
KOBE – ICANN GDD: Registry Roundtable with GDD
Thursday, March 14, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:15 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Okay. Good morning. Everybody hear me on this okay?

Yeah? All right. We're going to get started in just a minute. I'm sure a few more people will be coming. Usually it's a pretty well-attended sessions. So just get comfortable at the table, for those who weren't paying attention before.

All right. Good morning, everybody. How's everybody this morning? Wide awake? Ready to go?

All right. I know most of you are familiar with Dennis being here and moderating this session. But he's in another session so I will be doing my best to fill his shoes. I don't know – y'all be nice to me. Well, I'm sure we'll try to get some really good things on the table to discuss.

Looking around the table, I think most of you have been in this session before. You kind of know how it works. We're going to kick things off with introductions from everyone as far as who you are and what your affiliation is. I think you all know that, typically, Dennis asks, as far as your ICANN years – well, since I'm not Dennis, I'm going to shake it up a little bit. I'm going to ask you

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

what your favorite ICANN acronym because I know there's so many and then why it's your favorite.

So we're going to go across the room or around the room quickly. Again, just state your name, your affiliation, and your favorite ICANN acronym.

Ms. Austin, you are up.

DONNA AUSTIN: But I just got here. Donna Austin from Neustar, also Chair of the Registries Stakeholder Group. So [Our WIST] is my favorite acronym.

JEFF NEUMAN: Jeff Neuman. I am with Valideus and we represent a number of brand registries. Let's see. Favorite acronym is BTAPA. And I'm not saying it because I created that, but ...

DEITMAR LENDEN: Thanks, Jeff. Deitmar Lenden, also from Valideus. I also represent quite a few brand TLDs. Favorite acronym is DNSSEC.

JAKE WILLIAMS: Jake Williams from Interlink. I'll keep it super simple: just APAC, even though it's not fully an ICANN thing. Because we're from the APAC, so, yeah. It's not a fully ICANN acronym, but ...

[IA CO]: Hi. I'm [Ia Co] from Interlink. I'm originally from Kobe, so welcome to Kobe, everyone. We are the registry for the .moe, .earth, and .osaka. My favorite acronym maybe is a hot topic, so EPDP.

[KARLA HAKANSSON]: ... PDP or is it EPDP?

[IA CO]: Yeah, never mind.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Rubens?

RUBENS KUHL: Rubes Kuhl, NIC.br. My favorite acronym is TLA: Three-Letter Acronym.

[MARCEL WADE]: Hi. Hello. [Marcel Wade] from NIC.br. I would say ... ICANN is an acronym, right?

[KARLA HAKANSSON]: Yes.

[MARCEL WADE]: Sometimes I wonder if I really can.

VALERIE HENG: My name is Valerie, part of the Registry Services from ICANN, supporting the APAC registries. My favorite acronym is [PICTRP].

AMANDA FESSENDEN: I am Amanda Fessenden, also from ICANN Registry Services. My favorite acronym is RCEP.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Of course.

AYSEGUL TEKCE: My name is Aysegul Tecke. I'm with the Registry Services and Engagement Team with ICANN. My favorite acronym is RPM. It doesn't stand for Remote Participation Management but it stands for Rights Protection Mechanism.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: My name is Russ Weinstein. I'm with the GDD's registry team. My favorite acronym is MoSAPI but I don't actually know what it stands for.

YUKO GREEN: Hi. Yuko Green, born in Kobe as well. So welcome. GDD Operations. I would go with GDD.

AARON HICKMAN: Aaron Hickman, Senior Director of GDD Operations. I think my favorite one would be QLP.

CHRIS BARE: Chris Bare, Global Implementation. Favorite acronym is one that didn't last very long. It was the Financial Application Review Team.

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE VIGNES: Jean-Christophe Vignes, not from ICANN but in the spirit of cooperation from Uniregistry. My favorite acronym, showing my age, is DNSO.

DEAN EDWARDS: Dean Edwards from ICANN Product Management Team. Because I've been living it for the past couple years, my favorite acronym is CDZS.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Good morning, everyone. Brian Gutterman, GDD, ICANN GDD Registrant Program Manager. Favorite acronym is ERRP.

MICHAEL BAULAND: Hello. My name is Michael Bauland. I'm from [KNEP]. Since there's no one from [KOA] right now here, I think I'm also representing [KOA]. My favorite acronym is IDN.

[JETEN]: [Jeten] from Afiliis. I think the current favorite acronym has to be RDAP.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

[WATSON SING]: [Watson Sing] from Afiliis, coming from Toronto. Favorite acronym, since I'm a technology person, is EPP.

KRISTINE DORRRAIN: Kristine Dorrain from Amazon Registry Services. My favorite acronym for no reason at all other than I like to say it is RSSAC.

GEMMA KEEGAN: Gemma Keegan from Neustar. My favorite acronym is CZedDS because I only just found out the other day that everyone else says CZDS.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Craig Schwartz, .bank and .insurance. Some of you have already taken my favorite acronym, so I'll say SSAC.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What was your first choice?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: I think it was going to be RSEP and then it was going to be RDAP and now it's SSAC.

ROGER LIM: Hi. Roger Lim from the Contractual Compliance Team based in the Singapore Office, taking responsibility for the Compliance Team in Singapore, working with the APAC team. My favorite acronym would be UDRP.

JENNIFER SCOTT: Hi, I'm Jennifer Scott, also with the Compliance Team. I like the acronym TIAC. It's Transfer Emergency Action Contact. Not because of what it means but because it's a joke around our office that someone's going to name their dog that.

[KARLA HAKANSSON]: All right. This is Sheila that's back here. And, yes, you're going to have to speak because it is the rule. I let her sit back here only because she's our attorney and she keeps me honest.

