Transcription ICANN London
Registrars Stakeholder Group
Tuesday 24 June 2014
Morning Session (Part 1)

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

Michele Neylon: Good morning everybody, this is the Registrar's Stakeholder Group meeting. If you're looking for the registries they're in a different room, they're not here. This is for the registrars. There is plenty of space in the room, plenty of nice warm, comfortable seats, and there's even a few seats up at the table I think. And don't worry, we don't bite.

For those of you joining in the room, did you all get one of these lovely brochures we did? They're wonderful, they're great, they're colorful. They're printed on paper or card. They even have glossy stock.

Man: It is June 24. This is the Sovereign Room and we are starting the Registrar's Stakeholder Group Part 1.

Michele Neylon: Okay everyone, good morning. This is the registrar stakeholder group meeting. We're about to start. Think we'll wait another - maybe two minutes. There are printed copies of the schedule floating around the room somewhere.

There's also printed copies of our lovely glossy brochure, leaflety thing. And there's also the schedules up on the screen over there behind me. So we'll start momentarily.

All right everybody, good morning. It's coming up on 9:10 so I think we'll start this off. Staffer, I can't see whether we're recording. Okay, we have a fairly

busy schedule throughout the day, as normal. This is Michele Neylon, the chair of the registrar stakeholder group for those of you who don't recognize my voice or my face or whatever. Good morning everybody, welcome.

So we'll start off by doing a roll call, a couple of other bits of administrivia and then the first people we'll be hearing from as per the schedule will be ICANN compliance. Then we'll be having a chat with the registrar liaison team who are no longer called a registrar liaison team. They've renamed to something else. And there's no point remembering what that is because I think they're renaming themselves again. Is that right, Mike? Okay.

We'll be getting - we'll get a couple of coffee breaks throughout the day and we have a working lunch at - the working lunch idea being to work and, you know - work and, you know, where we'll be working a little bit on preparing for our interaction with the ICANN board.

We will be in this room for pretty much all of the day except for the interaction with the board when we will go to their room.

After we come back from that we'll be getting a couple of presentations from - well, from Stephane who will be talking to us about something I haven't fully understood yet which is part of the reason why he's giving a presentation at all. Then we'll be meeting with the registries and then hopefully we will adjourn at around 5:00 pm.

And in time honored tradition I'd love to say, you know, we'd adjourn to the bar, I think, which I've always wanted to say. And so we'll start I suppose with the roll call. Has the recording been started? Let's see here. Yes, thank you, sorry, I can't actually see them. There's people in the way.

Okay, then so we start the roll call. I'll start here, Michele Neylon, Blacknight Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

John Berryhill: John Berryhill, Uniregistrar, nominating committee for the registrar group.

Matt Serlin: Matt Serlin, monitor.

Man: Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Eckhaus: Jeff Eckhaus, (ENOM).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), United Domains.

(Kelly Salta):   (Kelly Salta), (unintelligible) Group.

Man: (Unintelligible) registrar.

(Peter Gorge):   (Peter Gorge), (Real Time) registrar.

(Chris Pelling):   (Chris Pelling), NetApp (unintelligible).

(Marcos):   (Marcos) (unintelligible).

(Gordon Dick):   (Gordon Dick), (unintelligible).

(Joyce):   (Joyce) (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) council wide (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), registrar (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Daniel Greenback): (Daniel Greenback), (unintelligible).

Mike Zupke: Mike Zupke, ICANN staff.

Amy Bivins: Amy Bivins, ICANN staff.

(Kaitlyn):   (Kaitlyn) (unintelligible), ICANN staff.

(Howard Dean):   (Howard Dean), ICANN staff.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) data.

(Darcy Southwell): (Darcy Southwell), Domain.com (unintelligible).

(Michael):   (Michael) (unintelligible).

(Christian Miller): (Christian Miller) (unintelligible).

Rob: (Rob) (Momentus).

Man: (Unintelligible) .com.

Graham Buntin: (Graham Buntin), (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), key systems (unintelligible) vice chair and only here for the
                 food.

(Paul Goldstone): (Paul Goldstone), Domain (unintelligible).

(Jennifer Standiport): (Jennifer Standiport), Web.com, vice chair.

Man: (Unintelligible), House Chair of Group Treasurer.

Michele Neylon: And do we have a microphone for the registrars in the room because I can see there's several of you. The way James put (unintelligible) I can tell you wanted to (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Paul Loam): (Paul Loam), (unintelligible) and Demand registrars.

(Dicky): (Dicky) (unintelligible), Free Parking Domain registrars.

Michele Neylon: Don't be shy, people.

(Ellie Bradley): (Ellie Bradley), (unintelligible) registrar services.

(Laura Gardner): (Laura Gardner), (unintelligible).

(Allen Barney): (Allen Barney), Imperial registrations.

(James Slade): (James Slade) (unintelligible), GoDaddy, GNSO councilor for North America.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you everybody. Just for those - I know there's several of you for whom this is your first meeting. Welcome. Just so you're - just to bring you up to speed a little bit with regards to the registrar stakeholder group, I am the chair. We have four ExCom members.

We have the chair which is myself, (Jennifer) who is the vice chair, (Ollie) is our treasurer, and (Paul) is the secretary. We have three GNSO councilors, one of whom is AWOL but hopefully will turn up at some point today.

So we have the GNSO councilor for the Europe region and (unintelligible) is Volker who also happens to be vice chair of the GNSO council, James Bladel is hiding down the back for some bizarre reason, I'm not too sure why. And - okay, interesting.

The current theory, James, is because you're not wearing a shirt that you're hiding. And you have, (Karen), who is not here at the present.

From the ICANN staff - actually we have the newly anointed senior liaison or something - what is your exact job title, Mike?

Mike Zupke: I'm the director of registrar services.

Michele Neylon: Okay, beg your pardon, the direct of registrar services, Mr. Mike Zupke. So for all your problems you should be directing them toward Mike. And he's joined by (Amy) and (Kaitlyn) and I'm not too sure about the - who the other two are I'm afraid. Hi.

Mike Zupke: (Howard) is the newest addition to our team. He's currently based in Singapore but he'll be moving - I'm sorry, in Beijing but he'll be moving to Singapore in about a month.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you, perfect. For those of you who are members of the registrar stakeholder group, we have done a lovely leaflet which we're quite proud about. If you have any feedback on us please do let us know. Just gives a little overview of who we are and as mentioned on there - why are you giving me dirty looks, (Matt)?

Matt Serlin: I'm actually not giving - this is Matt Serlin, sorry. I'm not giving you dirty looks. I was giving you a look of - it was one of congratulations and thanks. I know the - you know, I think you said (Jen) and her team put it together, but I know it's something that those of you who have been members for a numbers of years it's been something that we've tried to do and I was just going to give hats off for you as for pulling it off. So thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thank you, Matt. I just was a little bit weary of you. Matt was the previous chair of the registrar stakeholder group so you have to be careful of him. The thing is that several of the other stakeholder groups have done leaflets and brochures and various things like that.

