we are going to be more effective in communicating with the larger community and that we are putting out more public comments as we should be.

We are also still investigating support from ICANN on drafting of those comments because that does exist. And taking advantage of that will lessen the responsibility on individual registrars.

So that is what is happening there. Clearly there is more content that we need to cover on that but I think we are about out of time. So pay attention to the list on this and I guess that is a recurring theme of today which is there is a lot of reading to do. Do as much as you can and we can all contribute more. But we get it. It is a heavy lift.

We are moving now to the RySG meeting in Hall 3. That will be at two so we have got 14 minutes from now to get there. Thank you everyone for coming and participating today. We have got one last note.

ZOE BONYTHON: Yes just one last note because that meeting is going to kick off with a presentation from ASOP so we really appreciate people being there on time to be present for that presentation for the award. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great thanks Zoe. And last but not least it is Frédéric's birthday. Happy birthday. Thank you for sharing that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I am sorry where it the presentation? The ASOP Presentation?

GRAEME BUNTON: It is A3. It is in the registry room.

That is starting at 2. That is at the beginning of our joint session with the registries. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]