SHEILA JOHNSON: Good morning, everybody. I'm Sheila Johnson. I'm with the ICANN org legal department. Fairly new, so I'm going to go with an acronym – all the acronyms I'm learning – I'm going to go with DNS.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. All right. Come on up to the table. Please state your name, your affiliation, favorite acronym.

[UNIDENTIFIED MALE]: Good morning. [inaudible]. I'm from [inaudible] University in Tokyo. My favorite acronym would be TLD.

KARLA HAKANSSON: TLD? How has that one not come up yet? Fantastic!

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning. I'm [inaudible]. I'm here with the Registry Stakeholder Group at this ICANN meeting, where I give support for commenting. So I'm very interested in just sitting here in listening mode. My favorite acronym – I also wanted to keep it very simple this morning – is DNS.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Very nice. I actually don't think I even introduced myself. I'm Karla Hakansson. I'm with the Registry Services Team. I'm going to have to go with one that's different than what anyone else has said. I think it's Rubens favorite right now, which is [MSA].

All right. Thank, everybody. It's a great way to kick things off and get everyone talking and get it a little more interactive as far as how this session goes.

As many of you are familiar with, what we do is we now go around the table and we suggest different topics that we want to talk about. This is your session. This is your way to either ask us questions from GDD or to make a point about something. We can keep talking about it and try to get to some type of resolution with things or at least bring them up so everyone's aware of to just get clarity on something.

So let's start going around the table as soon as we have our latest guest, actually, introduce himself. Name your favorite ICANN acronym, and then we'll start putting each of the topics on the board, vote on them, and then go from there.

Yes, please, take it away.

RAYMOND ZYLSTRA: Raymond Zylstra, Neustar. I'm sorry, I missed the – I have to name—

KARLA HAKANSSON: Your name, affiliation, and your favorite ICANN acronym and why.

RAYMOND ZYLSTRA: Can I think on that one?

KARLA HAKANSSON: [inaudible]. [And go.] Say who you are at least.

RAYMOND ZYLSTRA: I did say that, yeah.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay, sorry. Okay, we'll come back to you on that one. So, Donna, I'm sorry to put you on the spot again but we're just going to go

right around the room as far as – I know. Gosh. And you said the best acronym.

DONNA AUSTIN: I know.

KARLA HAKANSSON: I know you did. But are there any topics—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [We started this way].

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. All right. Topics? And we're coming back to you. He's like, "Give me a thought." Craig, what about you? What would you like to talk about today?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: I would say GDD Summit planning.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Great. Okay. Aysegul is going to be putting the topics up on the screen, I think. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can I pause?

KARLA HAKANSSON: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a quick question about CZDS.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Anyone else? Topics? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. If you'd like to share the GDD Summit sharing – because I think it has been three years now. I don't know. Yes. So anyone knows what the difference is between the GDD compared with the ICANN meeting. Because a lot of people that go to GDD seem to be going here, too. So, yeah.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Great. Great question. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It'd be great if you could go over the future of compliance and the structure.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My question is LO refunds. As the six years is coming up for most people in their contracts this year or towards the end of this year, what the process is and how long is it going to take for the money to come back for those that have actually put funds forward.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Got it. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Cool.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Thanks. [Donna], anything? Yeah?

[DONNA AUSTIN]: Maybe we can talk a little bit about process, so the PICDRP and how the changes came down the pike. Maybe we can just have a quick discussion about process and just setting expectations when things come up.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Great. Thanks. Anyone else? Oh, good. You do have them all up. Okay.

All right. Now that we have gotten to this point, we're going to start voting on which of these topics we're going to be – we might be able to get through all of them, but we can set the priority in terms of how we address them. So for those of you who'd like to – oh, Raymond. By the way, I don't want to pass you on if you had something. Are we good?

RAYMOND ZYLSTRA: [inaudible].

KARLA HAKANSSON: All right. Good. Thanks. I guess that's the last time you come in late, huh?

All right. GDD Summit planning. Raise of hands.

One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten. Okay.

CZDS. Show of hands.

One, two, three, four. All right. Five, I think? Yeah. Okay. Five.

I think we've already got – oh, well we can talk about GDD Summit in ICANN meeting discussions. We'll put that together, I think.

Future of compliance and its structure?

One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve. I think I got everyone. Twelve? Great. Thank you.

And LOC/COI funds.

Three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten. Ten?

And PICDRP.

One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Seven. Okay.

So I think we started with the future of compliance. Is that right? As far as number.

Okay. So anyone else have anything to add as far as anything they'd like to discuss? Just want to make sure I've got this covered.

Okay – yes, ma'am?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just want to note that I have to run early but someone else here is going to ask my question. Thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. All right. Thanks. Come on up to the table for folks that are trying to sit into the back. Come on up. Interactive session here.

Can we discuss compliance? I think it's been covered in a few discussions, but just to make sure that everybody is aware. Yeah?

ROGER LIM

Sure. Hi, everyone. Roger here. So the compliance structure has changed slightly. So at this point, Jamie Hedlund will be managing the team directly. So myself, people like Yan from the audit team, and the U.S. team will be reporting to Jamie directly. It should not affect any interactions with the Compliance Team.

You had a question?

[JEFF NEUMAN]:

Yeah. Just on that, there's lots of discussion about people moving around from compliance to legal. Is that true, and does that mean that there's going to be a lot more control again over compliance by legal?

ROGER LIM:

No. It's still under Jamie, and Jamie reports to Goran. So there's no legal involvement like you mentioned.

[JEFF NEUMAN]:

Right, but it seems like the team, with Maggie leaving and others going over to legal – is it a smaller team? Can you tell us more

about the vision of compliance and why all of these changes – obviously, Maggie is left, but why all the other changes?