Within the (ExCom) we've met - we met over the weekend and we've been, you know, talking about various things that we'd like to do. Maybe (Jennifer) could speak a little bit to that. She's waiting as I've caught her off guard completely. The meeting we had with - between us with regard to possible changes to the website and all that.

(Jennifer Standiport): So just quickly, good morning to everyone and thank you for attending. So the ExCom met over the weekend to talk briefly about some of the enhancements we can make as far as the interaction, understanding that we've gotten some complaints and - well, understood regarding the amount of email that we'll be sending out.

So what we're proposing and what we want to put forth - and we will in a more formal fashion is the idea of making our website much more interactive, perhaps regarding updated newsfeeds and making it more of a portal so we're available to access information there related to items that have pertained to registrars that are in comment period or close to comment period.

Obviously ICANN website provides that information as well. Lots of times though registrars struggle as far as where to locate that information and we'll

be seeking additional participation and input and support regarding the enhancements we can provide.

So we can provide more relevant and more effective communication to you and so that you can seek out that information in one location.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, (Jen). I mean essentially, you know, the thing is the stakeholder group is only as useful to you as members as we all make it. So you know, we do really want your feedback and, you know, your assistance and guidance and help but, you know, if we - if the stuff that we can do to make this a little bit more useful for you.

We get a very large volume of emails from ICANN about various activities. At the moment they're just going out to the mailing list. You know, is that the best place to put them? Are there other things we could do there? We have managed to submit comments - a number of policy issues over the last few months, both as groups - as stakeholder group and as individuals.

And we are using - we're using a third party to kind of help draft those comments. James Bladel has been liaising with (Kelly) who's an external consultant. She's just going to draft those up. If this stuff records that you guys would like us to do more of, you know, please do let us know.

So I don't know, I'll just open that up for a couple minutes if anybody has any input or thoughts. Please don't all rush to the microphones.

Woman: James?

James Bladel: Hi, James speaking. There is a couple of open comments and one that's closing immediately after this - this meeting on the strat plan and budget for fiscal year 2015.

I think that we probably need to weigh in on that, that's been - there's been some discussion about what that - some of the assumptions let's say, the revenue assumption particularly we need to push back on because I think that if that - if those numbers are expected to proceed then there will be some shortfalls at the end of the year and then ICANN will be looking to potentially raise fees.

So we need to, I think, monitor this very closely and if we feel that those projections are overly optimistic or even, you know, a fantasy then we need to say so.

Michele Neylon: Thank you, James.

James Bladel: I guess what I'm saying is does anyone have a burning desire to help me go through the budget and strategic plan and gen up some bullet points so that we can get something over to (Kelly)? Because it's got to be done July 1, Monday. (Ollie)? Okay, yes.

Michele Neylon: And I see (Ben) has volunteered as well, thank you, (Ben).

James Bladel: I'm sorry, who?

(Ben Ansen): James, it would be my pleasure to help you.

James Bladel: (Ben)? Okay, so (Ben) and (Ollie), great, thanks.

Michele Neylon: Anybody else, any other comments? Okay. (Jen)?

(Jennifer): Just one more thing I'd like to add about the brochure. We'll be seeking additional participation because obviously this - the initiative is the first of many.

So if anyone's interested in contributing to the next iteration of this, which will appear in LA, please just let me know or let anyone at the table know as well. Appreciate your participation.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Just with regards to participation and interaction. There's a lot of working groups going on at the moment dealing with a wide variety of different policies, implementation of policies, and also some other fun things.

Marika will be talking to us about that in a bit more detail later on today. For those of you who have never joined a working group, please, you are welcome to.

I mean of those of you here - you know, it's just a matter of turning up, which I think there's quite a few here around the table who have joined one or more working groups. You know, your participation is welcome and is needed.

Okay, I think it's coming up now to the - our first guest has arrived, good morning, (Maguy). So I think - I don't know, bear with me one second.

Maguy Serad: No, we're going to continue on through so the recording will continue to go until we reach the break.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks for clarifying that because I missed that entire memo. I think we'll just hand over to Maguy then.

Maguy Serad: I'm not sitting next to you for once.

Michele Neylon: Are you afraid to come and sit beside me, Maguy? Are you looking for protection over there?

Maguy Serad: No, good morning everyone. My name is Maguy Serad from contractual compliance. We are here this morning to provide you a brief update but mostly to have a dialog with all of you.

We have plenty of time today but also would like to note that, please, do not hesitate to join us. Wednesday is an open forum for everyone to join us on a very in depth update on compliance, which has an update about the registrars.

But Thursday we have a closed session just for the registrars to come in and ask questions, think of it as a Q&A or a working session, whatever it is needed. We wanted to have the opportunity to work with you directly.

So with that - who's driving the slides, (Jennifer)? Please. All right, next slide, please. So the general update - start with - before I do that, sorry, I want to introduce the team that's with us today from compliance. I have (Jennifer) next to me, she is supporting (unintelligible) the registrar stakeholders - (unintelligible) the registrars but also registries.

To my right I have Jan (unintelligible), he is our risk and audit manager. In the audience we have with us our regional Istanbul office representative. We have (unintelligible) and (Selim) and (Saharas), thank you.

We're missing some other - another team member who is at the registry stakeholder group. So we're here so we can have a very direct dialog with everybody.

So the first update is a general one regarding quality process. You know, we have finally - on one system we are finally consistent with our processes. And what we started to do is what we call a QA process check.

And the objective of that QA process check is to randomly confirm compliance and we're starting with Whois inaccuracies. So the team is leading an effort to go back to what we call closed tickets and confirm that when they are resolved they are resolved properly. And if not we will reach out to you guys to address the issue.

The other thing I have - bring to your attention is the compliance checks. You heard us talk about those for a while. And you probably - some of you have been - have experienced it. What does a compliance check consist of? We have a slide later on in the deck but it's basically when it's - a time to renew your contract or to get a new (unintelligible) if you are currently a registrar.

The - service's team reaches out to us and says, can you please provide us a compliance check on registrar X. The objective of the check is to ensure that the registrar is in compliance with activities before we add on more responsibilities.

So that's something we're doing regularly. It's even now more valuable and visible to the community because of the new gTLD rollout so that we - as you can start seeing some crossovers in ownership and relationship.

We'll provide a high level update on risk and audit. Then - next slide, please. I provided those slides for you, for your reading, not this one specifically. The only thing I want to highlight is the volume of risk and accuracy. We're seeing about 10,000 and that's a combination of single complaints, multiple complaints, and bulk.

The next slide, please, (Jennifer). The most important part about that is that we have - the team and the system have helped us address about half of those in closing them before first notice is sent out. So we are filtering.

We are addressing those domain names - we probably send them your way. and hopefully you've seen - continue to see an improvement in the quality of the tickets. I'm looking for Volker, I don't see him. There he is. Because there's something - if you can - many of you brought to our attention but specifically Volker experienced many of those.

Next slide, please. This is the registrar and registry compliance check list. Basically you look for this on the registrar column, why and when we do it. The compliance check focuses on a couple of areas. The first one, if there is a breach of suspension in effect that's definitely a noncompliance and there's no activity that moves forward until that has been addressed.

Another area that is critical to our compliance check, if there is a served notice or any type of enforcement notice, that's also a showstopper.

Now we also look at data escrow. We all know the value of the data so that's also another showstopper for renewals or transfers (unintelligible).

The performance history looks at the overall view of the registrar. When - how many breeches have happened in a calendar year, what's the status? What's the registrar's behavior? And what we mean by behavior is the collaboration, the turnaround time and the responsiveness?

So we provide - think of it like a report card to assess - and it's only internal. It's confidential. And it goes directly to the source. It's not published. But it also - it's just going to keep it all together and make sure everyone's doing their job right.

Next slide, please.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Maguy. Just one second, please. If you don't mind - you're giving us a lot of very useful, interesting information. But I think a couple of people on mics have a couple of queries for you on what you've presented so far if you don't mind.

Maguy Serad: It's up to you. It's your time. I just want to make sure we get through 2013 RAA.

Michele Neylon: Okay. You want to - you okay, Jeff? Okay, sorry. Please continue, Maguy.

Maguy Serad: I'm sorry?

Michele Neylon: No, it's okay, please continue.

Maguy Serad: Continue, okay, next slide, please. So with you guys, when you - when we have the Q&A we'll go back to that slide to make sure we're addressing your questions.

                 Risk and audit, I'm just going to turn it to Jan to give you a very high level update on where we are on the different activities. And on Wednesday we will be providing many statistical data of what is Years 2 about. So Jan?

Jan: Hello everyone. We just completed the Year 2 of the three year audit program, which we ran pretty much very similar to what we've done in the Year 1 in the way of number of registrars on the audit.

                 And we will show later more statistics but in clearly speaking, 95% of the registrars under audit passed it. We rolled in - into Year 3 - we will be rolling into Year 3 five registrars that did not pass the audit for most - not because they were not compliant but because the - they were just recently changed the ownership and the new owners did not have all the documentation.

                 There will be - there is another ten registrars who will be partially - I don't want to say reaudited but more likely retested in certain areas where they were not fully compliant.

                 We have to terminate the agreements with three registrars that either decided not to participate in (unintelligible) meaning they just refused to show the documentation or there was total lack of communication for unknown reason.

                 We also - that's - now the new topic is new registry audit program, which that is a brand new activity. We - meaning ICANN staff reviewed the new gTLD

registry agreements and designed the audit procedures to address the most important clauses in these agreement.

The program will - that's totally different program from the three year audit program that is targeted at the registry operators what were the new gTLDs.

This activity will start in July. We conducted two outreach sessions with registries, explain what are we planning to do.

And the third activity that we are doing is the internal audit that means the internal audit (unintelligible) the compliance department itself. The purpose of that is to ensure that we as compliance work efficiently and effectively and last year we identified some rooms for improvement, let's put it this way.

And we corrected - well, we improved the techniques and back in August. And we're going to review - we're going to come back to review of the processes. And then we will continue the interrelated activities in 2015.

Now this slide shows you the plan for the Year 3 audit of the registrars, which again will be very similar to Year 1 and Year 2. I'm not going to read this, this is the timeline, which is, again, very similar to what we've done in the past.

I do want to say that the request for information, which - or the RFI document, they're going to be sent to those who did selected for an audit will be improved because we're journeying from Year 1 and Year 2, what type of documentation satisfies the audit, what does exist.

So we will be including some examples of what exactly we're looking for because we understand that you are - it takes some time to collect the documentation we ask you for. So we'll try to help.

But the key - the most important key thing I want to say about the audit in general is communication is the most important thing. If registrar does not

understand or - what we're asking for, it's just - what needs to be done is just ask.

We were able to resolve everything in the Year 1 and Year 2 with 95% of the participants, which I thank you very much for - any of you were participating in Year 2. Yes, I see a question?

Michele Neylon: Please go ahead. Please state your name for the transcript.

(Christian Miller): (Christian) (unintelligible). On March - May 2013, correct? Starting in December and going backwards in time to April or...

Jan: Yes, yes, I see.

Man: I see another question there.

Maguy Serad: That's what happens when you use previous slides.

Michele Neylon: James, go ahead.

James Bladel: I had a question about the Year 3 audit because I think - and I don't know if this is the appropriate time but Year 1 was on the previous RAA, the 2009 RAA, and for dates - for names that occurred for, like, I believe 2011 was the sample set.

Jan: the RAA, yes, was 2009, yes.

James Bladel: Year 2 was also on the 2009 RAA and that made sense. And was using a 2012 sample set for names that were created, renewed, or transferred during 2012. I'm curious, Year 3 - is that going to be on a 2009 RAA and what dates will bracket that sample set?

Because it's starting to make less and less sense to a lot of folks, I think, to go - keep going back to this deprecated RAA that we don't use any more. I guess I'm confused how Year 3's going to work out.

Jan: Excellent question. The test steps design the way that they - it doesn't really matter if you're in 2009 or 2013. Because the - essentially the clauses are very similar. And then the second part of the question was what the main set will (unintelligible) as a sample. It's going to be in the last 12 months.

So it's the most recent registration.

James Bladel: So if we look at the last 12 months, January 2014 through December 2014 under the 2009 RAA will fail because we move to the 2013 RAA on January 1, we've got a...

Jan: It won't fail because the test steps - like I said, they're written the way that whether you are on 2009 or 13 they are very similar because the - the essence of the agreement is the same.

James Bladel: Okay.

Jan: There is slight verbiage - difference in verbiage but for example if it says the - whether in 2009 or 2013 says you need to send the renewal reminders. If you have them, you have them. If you don't have them then...

James Bladel: Okay, I guess we'll - we'll see how it plays out.

Jan: Yes.

James Bladel: But this is the last year for that, right? (Unintelligible) three-year plan, 2015, okay, thank you.

Jan: Yes, this is the last year. After the end of the Year 3 program we're going to do - we will continue to do audits but not on a massive scale like that. They'll be just as needed.

Michele Neylon: Just one follow-up question just from me, Michele Neylon for the transcript. When this was originally announced, whatever it was, like, two years ago, at the time was meant to be 33%, 33%, 33%, like this, a third, a third, a third, which was based on the number of registrars that existed at the time.

                       What's happening with respect to registrars that didn't exit when this program launched? In other words, registrars that were created in the last 12 to 18 months, are they being audited, yes or no?

Jan: They will be captured in the Year 3.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

(Jennifer Scott):   Thank you, Jan. Good morning everyone. I'm (Jennifer Scott), manager of contractual compliance. Up now are some of the lessons learned by ICANN with regard to registrars since ICANN 49 as they continue to sign on to the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement or RAA and align their practices and procedures with those contract provisions and specifications.

                       Next slide, please. We've seen some confusion by registrars as to what information particularly dates go in the blanks on the CEO certification form. So we've provided this clarifying image that's labeled for you. The date that the certificate is signed by the officer goes directly under the title.

                       And the date that the 2013 RAA was executed goes in the second blank. And the year which the certificate applies to which would be the prior year to the one on which the form is submitted should be inserted in the fourth blank on the form.