KARLA HAKANSSON: We've got a queue, so one second. Do you want to address that one, or ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah. Go ahead, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Karla. So what might be helpful – and I don't know if it's available – is we haven't seen an org chart for quite some time, and that goes for GDD. We haven't seen an org chart for a while. So I don't know if they exist, but that might help the conversation if that's available.

KARLA HAKANSSON: That's a good suggestion. Craig, I'm sorry. I [inaudible].

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Just to follow up a little bit on Jeff’s comment, I thought I heard yesterday in a session that – and it might have been Jennifer – you’re still working compliance but that you’re now part of the legal team. So how does that work?

JENNIFER SCOTT: All right. Sorry. Let me bring some clarity to this. So probably, Jeff, you weren’t in any of our sessions. Jamie did go over this in, I think, all of them. So sorry you missed it.

So the V.P. position has been eliminated, so, like Roger said, anybody who was previously reporting to Maggie is now reporting up into Jamie.

For this week, I was still part of the compliance team. As of next week, I will be with the legal team. But I won’t be double dipping. The compliance team might be one of my internal stakeholders as part of the legal team, but I won’t be continuing on in a role for the compliance team members.

What Roger was saying is the elimination of the V.P. role and my move have no impact on the compliance enforcement mission. Our mandate is still the same. Our work, our processes, our procedures will all still be the same.

However, the compliance team is having an outside consultant come in to look at the way that we structure our work to see if it’s

the most efficient and effective way of doing thing. The 1-2-3 process that was implemented back in, I think, 2011/2012 served its purpose at that time, and now we're taking a fresh look to see if there's something that we can do to enhance that process.

But in terms of our work, it's status quo for now. We did get an invite from, I think, the registrars to provide input on what they feel about the processes and procedures and see if they can also provide some feedback that could help that refresh look. I'm sure, if the registries wanted to put some together in that term as well, they could do that, as well as any other community members. We're happy to take any feedback and do that.

But this is not a structural change in terms of compliance reporting up into legal or anything like that.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. I appreciate that. Thanks, Jennifer. What's a little bit concerning to me is that, with Owen having left and then Maggie, you're going over to legal. I thought there's someone else going over to legal as well from compliance. I'm trying to remember who it was – no?

There's a lot of institutional knowledge there and it would be great to just, like Donna said, get an org chart and figure out what's going on because it – and I apologize I missed the last sessions. There's so many conflicts during this meeting. So that's it. Thanks.

JENNIFER SCOTT:

On the org chart thing, I think that's an org decision. It's not a per-department basis decision, I don't think. I [don't] see Russ nodding. So maybe we can take that back and see if the org is still publishing those. But if not, that's above the department-level decision making.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Thanks, Jen. This is Russ. I'll take it back to Cyrus and let him know that there was questions about it. We'll think about what ways we can try and clarify how we're organized and how we do the work. But overall, I don't think anything has changed on the GDD side. You saw Cyrus recently go from the interim role to the permanent role of Senior Vice-President over the Global Domains Division. Other than that, it's the same that it was before that. Thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

All right. Thanks, everybody. Yeah, Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Russ. It's kind of not the same as it has been for a while because there has been some changeover in personnel. So the point about the org chart is important because we know there's been people leaving us – three that I can think of – but we don't know if they've been replaced or, if they haven't been replaced, what the strategies for ensuring that the work is still covered are. So it's been a while since we've seen an org chart. So yeah, it's not just the Cyrus/Akram change. It's wider than that.

[RUSS WEINSTEIN]: Thanks, Donna. I understand. I would also ask, are you seeing gaps in work getting performed? Because if you are, please let us know that, too. I think, so far, we've done a pretty good job of covering and trying to figure out how best to organize or how best to get the work accomplished with a few heads moved around and out and stuff. But if there's a gap, please let us know.

KARLA HAKANSSON: So one second, Jeff. Rubens, you had your hand up.

RUBENS KUHL: I was wondering, how was the integration between the compliance ticketing system and the naming services portal going or not going?

JENNIFER SCOTT: I think there was a presentation on that earlier in the week, but the development is underway to get the compliance ticketing system into the naming services portal. I think we're looking somewhere around the end of calendar year 2020. It might have been that. Don't quote me on that.

Anyway, I think there's some folks in the room who might be able to speak better to that. Sorry if I'm putting you on the spot. But it's under development. It's in progress, and hopefully the compliance cases will be visible just as any other cases are to registries and then eventually registrars as well.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah, Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: I have a specific – it was one of the first times in a number of years a filed a complaint. It seemed to have gone in a black hole. Again, I can't really compare it to much because it's not very often that I

file a complaint against a registrar or something like that. So I don't know. I can't provide that feedback.

But from others that I hear in the community, they all are of the opinion that it takes so long and it seems like it goes into a black hole that there's very little communication back and forth. The complaint I filed was probably three months ago, and I actually can take that one offline.

So the answer to your question of have we noticed a slowdown? I don't know, but this particular item is very slow and still not resolved.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Right. So I think – oh, sorry. Go ahead.

JENNIFER SCOTT: I was just going to say, if you want to send us over a ticket ID or any details that you have, we can take a look and give you more specifics offline.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. So I think the action items or the takeaways that we're following up on are to see if we can get the org chart, to see if we can get some clarity around roles and definition as a part of the

org chart, and then Jeff will figure out how we can follow up with you on your issue.

Anything else?

Okay. All right. We're going to go to Number 2, which is GDD Summit versus ICANN meeting. So as far as the GDD Summit versus ICANN meeting, the way I've always heard it to be is that ICANN meetings are more policy-driven, where the GDD summits are meant to be more of a business opportunity for the registries and registrars to come together and have discussions, as well as with the GDD team.