These certificates must be submitted to ICANN by the 20 of January from the prior year's compliance. And a blank compliance certificated is appended to the end of the 2013 RAA, which is online at ICANN.org if needed.

Next slide, please. Registrars have also been aligning their Whois output with the registration data directory service specification, which has detailed formatting requirements for Whois output.

The fields that are required to appear in the Whois output are called keys and the data that populates the keys are called values. And this is the list of the most common formatting issues that we've seen with respect to the Whois keys.

Next slide, please. Similarly, this is a list of the most common formatting issues we've seen with respect to the Whois values. Some of these formatting issues arise when the registrar hasn't previously collected such information or their systems weren't set up to allow for blank values although some of the information may be not applicable to a specific territory such as the postal code or where there's perhaps optional fax number.

And therefore registrars have been entering inaccurate information due to not being able to leave some of these keys blank.

We've seen registrars been working diligently however to correct these formatting issues and collect the required information to bring these values into compliance with the 2013 RAA and its specifications.

Next slide, please.

Michele Neylon: Hold on a second, please, just one second. Would you mind going back a couple of slides, please? One forward. Sorry, sorry, because you're giving us quite a lot of information. I think people are trying to digest that. I believe James had a query?

James Bladel: There were actually two - well, one was from (Rob) and he was, like, why couldn't we (unintelligible) the transition to have this (unintelligible) one be affirmation or be - what do we call it? The certificate - be web form, you know, that our CEOs could e-sign or e-signing the agreements, you know. Couldn't this be another electronic document?

And then the second one would be - the second question would be - I agree that all of this stuff is important and I'm glad to see that we're seeing a little more consistency and standardization in Whois output.

I would recommend that your systems be a little more tolerant to whitespace, that's really hard when you get slammed with a compliance notice and it's because you have two spaces or three instead of two or one instead of two after a colon. I mean those things are - I mean if you get the wrong field or they're in the wrong order or something that's pretty obvious.

But it took us quite a while to get the whitespace issue going. And I don't know, most people here - at one point coded systems before when usually you can ignore white space to a point. So just putting that out there as a suggestion, thanks.

(Jennifer Scott):   Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Just one question as well, on the - these are your next slide. Are you suggesting now that if for example my registrants in Ireland put in 000 as a postal code that you consider that to be a Whois inaccuracy?

(Jennifer Scott):   At this time we're treating things that are (unintelligible) system unavailability of the system to be able to leave that blank as a Whois formatting complaint rather than a Whois inaccuracy complaint such to relieve the burden on the registrar from having obtain the verification and validation that this is an accuracy program specification that's requiring.

Michele Neylon: I didn't understand that.

Maguy Serad: Repeat the question, Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'm just - we've had - there has been a bit of backwards and forwards between the registrars and yourselves on some of the formatting. For example, the country code issue that came up previously.

And now this one around post codes is a bit of an interesting one because - for example, in the case of Ireland we have post codes for certain parts of the country and pretty much the rest of the country doesn't have post codes. So a lot of - there is actually no way on this earth that I can actually validate or not whether they should put in a post code or do not put in a post code.

And if you're telling me that you're going to find fault with my registrants putting in 000 when they've been trained for years to do so then we have a problem.

Maguy Serad: Thank you, Michele for clarifying. So at least in Ireland you have some post codes. In Lebanon, zero. So talk about Whois inaccuracy. Here's what I would like to suggest. If and when we send it - we do our best to validate before we send it your way. And you saw that from the complaints that we close before we send you first notice or a first inquiry.

To respond, if we send you one and you say this is valid, respond. Just let us know and we take care of it. But what we will do, we will document and inform our staff for this type of address until we have something more systematic that's a global addressing system. We need your help on that.

So for the - you know, and again, we have an international team, not because we have the three hubs. Compliance been global even when we were based in LA. We've got Chinese people, Koreans, I'm a multi-international. So we

kind of say, hey guys, this address looks fine, does it look right? You're from the region. We try to validate.

We don't have anyone from Ireland, sorry. But respond, let us know, and we'll work with you on it, that's the most important message in anything and everything you see from compliance.

Michele Neylon: Thank you, Maguy. (Ben)?

(Ben Ansen):   Hi, Maguy. (Ben Ansen). So it would be really, really helpful for registrars to actually get a list of the rules by which you're validating different countries and post codes and addresses because we see inconsistency in different requests based on country addresses that you've looked at.

So you know, we all work in a programmatic way when accepting registrations from our registrants. So if you can give us the rules by which you're working to it will probably help us in ensuring that we reduced the levels of compliance because we can add certain rules within our systems not to accept this kind of stuff. But then we would have a consistent playing field on which we can all start working on the inaccuracy reports. Thanks.

Maguy Serad: Thank you for the recommendation. We will take that and may I suggest, we have been sending monthly updates but when we have something specific to the registrars we directly send you an email with that attachment.

So we will do so through that venue. Look forward to that one, please. You guys get this - get those emails from us?

Michele Neylon: They're forwarded on by me, Maguy. In fact, we...

Maguy Serad: Not just to the registrar stakeholder group, we send it to all the registrars. But I only saw (Jennifer)'s hand up. you guys don't read that stuff?

(Jennifer Scott):   I do.

Maguy Serad: Okay, good, thank you. Because it's not then an efficient way of communication. We'll eliminate that, one less thing to do. Okay, thank you for your suggestion, we'll take that into account.

Michele Neylon: All right, thank you.

Maguy Serad: Can we continue with...

Michele Neylon: Yes, yes, go ahead, go ahead.

Maguy Serad: Go ahead.

(Jennifer Scott):   So this is a requirement that was under the 2009 RAA, registrars under the 2013 RAA are still required to take reasonable steps to investigate and correct claims of inaccurate Whois data.

Additionally, under the 2013 RAA which adder new requirements under the Whois accuracy program specification, that is what requires registrars to now perform both verification and validation of Whois data under certain circumstances.

And the circumstances include when there is information suggesting that the Whois data is inaccurate or when a registration is new or transferred to the registrar or there's a change in the registered name holder.

Next slide, please. Under these circumstances, a registrar must obtain an affirmative response from the registrant within 15 days and that's calendar days.

But absent such an affirmative response the domain must be suspended until it can be verified or alternatively the registrar must provide ICANN was approved that they performed manual verification.

Next slide, please. When ICANN sends the Whois inaccuracy complaints for 2013 RAA registrar it expects one of there results. And the first is that the Whois information is updated. We'd like to see the verification of the data and then validation of the format of those updates. And I'll go over what those two things mean in a bit.

The second option would be to suspend the domain if there's a lack of an affirmative response from a registered name holder or manual verification of the data. And the third alternative would be verification supporting that that Whois information was already accurate as is.

Next slide, please. As I mentioned, the triggering deadline is 15 calendar days from the Whois accuracy program specification but ICANN's first notice on Whois inaccuracy complaints remains 15 business days. Therefore beginning with the second notice ICANN will inquire why registrars have not yet suspended the domain.