I think that, based on – and it's a collaborative effort in terms of putting the agenda. Russ or anyone else from GDD, if you want to try to chime in and see if there's any other definition that you want to add to that.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

The other kind of thing that comes to mind as differences is you, the contracted parties, have full control over the agenda. At an ICANN meeting, you're one of many stakeholders submitting topics and chasing everyone else's agenda around and trying to fit it into yours. At the GDD Summit, it's yours. Yours to set and yours to help execute. And we've been doing really collaborative

with the GDD stakeholder groups and even folks outside the stakeholder groups that are in the region and elsewhere.

So that’s one of the differences I see between the summit and an ICANN meeting: the control of the agenda and the focus of the topics.

The other is hopefully there’s more sessions that are more designed like this, where it’s more of a conversation at a GDD summit. It’s more about getting work done than about listening to updates and thinking about how they apply to your business and taking stuff back to your teams and stuff. It’s more real-time, roll up your sleeves, try and get something done together. That’s not just within ICANN. It’s with each other as well.

So those are the two main differences I see.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Thanks, Russ. Having been a part of the planning groups, I know that there was an effort to pull together agenda items, and then, as a part of the planning group between the registries and the registrars, members of both the contracted party houses voted on the agenda topics. From that, we came to the final – or, actually, preliminary – agenda where we are today. It’s close to final, though.

Amanda, I'm sorry to put you on the spot, but would you mind seeing if you can find the link to the agenda? Then we can post it up. So if anyone has any questions or if you'd like to see it, please go in and take a look at it. We actually have one spot that we're trying to fill as far as a session moderator or a leader from the contracted party house as far as how to make ICANN policy work for business. So if you have any thoughts about that, not that we need to cover that here necessarily, we can share it now or come back to us as far as what you think.

Let's see. I think we've just about covered – does that clarity to what you're thinking of? Okay.

I would also say, if you feel like you didn't have an opportunity to either contribute to the list of agenda topics or to vote on them, I think that's something else that we need to know. I think GDD is taking more of the role as far as trying to facilitate the conversations and put things into place for you, as you guys are driving that agenda, as Russ said. But if you feel like you didn't get a chance to contribute to that, then please let us know because that's something that we want to definitely try to resolve for coming years.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just one observation. [inaudible] It seems to be the GDD doesn't go beyond the level of people attending the ICANN. Yeah, I get it,

but more session for conversational – but those sessions still, depending on the people that are probably attending in the ICANN meeting. So I would think that GDD is more going to the next level, the operational, so some organization can send the next-level people to understand more on the GDD operational side versus more on the top-level.

It's still needed, but I'm just thinking that it will be expanded a little bit more.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Good. Thanks. Good input. Thanks. Craig?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Hi. The reason I brought this up is less about the distinction in an ICANN and a GDD meeting but more to have us think again about the timing. I think there was some survey work done a couple years ago about when the ideal time is to have the summit and thoughts about location. I guess I would just ask people to think about that again because the window of time between this ICANN meeting and the next ICANN meeting is very short, and the window between the June meeting and the annual meeting is a fair bit longer. It might be more opportune to have it between the second two meetings than between the first two, just from a timing perspective.

I realize, too, that the fact that this is in Kobe and then the GDD is in Thailand is coincidence, but more thought should be given to those coincidences because [it's not a] significant investment in time and resources to consider going to both.

I actually had signed up and planned to go to Thailand as well but got so much work done here at this meeting that I find it really hard to rationalize coming back to this region six weeks from now. I have to think there are probably other people in the same shoes as myself.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Good. Thanks. Good input. Yeah, Andi?

[ANDREA BECCALLI]: Hi. Andi, ICANN staff. I was involved quite a bit on the planning and choosing of the GDD Summit, and we actually chose the location for this year's summit based on a survey that we put out to the contracted parties. You guys voted on it. It pained us also know that that's probably not the greatest choice: to be going back in the same region.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: And I acknowledge survey work was done. I don't know how long ago it was done, but maybe it's time to do it again to think about

both the timing and the location relative to the ICANN meetings, even though the countries aren't planned out that incredibly far in advance, which is a little bit unusual for an organization of this size: to not know three years from now where the next ICANN meetings are. Maybe there are now. They used to not be. But perhaps doing some additional survey work makes sense.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Okay. Great point. I think that we are always open to getting additional input via survey or any other [inaudible] like this to take that – also, being part of the planning group, it had been put out there and considered to move the meeting between the two later ICANN meetings. With holidays, school schedules – all [inaudible] – it just wasn't working in terms of how we can make that happen.

Because of the – well, with the location, it was pretty critical to make sure that we did reach the APAC region because we had not been in the APAC region yet for a GDD summit. So we felt like it was really a gap in – you're right about the coincidence that it happened following the timeframe just after Kobe.

The good news is – and a couple [affronts] with this – we are trying to get well ahead of the location planning. I believe we're looking two years out right now, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. We're doing Europe. We should have an announcement on that soon. And we want your feedback. We definitely want to make this convenient.

Also, keep in mind that we're trying to partner with other events so that you're not coming so far for a two-and-a-half day event that we realize is also a huge ask.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah, Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Karla. One of the things that we heard a lot when people find out this was Bangkok is it's too far to go for three days for folks in North America and Europe. I appreciate that that's where most of our folks come from.

But I wonder, if we're thinking about where we're going to have the meetings over the next two years, if we can think about whether it works better for us to have, in the primary meeting is in Bangkok, two hubs – remote hubs; one in Europe, one in North America somewhere – so that we can still achieve some of the in-person meeting but people don't have to travel so far.

I know we have a time zone issue that we have to overcome, but maybe we should ... Let's think about this because I think, as a model, it could actually work pretty well if we can do it, find a way to make it work, because we could actually do it for other things if we have a big issue that we want to talk about as a group. Maybe we can put aside a day and make that happen.