ICANN's also been conducting periodic post suspension review of domains to ensure that suspensions continue or that the Whois was updated. And in the cases of the Whois being updated we will request the verification and validation to be sent to ICANN.

Next slide, please. And so just to go over the difference between verification and validation since they sound very similar and we've seen some confusion from registrars as to what those things are.

Verification is either the affirmative response from the registered name holder or something done manually by the registrar after the affirmative response, and that manual verification can vary depending on what the claim is.

But in either case, evidence of the verification must be provided in the response to any claim of Whois inaccuracy.

The other hand, validation is to ensure the format is consistent with standards and I think this goes to probably - what the gentleman was asking before about what we are looking at in terms of formatting of validation and the standards are listed in the Whois accuracy program specification in Section 1.

And it is different - there's one RFC for email, the IT TE 164 for telephone, and the UPU or similar equivalent standards for postal addresses.

We have seen some registrar who've tried to use the things like Google maps or other proprietary sites and ICANN will not accept those unless those sites are themselves relying on these standards.

But it's important to note that there are these three separate obligations whenever addressing a Whois inaccuracy complaint, which is the investigation piece under 3.7.8 and then the verification and the validation on those specifications.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead, James.

(Jennifer Scott):   Hi.

James Bladel: Not something obtained from the registered name holder?

(Jennifer Scott):   That would go towards the verification piece and unless - I would say the registered name holder works for the UPU or something that would not go to the formatting piece.

James Bladel: But if they have something like a government form, a government issued ID, utility bill, something that is tied to a specific location, wouldn't that satisfy both validation and verification?

(Jennifer Scott):   That could be used in an instance of validation if it was recent enough to be valid and look like it was still a valid address format for that.

James Bladel: Okay, so we've been using the UPU in place on a per country basis. Some of them are paid, some of them are quite expensive. Some of them are free. And we've been kind of - basically we've been taking them on a country by country basis.

I would just recommend that, you know, leave the option open that if we can get somebody to submit a tax document or something that was issued by a local government that that would be provided - something obtained from the registered name holder though it be - you know, maybe - maybe consider loosening that last bullet point.

(Jennifer Scott):   Thank you. And we will look at any evidence that registrars provide us in response to these notices. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: (Jennifer)?

(Jennifer Standiport): (Jennifer), I appreciate you saying what you won't regard as valid sources. Perhaps you could propose websites that you would consider valid sources in regards to the Google maps comment?

(Jennifer Scott):   Okay, thank you, we'll take that into consideration, thank you. Next slide, please. Turning to abuse reports, we've seen registrars also aligning with the 2013 RAA on abuse reporting and handling procedures, which are captured in Section 3.1.8.

Registrars are required to set up abuse report handling procedures published abuse report contact information on their website and in (unintelligible) output as well as take responsible and prompt steps to investigate and respond appropriately to abuse reports.

Abuse must be investigated by registrars regardless of the jurisdiction that they arise from and registrars must also investigate these reports, whether from law enforcement or otherwise and even without a court order.

Next slide, please.

Michele Neylon: Hold on one second, please. This - I think this one's going to require a little bit more work, you're not going to get away too quickly. Go ahead, (Christian)?

(Christian Miller): What I see a lot is that abuse complaints are sent to, you know, any contact that can find the - you know, go to the right entry and, you know, send them to the change history and stuff.

And the last couple of years I have forwarded that to the abuse department but it's getting so much now that these days I just trash them basically. So abuse reports requirement - I hear that you said that they must be abuse addressed and so forth.

I would say, yes, cool, and what would I do with an abuse report, which, you know, reach us on any other means? Where is actually the limit of, you know, do I have to look into my physical post box everyday or something?

Michele Neylon: Do you understand the question?

(Jennifer Scott): Yes, thank you. I know under Section 3.18.2 is the requirement for law enforcement for these complaints to be handled in terms of checking the email and/or other contact information 24/7.

However, the RAA doesn't go to whether or not abuse reports are sent to other email addresses that are published specifically for abuse.

Michele Neylon: But I think what we'd like to know is if I get sent an abuse report to my personal email address and not to our abuse contact, can I safely ignore it? James?

James Bladel: I'm giving them a chance to respond.

Maguy Serad: You know, I like to have (unintelligible). if you're getting abuse emails to your personal email, that's personal problem.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Maguy Serad: Sorry, guys, I couldn't help you. (Unintelligible). But on a serious tone, on a serious note, it's a valid question and what I'd like to say - it's not your business email and it's not - and Mike was referring us to a contract provision. Can you quote it?

(Jennifer Scott): Yes, it's 3.18.1, which are reports that come to the abuse contact email address specifically from any source, whether law enforcement or other.

Michele Neylon: I think the - I think where the - what the query - I suppose - I think we're probably going to work on the basis, if you send an abuse report to us and it goes to the correct channels that's fine. I suppose - I'm just channeling you, (Christian), I don't know, you can tell me if I'm getting this wrong.

I think our concern would be that if other people within the broader community were starting to say that we weren't responding to things, they were sending them to the completely wrong contacts, that you're not going to throw us under the bus.

Not that you would but, you know, if I get abuse reports sent to my sales staff instead of to our abuse staff then, you know, if it's going to the wrong place what the hell am I meant to do with those? Is that right, (Christian)?

(Christian Miller): Yes, and additionally I - you know, I want to train people. We have an abuse address, we even have abuse staff, there are half a dozen people waiting for this stuff. And still so many people send that to the write contact or some made up info address or so.

If I accept these for the next couple of years what's the abuse address for then? So I want to actually educate the people but without getting hit by you guys and - because they send it to, you know, room cleaning woman.strata or .de or something and we didn't have a look at that.

Michele Neylon: I like - Maguy, we're in a similar situation to him. And we often see the same report being sent to 25 different email alias. I get it at (unintelligible) - engineering@Blacknight, I get it abuse@Blacknight, I get it (unintelligible) at Blacknight, I get it (unintelligible) at Blacknight.

I get it at engineering@Blacknight and then my own personal email address. I'm like, okay, we've published all this - the abuse contact, please use it. James?

Maguy Serad: Just a very simple comment in answer to this one, guys. It's a rough period for everyone. We internally have to ramp up for 2013 and get to know how to manage it. So did you - so will the community. Once the outreach we will make sure we let the world know who's in attendance how and what to look for for the abuse contact info, what's the use of it.

But what I'd like to suggest on the business side operationally is that, you know, you reconsider how and maybe the verbiage or some kind of process where if it's gone somewhere else you redirect it. But if and when we receive

this type of abuse complaint we require facts before we forward you sometimes.

So - and if we see there's a repeat behavior or something of that nature we will work with you to address that. So - which we have to look at it and there's no right or wrong answer here. We just have to manage until that knowledge is built and understood.

Michele Neylon: Thank you, Maguy. James?

James Bladel: Thank you. Thank you for that. I'm looking at your second bullet point and your last bullet point. And I have some questions but maybe I could just start by asking you to expand upon this.

When you say law enforcement reports can be from any applicable jurisdiction, I'm assuming you mean applicable in the determination of the registrar and its council that that law enforcement is applicable to its business and its customers and not in the terms of the law enforcement agency that's making this claim.

Because we certainly have sufficient examples of law enforcement believing that they have applicable jurisdiction. So I think where we believe they do not.

Secondly, the idea that we cannot - registrars cannot require a court order to investigate reports of - to investigate I think that's fine. I think that the concern is is that - particularly for law enforcement that there's an expectation that a certain actions will be taken or certain resolutions will be found and I think that if we are obligated to investigate per our own standards and procedures that's fine.

But I want to make sure that we're not guaranteeing any particular outcome with that, particularly if we're saying that there's not a court order involved.

There are groups out there that believe themselves to be on par with law enforcement. Let's call them vigilantes, self appointed.

And certainly these kinds of - I'm just saying, this kind of bullet points and the language in these two bullet points is helping them kind of - or let's say, adding to that misconception that we are equally responsive to really just anyone off the street as we would be with someone, you know, in our local town or country with a badge.

So I just wanted to get your thoughts particularly on the second and last bullet point and what you're really driving at with those two points.

(Jennifer Scott): Thank you for your questions. Regarding your first question to the jurisdictional limitations. There are no limitations on jurisdiction. So the law enforcement - I know, the law enforcement...

James Bladel: Say that again, please.

(Jennifer Scott): There are no jurisdictional limitations on where the law enforcement report could come from or a report from anywhere - anyone. So therefore...

Matt Serlin: Sorry, hold on one sec. So this is Matt Serlin. So 3.18.2 of the RAA says law enforcement (unintelligible) national territory government to the jurisdiction in which the registrars established or maintained a physical office.

James Bladel: Correct.

Matt Serlin: So how does that get translated into law enforcement anywhere?

Michele Neylon: This is something we've discussed at length previously. I mean on a very simple - from a very simplistic overview, as an Irish company I have offices in Ireland. I do not have them anywhere else. I will not accept law enforcement requests from anywhere other than Ireland.

If I had offices in a different jurisdiction then that would change. But this is something we discussed at length with you going back over the last - I don't know, two and a half years, longer. Matt?

Matt Serlin: Yes, I mean Volker, James, Jeff, and I can all - you know, this was a very clear part of the RAA discussions. And Volker - go ahead.

Volker Greimann: We discussed this at length during the negotiations and it was conducted by ICANN staff at the time that we were only forced to take action on requirements from law enforcement of our jurisdiction - applicable jurisdiction is the jurisdiction that is applicable to the registrar, not anybody else, that was the definition that we found and agreed upon at that time.

Any other law enforcement reports will be read just like any other abuse reports from any third party that were received. So if - for example, an Iranian law enforcement official comes to us and says, here's something wrong, you must do something about it. We'll treat this just like abuse report from John Smith that comes to us. We are free to ignore it if it's bullshit.

Mike Zupke: So this is Mike Zupke from staff. I think having been in the room with you, you know, I remember some of these conversations and so I think that, you know, my sense of where we were in the discussion was that if your local law enforcement agency or if your local government designates somebody as law enforcement, then that's what you would respect as a law enforcement complaint.

So if you were in the United States and you've got somebody, you know, in your government and the FBI says this guy from Canada is law enforcement, then you would regard that as a law enforcement complaint that you would treat as such (opportunity to learn) the RAA.

And so there's not a limit to what jurisdictions might be considered law enforcement till you specify in the RAA except that, you know, your local government can tell you this is or is not, you know, to be regarded as a law enforcement agency.

So I think that's maybe the fuller answer and hopefully that's sort of consistent with everybody else's, you know, memory of the discussion from the negotiations. But...

James Bladel: I just think you need to be very careful with this language particularly putting it out in the wild. You know, there are a number of groups that believe that if a Web site is accessible from their national boundaries that that means they have jurisdiction over it. Doesn't matter where the registrar or registrant or content is located.

So please be careful with some of this language. I think it's confusing. A very important issue. We are not, you know, we're trying to navigate these waters and we don't want to put ourselves in a position where we are subject to the least tolerant or strictest possible subset of all laws anywhere on planet earth and those are of course changing at every moment, so let's be, yes, be very careful.

Maguy Serad: Thank you. We will update that.

James Bladel: And then I'm sorry I had one - I know we got off on a little bit of a track here but you said unless they inform ICANN of a specific local law or regulation. I'm not clear on that last point.

Woman: Oh, you're referring to the last bullet on this slide. You're correct that the (first placement) here that a court order is not required to investigate a report. And so if a registrar informs us of a specific local law or regulation that requires a court order to investigate an abuse report, then of course ICANN would consider that before moving on with the abuse complaint with the registrars.

James Bladel: So the burden of proof is on us to demonstrate that a court order is required?

Woman: To investigate.

James Bladel: To investigate.

Woman: Correct.

James Bladel: But not necessarily to take any specific action.

Woman: Correct. There's nothing in the RAA that...

James Bladel: And no guarantee of outcome of that investigation.

Woman: Correct. This has nothing to do with the result of the investigation but purely the duty to investigate.

James Bladel: Okay. I'm going to need to noodle on that one for a little while but I see where you're going with that (I think).

Woman: Okay. We can skip the next slide, which covers most of these issues. Moving on to privacy and proxy services. We refer you to Section 3.4.1.5 of the 20133 RAA and the specification on privacy and proxy registrations.

                   It's important to note that proxy services must be separate legal entities from the registrar to avoid any improper self-registration. Additionally the same Whois verification and validation requirements apply to registries (shouldn't utilize) the privacy or proxy service. Next slide please.

                   I'll now turn to a discussion of some of the consensus policies, particularly the UDRP or Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Procedure. And here are some general UDRP issues.

Particular note is the problem of registrars not keeping the status quo of a registry (unintelligible) subject to the UDRP and/or transferring the registry (unintelligible) instead of implementing a decision. And that will be addressed by some of the more recent proposed revisions of the UDRP rules that will be implemented approximately the middle of next calendar year 2015.

ICANN's also aligned back in June of 2013 with the UDRP providers reaching out to them to ask them to file formal complaints for UDRP issues encountered with registrars by using ICANN's consolidated complaint tool. Slide please.

Here is some information about those revised UDRP rules that I mentioned and the word lock and what a lock means. Will be defined and registrars will be subject to locking a domain that is part of a UDRP within two business days of the request for verification from the provider. Next slide please.

Finally, ICANN has been investigating a number of complaints regarding deceptive transfer and domain renewal notices. These notices attempt to trick registrants into taking action at the threat of losing their domain. And then the registrants end up unknowingly transferring or renewing their domain with a different registrar.

Although ICANN's investigation is in process, it should be noted that the deceptive notices may violate the RAA and in particular the registrant's benefits and responsibilities.

Michele Neylon: So just hold on there one second please. Okay. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Okay. I think I know what you're talking about here and I will tell you that this group has been wrestling with that issue for a number of years and we hate it. But we've never been able to pin down exactly where. They've been very, very slippery and squeezing through different loopholes in the RAA.