But there's a big expense for us to travel, for any of us to travel, regardless of where it is in the world for two days, for a three-day meeting. It's the same for staff. It's the same. It's the same challenge.

So I wonder if it's possible to think about whether that would work for us. Maybe it will. Maybe it won't. Because I know the time zone is going to be the biggest challenge. But maybe we could think about that because I think there would be value in still doing something like that.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Great. Thanks. Great input. Yeah?

[MICHAEL BAULAND]: I want to second what Craig said about the timing and putting it between the other two meetings. But you said holidays and school days. This is never going to change. So does that mean that, as a conclusion, GDD will always be this time of year?

KARLA HAKANSSON: That’s the frame of mind, I believe, people were thinking about because the September timeframe – you’re right. It’s always going to fall into that. And it just naturally defaulted back to the second quarter. Unless something really drastically changes, I don’t see that that is going to change in terms of the timeframe for the meeting.

Again, that’s not say that that subject is closed. I think it’s definitely something where we continue to have the dialogue and the suggestions, thinking about the hubs as a potential opportunity for that as well.

So I’d say let’s keep getting that input and thinking about it.

One other thing I would say to scheduling and timing is this year is interesting. We’ve actually pulled the agenda planning earlier and are trying to address a question that came up very often which is, “Can you please get us the agenda earlier so we can make those travel plans, so we can make the call as to whether or not we have to ask our senior leadership for the travel time and for cost?” So we’re trying to make sure that you’ve got enough information in advance in order to make that call.

Yeah, Craig?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Something else to think about – I haven’t thought about it a lot, but since a lot of us are here at this meeting, if some of the registry and registrar sessions were pulled out of the regular meeting schedule and we tacked on a day-and-a-half or two days at the end of an ICANN meeting that was just registry- and registrar-focused, maybe that might be a way to maximize people’s investment in time and resources to travel. You might actually get more people coming to ICANN meetings who might otherwise not if you’ve tacked on this other registry and registrar event at the last day or two. Something to think about.

KARLA HAKANSSON: That’s interesting. I think that that’s something, maybe, Andi, we think about adding to the survey as a potential option. I don’t know from a logistics standpoint because there’s a lot of other logistical things to consider as a part of the team that we don’t necessarily deal with in terms of whether or not they’d be able to extend it. But we should certainly investigate and see if we can do that.

Any other thoughts? Rubens?

RUBENS KUHL: There is a growing concern among both the contracted parties and non-contracted parties about the costs involved in the

intercessional meetings. So perhaps sticking to ICANN hubs – Los Angeles and others – would allow ICANN to save a lot of money and still allow us to have the GDD Summit and a non-contracted parties intercessional as well, as effective as it would be in other places, but costing less money.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Yeah. Good suggestions. Okay. So I'm going to make a plug for this, which is: another way to add input is the contracted party satisfaction survey, which was sent out on the 26th of February. It's open until the 2nd of April. It does have a couple of questions around meeting planning in terms of what we're thinking about that. So we can take that input as well. We'll also do a survey following the 2019 GDD Summit, which we always do, in order to capture feedback.

So I would say this is your opportunity, not only here in this room but also your opportunity to share your thoughts about this and give us your input. So please make sure that you fill out the survey if you haven't received the e-mail, which came from a third-party MITA group. If you didn't see it, let me know after this session and we'll make sure that you get it.

We had one before you, Russ. Hold on one sec –oh. Oh, okay.

[RUSS WEINSTEIN]: So if you didn't get it, it may also be because you're not the primary contact. We only send it to the primary contacts of each registry and registrar. So if you are not that person, that's why you didn't get it.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Right. Good point.

[MICHAEL BAULAND]: Very quickly as an observation, you said you made the effort for the GDD to take it to other meetings so that we didn't only travel for three days. I understand those [on] ICANN meetings, but if some more information could be provided, I think it would make the trip more worthwhile for all of us.

KARLA HAKANSSON: I agree. And we're working ... So this is a continual effort to make that happen. I do know that, for the other meetings, they had a survey out for folks to contribute agenda topics. I believe it closed last week. They're capturing that data in order to be able to pull it in. We've already asked them if – we said, "Hey, we found a lot of value in starting that agenda topic discussion earlier on," so that, if we could do that while we are having those bundle of meetings together, they pull in their planning as well.

Yeah?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So if you go to the website, I think they're going to be posting their preliminary agenda very soon. Actually, if you do search on GDD Summit 2019, you should be able to get to the webpage to get that information for all of the meetings that will be happening that week.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Any other thoughts? Questions?

All right. Let's move to LOC/COI funds. Yes?

DEITMAR LENDEN: Hi. So for all registries in the Registry Agreements, your LOC or COI is no longer required as per the registry agreement. So I have a couple of questions. I guess the first one is, is it up to the registry to make the first step in getting the funds back? First question.

Second question. What is the actual process for doing that? So would we raise an NSp case for example? Because I don't recall seeing anything in the dropdown menu with regards to that. So that would be that one.

I guess the next question, which is probably the most important one, is timings because, obviously, during the application

process: “Get the money! Hurry up! Hurry up!” and then sometimes getting money back can be a little bit slow.

So I just wanted to know if there’s any indication as to what the timing might be on that particular process. Is it going to take weeks, months, years? Hopefully not years. Thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON: [inaudible]. Thanks.

CHRIS BARE: This is one of the things that’s coming up in conversations. We’ve been talking about in the back of our mind for the past year. So now in the last couple months it’s come up several times.

The first of the obligations [that end], I believe, are in July of this year. Come October, they’re going to start to ramp up, so next year we’ll be having quite a few every month.

The current process we have to release documents usually is triggered by someone giving us a case through NSp and letting us know that this is happening. It’s usually either because either it’s an application that withdrew, it’s an RA termination, or there is someone who’s amending or changing their LOC or COI.

That’s generally a two- to four-week process once the case beings. That’s due to interactions with our bank and your bank

and the like. A little more time on a cash escrow versus a LOC, but still within that timeframe.

But with the expectation of a large number coming up for at least several of the months over the next couple years in particular, we're looking to come up with a more streamlined way of doing that and probably actually thinking about more batching them, either in monthly – I don't have an exact answer to that yet. We are working on that. I would expect we could have a proposed process for that in the next couple of months.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yes, please.

ANDREW: On your point of starting in July through October, what started the clock ticking? Was it contracting?

CHRIS BARE: It's the six-year anniversary of your Registry Agreement execution.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi. Wouldn't it make sense for ICANN as the beneficiary to make contact with the bank to release the funds on the anniversary?

CHRIS BARE:

There's a slight nuance. There's people who are an allocation schedule, in which case they've got multiple TLDs under one LOC. That's a slightly different process. You would have the opportunity to amend your LOC down to the dollar amount based upon that.

Then there's two types of LOCs. There are the ones that are advised through Bank of America, which is a much quicker process and the bank is able to actually release the documents. They don't actually even have to send them back. They use a SWIFT to notify the other bank.

That would be a faster processes versus ones that are not advised through Bank of America and then there's more paper handling that has to go. That is a longer process.

One of the things that has come up that we did talk to our bank [about] and one of the recommendations was, if your LOC expiration date is past your obligation date, you are able to put an amendment request in to amend the date to coincide with your obligation end date. That also takes a certain amount of administrative time on our part and would likely incur a bank fee for you guys because no bank does that for free. So that is one of the considerations. So if timing were that critical, that can happen.

I would expect, still, we would be within a couple-week timeframe, though, of the obligation date.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Chris, you and I had talked a little bit before this meeting before we came to Kobe about this topic. We had talked about providing some more formal process and procedure information later into the spring. So I can't remember the timing we were thinking, whether it was just before or just after the GDD Summit timeframe, but I think we recognized we need to educate you all on what we're expecting to happen and what your options are and how to go about doing that as efficiently and as effectively as possible.

So we're working on that. We're working with our bank and some of the other banks to see what will be as lightweight as possible because we recognize that there is 1,200 of these or so that need to move around over the next few years. But we're thinking about and we know we owe you guys information, so we're looking at what that is and whether a webinar makes sense or whether it's just process/procedure documentation and whatnot.

ANDREW: Doing that before GDD would allow for more feedback like this in conversation at GDD, which I would push for. Could you – I’m sorry. I don’t know your name.

CHRIS BARE: Chris Bare, Global Implementation.

ANDREW: Chris, could you dive into that nuance you said about the portfolio applicants having multiple TLDs under one LOC?

CHRIS BARE: The obligation to have a LOC in place for TLD obviously expires at the six-year mark, but there are individual registry operators that have multiple TLDs covered under one LOC. Most of them have what’s called an allocation table as part of that letter of credit, which defines the dollar amount per TLD that’s set aside in case of EBERO. That is allowed to be amended based upon the current obligations.

So when a TLD no longer is required to have funds set aside for the LOC, they can then reach out to us and then, through the bank, have that dollar amount brought down to match the number of TLDs that are under obligation.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Deitmar, did you have another question?

DEITMAR LENDEN: Yeah. I've just thought of something that's completely separate, maybe. Because, obviously, the LOC is there to cover the EBERO process. What happens next?

So, let's say, in seven years' time – so one year, so next year – a registry, for whatever reason, has an issue and has to move to EBERO. Where are the funds going to come from? Is that out of your pocket? Well, it's obviously our pocket, potentially, as a group, but ...

[RUSS WEINSTEIN]: That's a good question, Deitmar. I think the thinking behind the LOC component of the application was, "We're starting something brand-new here," and it was a way to reduce risk in the startup phase. So that six-year horizon was chosen as a risk horizon.

So, so far, we've only seen one incident that required EBERO and that we've utilized EBERO on in the five years or so we've run it.

The idea is that, yes, ICANN would inherit that risk associated. In the, I think, registry transition process document, [which] hangs off your contracts as one of those attachments, that specifies

that, in the event we go end up trying to rebid for the TLD, we would recoup our costs first before transferring the rest of the money back to the losing registries, so to speak.

So I guess, if there's a future for the TLD, we would attempt to recoup our cost first and then share the remaining surplus with the losing registry.

DEITMAR LENDEN: I guess then – sorry, Russ – the flipside of that – sorry, I didn't look if anyone else was going to say anything – Russ, is that, if it is a TLD that's not worth recovering, then I guess it's just a sunk cost that goes away.

Okay, fine.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: That as a nod yes for the record.

KARLA HAKANSSON: All right. Good. Great discussion.

Okay. Ley's move to PICDRP. I don't remember who actually raised their hand on this one.

Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Karla. I don't want to get into the specifics of the PICDRP issue that we have outstanding, but it's more about a process and setting expectations. So Russ and I have already had a conversation about this, and we think that we can do things better in the future. But it's just a general conversation about communication when we get things from ICANN that potentially may seem indirectly related to our Registry Agreement. I think we understand those sensitivities around that.

We had, I think, a pretty good session with compliance yesterday. At the heart of the issue was the communication about how things come down the pike to us. So I don't really know how to have the conversation in this context, but I guess that's what I was driving at.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yeah, Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Just to add to that, Russ, when you came to the meeting in Barcelona, you introduced a topic and you said, "We want to work with registries on this." A couple of us volunteered to work with you, and then it kind of went into a black hole until you sent us the changes and said, "Oh, by the way, you have 15 days to review, and we're going to post it."