So please tell me are we saying now that the registrant's benefits and responsibilities statement in the 2013 RAA is closing those loopholes because they're accepted?

Woman: The investigation is still ongoing. However, that is the part of the RAA that is - would be violated if we came to a certain conclusion about the notices.

James Bladel: Okay. So I just want to say to the folks at the table you're welcome. And it was a total accident because the registrant benefits and responsibilities - we're saying that out in Los Angeles and it was not intended to do this but if that's a beneficial side effect of laying out those clear communications between a registrar and a registrant.

And it's this (bank) renewal notice thing or domain slamming or whatever you want to call it issue is caught up by that, it was not intended. It was not by design but certainly - yes, we'll take that.

Maguy Serad: So as (Jennifer) mentioned, we are reviewing and really attention and detail to everything in the RAA consensus policies that can apply. You are correct. This has been a challenge for all of us around the world. Not just registrars but also the registrants and ICANN.

So what I'd like to do is maybe by the next ICANN meeting provide you and update on this and how and what was applied to. Is that acceptable?

Michele Neylon: Yes. Thank you. Michele for the record. And we have shared with you - well with both of you and other colleagues of yours various charming letters and emails from maybe the same bloody entity. And I think we all know who it is. But if you need anything further, feel free to reach out to me personally and I'm sure there are other people who would be more than happy to assist you in any way possible in dealing with some of this. Thanks.

Woman: Thank you. Next slide. This is actually that member presentation. You can send inquiries to compliance@icann.org if you have any questions about this presentation. We just ask you to put ICANN (50) RrSG session in the subject line.

We still invite you to join us at our outreach session tomorrow from 9:30 to 11:00 and Thursday as well we have a registrar outreach session. At this time if there are any other questions, we'd be happy to field them.

Michele Neylon: Oh don't worry. There'll be plenty. Okay. So I've got Jeff and I've got James. And anybody else? Okay. We'll go Jeff, James.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thank you. Jeff Eckhaus here. Thanks for the presentation. It was actually very informative. I did have a question -- this is going way back to the beginning -- on the number of complaints and the ones that you had said you received when you listed out what they were about and you had about Whois inaccuracy.

Yes. If you could scroll back to that. Just to know - let me just double check my numbers early and I was trying to do math in addition, so I just want to...

Woman: (Last bullet).

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. So okay. So what I see there is just about 10,000 or so for Whois inaccuracy. And then if you go to the next slide, (6785) you sent the first notice on - so somewhere around 30% were false - I guess you could call them either false complaints or they were inaccurate complaints, which I know for you and your team it's got to be a huge pain to have to go through and sort through them.

And I'm wondering what you are doing or what we can do to try and help to mitigate these. Because I'll tell you out of those (6785) I assume as good a

job as you guys do some still go through that are not, you know, that are still not accurate complaints then.

You know, you're doing a good job of filtering but still more go through. What can we do to stop this because we're getting these? They're now - because what you have to understand is some of these if they're not happy that you come back and say this is an inaccurate complaint, guess where they go to. The abuse assets listed at the top of our Whois and those start to clog.

I mean look for us. You know, we have 15 million domains on our platform. So the number of Whois outputs and the number of baseless emails that come in has just skyrocketed. I mean it's outrageous how many we've had.

So if they're not happy with the answer you give, they come to us. And they send, you know, another email. What can we do as, you know, to benefit both of us to stop this and to help people - to try and get people one, to put in accurate complaints? Is there something in your front-end system? Is there something we can do saying this complaint is closed; please don't contact the registrar?

Just trying to think through of what we can do to stop this huge volume of, you know, erroneous complaints. This is just - this is for a quarter. Is that correct? Yes. I mean this is - I mean you're talking 50,000 for the year. It's outrageous.

Maguy Serad: Thank you Jeff. So this, you know, this has been put together since we started collaborating on what we can junk complaints or invalid complaints. But they can be invalid because it's already suspended or transferred or something. Or it can be really a wrong Whois inaccuracy complaint.

And since we've launched that effort, we've done some automation in some of the validation. So it's not a shop of Whois inaccuracy people manually looking at everything.

We've continued to enhance the systems where possible. We all know there's always got to be some human check to certain elements. So on that line, you're asking us what we can do as a team on this one.

I think the first thing that comes to mind and Jeff reminds this, there are some lessons learned. We can update the FAQs online that we provide. You know, when people to go submit a complaint, we provide some FAQ training and we can update them - update another list.

But if you have some ideas - I'm sorry - I'm usually fast and we can solution things but...

Jeff Eckhaus: Thank you.

Maguy Serad: ...if you have ideas let me know.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. (Unintelligible) keep that up for me. So one of the suggestions, you know, I don't know where you - what you are doing on the validation of the people but what is the validation you're doing for the submitter of the complaints? And are you - you know, is it possible - you know, it's pretty easy for people - you know, and this is one I won't go into the whole arguments about the verification.

But it's pretty easy to get an additional email address, you know. Is - I mean I don't know if you don't want to give away your secret sauce but like what is - what are the methods you're using to verify people who submit complaints and are those people who submit invalid complaints - are they being, you know, picked out of the system? You know, I don't know if that's being done. If you can - what level of detail you can explain to us about that.

Maguy Serad: So we call those repeat offenders. We do maintain a repeat offenders checklist. Because talks about trust. Trust has got to be built across the

whole ICANN community. And if we have repeat offenders that are abusing of that, we track them and we give them a notice like we send notices to the registrars.

And I'll be honest with this audience, when we presented that at the ALAC and our public outreach forum, we got a big pushback. There's nothing in the contract that you can give the public notice. I said, "Yes we will. It's operational. Doesn't have to be contractual because it is of abusing of the system and of the right of that contract."

So what we do we track that list and we send a notice pretty much informing the complainant or the reporter why that complaint and you are not, you know, it's not - it's an invalid complaint.

And if it repeats by the third time, we suspend the right to submit a complaint for a certain period of time. Then we open it again. If it happens again then we just suspend it. And you're right. There can be created - I tell you. This universe I've never seen such creativity in the last few months.

Jeff Eckhaus: You literally have nothing better to do.

Maguy Serad: No. I know. So yes, I'm thinking of hiring my kids into this job because they can think alike on that stuff.

So if you're seeing some aspect of creativity like we continue to see, it's all about dialog guys. Let us know. We might miss something but let us know. We capture it and we will validate it. You know, it's all fact based. We will validate what you're sending us too. Yes. This is the criteria. And we will validate it and look at it factually.

And we will inform the public in our Wednesday outreach session letting them know do not do this. Okay. Does that answer your question?

Jeff Eckhaus: It's (on the way). Yes. But thank you.

Michele Neylon: And just for clarification Maguy, I've been spacing the (unintelligible) things for you to clarify. But you haven't outsourced of your compliance function to any other structures of ALAC yet have you?

Maguy Serad: What do you mean outsource?

Michele Neylon: Jeff, would you like to...

Jeff Eckhaus: No. I've just (unintelligible) over that. For some of the other groups that are within ICANN - constituencies rather - for other groups is something you might have mentioned earlier. Send notices saying that they are certain parts of ICANN and we need to take down domain names. You know, they work - they're in different constituencies. I'll explain a few outsourcing (assets). But...