That to me is a communications breakdown. We volunteered at that meeting and said we would want to help you and we didn't hear anything until we got the 15-day notice that you're planning on posting it.

So I think that that was also something we need to do better, I guess, in the future.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

That's good feedback, Jeff. I agree with that. That's something we can definitely do better on in the future. I think this has been a good learning process for me and for us, so I take that to heart.

In general, Donna and I have been having these conversations in the background, and I think it's really pertinent to have them because the document I just referenced, the registry transition process – there's like, I don't know, a dozen of these across the Registry Agreement, where it's referenced by the Registry Agreement and it talks about process and operation.

We're getting that operational experience now on these other documents and recognizing that there's opportunity for improvement or there's areas where there's multiple interpretation or there's gaps and things that we can do to fill those.

So I think it's in both of our interest to try and work on those together and try to close those gaps where we can. It's really a matter of how do we do that? How does one side trigger and how do we talk about it together and make sure that there's clear eyes into it? What the expectations are, who's going to do what, who gets [to] review, and that sort of thing?

Ideally, those documents that are just referenced – I haven't done a whole of thinking about this, but the full Registry Agreement amendment process – the global amendment processes we talk about, like when we did in 2017 – is a big, heavy sledgehammer of a process.

So I think where we can avoid that is great, but if it's necessarily, we get it and we'll do it. But I'm just trying to think through how do we do some of these things that are hopefully more operational in nature without having to go through that kind of process but that we're both satisfied with how it works and what the product is at the end.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Jeff and then Rubens.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Without going into any specific details, although just a general reference, on this last one, on the PICDRP, we completely

understand that, because of some complaints and things that were filed, your goal was to try to address those. If you had come to us and we could have discussed it. We could have helped you as narrowly as possible address those specific goals.

But what happened was we got this legal language, so it's already been thought of and crafted and pretty much finalized on your side. I completely understand why legal would draft the language that they did and make it much broader.

But at the end of the day, if we're trying to solve a specific problem, if we know the problem and can help you, we can help you make it narrow and avoid the other pitfalls that we are now in. Plus, there may be other improvements or things that, from our side, we think are needed.

But to bring us in at the end of the process is where it gets much more difficult. Thanks.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, Jeff. Good feedback.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Rubens?

RUBENS KUHL: Just a warning that it was possibly not the best timing to issue RFI with Spec 11, where we already didn't like that. So that's a well-known fact that even came to a complaint that our stakeholder group filed and then tried to amend the process that is related to that.

So perhaps there could be better timing to look into that matter.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. All right. Good. Good discussion. Thank you.

Any last thoughts? Questions around this one?

All right. Let's move forward to CZDS. Yeah, Deitmar?

DEITMAR LENDEN: I'll take this one on behalf of the person that's left the building. And, Dean, I'm really sorry. We really had a conversation about this, but I'm bringing the topic up again.

One of the functionalities that was available previously was the opportunity to download more information about the requesters within the CZDS portal. At the moment, there is a download functionality but the information that's provided is extremely limited. It's limited to the requester's name, date of request, date of approval or denial or whatever the process might be, and half of the comment.

So it would be good to have the ability to download the other functionality again. So, in other words, the user details, like the requester’s address, requester’s telephone number, fax number, IP address, and stuff like that.

Now, this might not impact all types of registries because they are open TLDs that probably don’t really mind too much about who has access to it. But there are certain TLDs that do mind and also would like to have better information about who’s applying for or asking or requesting CZDS access.

And, Dean, I know we’ve had this conversation. So thank you.

DEAN EDWARDS:

Yeah, we did talk about, but I think it’s a valid point. The intent when we made the move to the new platform was to basically just lift and shift is. So that’s something that clearly has been removed. I think, as you and I had talked, the way Naming Services portal handles the end user data is a little bit different. So it doesn’t actually get stored in NSp. It’s stored externally. So there’s an external call that happens when you go to look at the details.

So all that detail aside, I think it’s a valid request, especially if it was there before. So I’m hoping – I need to go talk to the dev team – it’s a reporting function. I think it’s something we should be able

to fairly easily come up with. I just need to look at the details and how we do it.

I know the other thing we had talked about similar to that is the amount of records that get downloaded with that report. So it's not everything unless you've actually scrolled all the way down to see everything. So that's not valid. So we need to fix that.

So, yeah, I've got both of those and I'm going to take those back. I'll work on those when we get back. Hopefully, like I said, it's a reporting thing. It's something that doesn't have to sit on a roadmap somewhere and take forever to get. I think that's a valid, valid feedback.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Great. No? Okay. Yes, Rubens?

RUBENS KUHL: There is one other feature that we are missing from the new CZDS, which is the ability for us to respond the requester and say, even in case of approval, "Hey, you have been approved, but blah, blah, blah, blah, blah." In our case, we use that to warn them that, even though we're approving for an indefinite amount of time, we reserve the right to revoke that and move to a limited-time approval.

That seems to be missing from the new CZDS, so let them back.

DEITMAR LENDEN:

Yeah, that's fair. It is. I acknowledge that that was taken out. Certainly I know in the previous version of CZDS you could accept and add a comment, which is your point. That was taken out. I think the thinking there was, well, if you're accepting, what else do you need to say? But acknowledged.

So, yeah, I think that might take a little longer to get back in because that is development for us, but certainly I'll add that. I hadn't actually officially heard from anybody that that was an issue and you wanted that back. So that's good to hear and I'll take that back to the team. Thank you.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

Great. Any other thoughts on this one?

All right. I actually have a question for all of you. I don't know if you've seen this in the agenda that's been posted for the GDD Summit, but it was a proposed session to have a combined registry and registrar discussion like this. So it would be the first time that it would actually be a combined discussion. I don't believe that the registrars have something similar to this.

So we thought we would open up the conversation to both contracted party houses. So I'd like to get your input as far as thoughts on that. If there is a desire to have it as just registries and then also a combined or one would suffice, I'm just curious if anyone has any thoughts on that.

Yeah?

DIETMAR LENDEN: I guess the difficulty would be that the registries and registrars don't necessarily have the same tools, for example, like – well, the registrars are getting the NSp at some stage in the near future. So some of the tools are different and some of the other actions are different, but I think there is some stuff that we could sit down and talk around the table about.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay.

DIETMAR LENDEN: I guess the only concern would be that one of the parties might try and hijack the conversation about – I mean, it could be us. I could be them. That sounded bad. It could be one of the contracted parties particularly hijacking their particular session, but it seems [inaudible] idea, I guess.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Good point. Yeah?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know that it has to be an either/or type of situation, like we can't have one that is still catered to registries, but I would support it.

There was something years ago – I want to say we were in L.A., maybe – and there was registries and registrars at ICANN, and ICANN actually left the room for a period of time. I think that was a GDD Summit. Maybe.

KARLA HAKANSSON: It was, actually.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't think it was a roadshow. I think the format was slightly similar. Maybe it wasn't quite [a] conference but it was an open agenda. That was maybe one of the more productive sessions I've ever attended in years.

So I'd support the idea in general.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Okay. Good. Thanks. I remember that had been discussed for a while, but it doesn't sound like it actually came up when we were going through the agenda topics as a separate session.

I also recall, during one of the ICANN meetings: "Well, why make it a closed session? Why have any closed sessions?" There was that whole conversation as well.

But I would say let's take the feedback and, if there's an opportunity to make that happen again, I would say let's collectively discuss it and figure out a way to make it happen if it works on the agenda.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Yes, Russ?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I have one unrelated item I forgot to ask about earlier. As you all should know, we requested you all to do RDAP formally a week or so ago. We wanted to do some webinars for the contracted parties, helping you prepare for that. Our current plan was to do two webinars: an evening in L.A. targeted at the ACPAC and west coast community, and a morning in L.A. the next day for the east coast/European communities.

The idea was – I think we were planning on translating both of those. We just wanted to socialize that. Obviously, both sessions would be recorded and available after the fact. The intention from our side is you would not have to attend both sessions. I know we've gotten that feedback in the past. But with something brand-new like this, we thought it would be important to do the two sessions so we could be available for live questions for the whole 24-hour community.

Just wanted to socialize that here and make sure we're not doing something crazy and give you guys a chance to give us the feedback.

DONNA AUSTN:

Thanks, Russ. I think it's a really good idea. I think, when it came up during the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting, we suggested that it would be worthwhile running any content past Wilhelm or the RDAP working group, given it was a pretty close collaboration.

I think the other thing that might be helpful is, depending on the questions that come out of those sessions, whether development of an FAQ or something like that might be helpful as well, just so that it doesn't stop at the webinars if there's more information needed.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Brilliant. Thanks.

DEITMAR LENDEN: Hey, Russ, it's Deitmar. If it is humanly possible, can we do a dummy's guide for RDAP? Because that is quite a technical process. The information that's coming out of that is extremely technical. So if you're not a technical person – there are people that aren't necessarily technical – a dummy's guide [inaudible] – well, that could form part of the FAQ, I guess. That's be great.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Okay. I do think the – I don't see either of my tech services folks in the room at the moment—

[DONNA AUSTIN]: Yeah. Over there.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Oh, [inaudible] is here. But I do think the intent of that webinar is for implementers, project managers, and technical folks. So the idea is that you'd come in with some level of knowledge and be able to speak the lingo.

We do have a bunch of resources we recently published on the RDAP website. I can't remember the URL, which is unfortunate, but if you Google or search ICANN and RDAP, you'll get to it pretty

quick. But there was a number of resources there with things that aren't quite a dummy's guide but I think are more targeted at the non-techy audience, as well as there's things targeted at the techy audience. So that can help get you up to speed a little faster.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Russ. If that is the intention, I'm not sure what communication you'll use to get that information out there. But if it goes to all registry operators, it's really important that they understand that that's the focus and the intent is that you will have your – whoever your technical support is. I think that's important to make that clear. Very clear.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Yeah, good point. And I think our intent is to notify – we'll send it to the primary contacts like we always do but also the technical contacts listed that we have on file for you and the registry service provider if you've provided that as well. Contacts that we have, so ...

KARLA HAKANSSON: Did you want to emphasize something with the table?

JAKE WILLIAMS: Yeah, I just had a question. Okay, yeah. Yeah, my knees are always hitting tables. Jacob from Interlink. Just a question about the translations. Is that a live translation, where we are able to select the audio at that time? Or is translated it after the fact?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: The intention is live, similar to an ICANN meeting [inaudible] or something along those lines.

JAKE WILLIAMS: Okay. Great.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: And it would be U.N. languages. Or what our standard is: U.N. plus six or plus one or something.

JAKE WILLIAMS: Okay.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks.

KARLA HAKANSSON: All right. We've gotten through our entire agenda plus a couple of extra ones. Before we disband, any other questions or thoughts or add-ins that you'd like to bring to the table, so to speak?

Yes, Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Just a question. Do you keep action items coming out of this and then do you send those to us and then we [inaudible] to SLAs on that or something?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: We definitely have been taking notes. I've been looking at my team over here taking notes and keeping action items. I'm happy to share that with you, Donna. You can distribute it to your members, if that works.

KARLA HAKANSSON: All right. Thank you, everyone. It's always just a great conversation, I think, when we come together like this. So thank you. I know it's early in the morning but I definitely appreciate the attention, the thoughts, the questions that came up.

So have a great rest of your day. If you're traveling back, safe travels. We will see you in May. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]