Maguy Serad: Okay. So we educate everyone about compliance. It's (an all-in) responsibility including internal ICANN because it's a very serious (business). When you start a compliance process you're borderline legal. Right.

                  So we want to make sure that we are - so to answer your question, I'm not aware of outsourcing. So that's a direct response. But you are all familiar with the compliance notices. An increase. We standardized the templates globally so there is no confusion amongst us and amongst you what to expect. If you're receiving something on behalf of compliance but does it smell or look like a template, send them to us. Let us know.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. At a minimum it's probably improper use of your name or logo or letterhead.

Michele Neylon: Yes. So (we do) have very strict guidelines around the usage of the ICANN logo so we would assume that people misrepresenting their relationship with ICANN wouldn't go down too well.

Maguy Serad: May I suggest you bring this to Mike Zupke's attention?

Michele Neylon: Certainly.

Maguy Serad: And I will work directly - my team and I will work directly with Mike on that. Because it may be other areas that are not within compliance's reach. Is that fair?

Jeff Eckhaus: Sounds like a plan. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Sounds perfect. Thank you. Mr. Bladel.

James Bladel: Thank you. I'm also getting a little bit of a chuckle out of (Caitlin) in California wearing a scarf. And it's not that cold, you know. But she's all bundled up out there.

So thank you for this presentation. I think that it went very well. And I do think that we value - at least I do. Hopefully others value the exchange more than just the slides. So I think that's important.

So I'm going to take a little bit of time with this. I don't know how we're doing. If we're over schedule, just throw something at me and Michele. But one of the fundamental compromises that was established during the negotiation and execution of the 2013 RAA was that the Whois accuracy specification was a go forward proposition.

There was simply no way operationally that we could go backwards on existing 100 plus million domain name registrations. And on day one of that agreement taking effect, we'd be on the hook for any, you know, stuff that was in there.

What we agreed to was is was go forward, new registrations, transfers, change of registrant, anything that was reported to us - invalid Whois; anything that was reported for abuse; anything that was basically singled out.

The concern that I have is we're seeing one element in particular, which is the validation, which is let's be frank, the easier part of the Whois accuracy spec. But the validation being applied to domain names that have not - that are not new, that have not been updated, that have not been changed, that have not been reported - well, I don't know how they - I don't know how they rose to the level of scrutiny from ICANN compliance.

But the concern that we have is now we have to go out and touch a registrant, okay, that really is confused. Why are you coming to me? You know, and like 90% of them with the plus one on the telephone. But there are other issues there.

You know, the way I validate it is if I can put the number into my phone and hit the green send button and it connects, it's a valid telephone number. And in the U.S. that means you can leave off the one. In some cases you can leave off the country code. In really small towns you can leave off the first three digits or used to be able to.

So just I want to get your understanding. Do we - I understand that you guys believe, as you have expressed, that you are enforcing the language of the agreement. So my question is do we, me and Mike here and Michele, do we need to reopen this agreement to clarify that that's - to codify that compromise that was established that this was a go forward proposition and that this was not a retroactive requirement?

Maguy Serad: Thank you James. I cannot tell you what you need to do. We know the scope of the contract and we follow the word of the contract. I think you heard (Jennifer) answer earlier we're not going to asking to retro.

But if and when we receive a Whois inaccuracy complaint and it relates to that specific area, I think you all heard (Jennifer) earlier answer Michele's first question where we're taking that and we're considering it a format, which alleviates the pressure of that suspension and the strict guidelines from the Whois inaccuracy. But we cannot just not address it.

James Bladel: So are you treating those as invalid Whois reports? Is that how your characterizing those formatting issue?

Woman: If it's something simple out of a missing country code and everything indicates that it should be a plus one, we're sending that as a Whois formatting complaint rather than an accuracy complaint.

James Bladel: So I'm going to make this real easy for you. What do you want us to do with those? Add the plus one? Just type it in?

Woman: If that's appropriate...

James Bladel: Does the registrar just type it in?

Woman: ...to the case.

James Bladel: What if we're not sure?

Woman: If you're not sure then at that point you would need to contact the registrar.

James Bladel: See that's the part I think where we get into a little bit of trouble because now we have an obligation to go out and verify, validate - you know, as soon as we are going through what's no longer a formatting issue now, we're going out to validate or verify. So it's now tipped over from validation to verification and it is retroactive.

Woman: If it's done under Whois format, we will not request a verification from you. But if in the course of your processing of that complaint you need to contact the registrant that would be up to the registrar to do so. But we wouldn't ask for the evidence of the verification.

James Bladel: Imagine the European registrars are having a much harder time with this with country codes. But I'll leave it at this. It sounds like you guys need some more explicit language in the contract. So Mike, I mean, you know, we're trying to work this out and sand off the rough edges.

But if they feel like they're back in - painted into a corner here on this, then we've got to put some clarifying language in the Whois specification because, you know, it's not a practical reality to do what they're asking us to do.

Woman: I agree with that (Jennifer) (unintelligible).

Volker Greimann: Maybe just one thing. The way that we negotiated the (background) was that any actual inaccuracy would trigger a re-verification and a formatting error was certainly not contemplated to trigger a re-verification. And that is what you are doing now.

So I believe that the RAA opens up for renegotiation mid of this year. So there are some levels for this but if you leave us no choice, then we'll have to add this to the (work) list.

Michele Neylon: And you can have the fun and joy and pleasure of renegotiating with me as Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and you know how much fun that will be. It's okay. You can all vote me off as well if you want to guys.

Volker Greimann: No, no. You're Chair for life.

Michele Neylon: We are changing our bylaws but I don't remember that clause being put in there. If you want that in there Volker, you have to put in a clause where I actually get paid a massive salary. (Rob), go ahead.

(Rob): Do we have time for one more? I think one of the things that came out for me today on the abuse side in the system -- I have recently taken over for our register -- it would help me; that there's a strict difference between the investigation requirements and then the outcome of a complaint.

Specifically when it's from a law enforcement agency outside our jurisdiction or as James put it, a vigilante kind of group, which is, you know, making claims. And the kind of point I want to get to is sometimes based on the claims our response might be thought is going to be you need to contact law enforcement in our jurisdiction.

We know that we are not going to touch this issue unless you bring our enforcement - our law enforcement into the fold. Yet there's still a burden put on the registrar to investigate and respond to ICANN about the investigation.

So I'm just wondering if maybe this is something we can't work on where when we know what the outcome is there's something in the claim that makes the outcome obvious yet there's still this, you know, pretty ridiculous burden of investigation put on the registrar.

Woman: You're correct that the investigation is required under both 3.18.1 and 3.18.2 and .2 relates to the reports coming from law enforcement or the consumer protection agencies or quasi governments or entities.

But 3.18.1 is the investigation piece related to reports coming from anyone. And when we're sending these abuse complaints to registrars that's to find out what they have done to investigate and the requirement is just part of the contract.

(Rob): I think we understand that point and maybe it's the language in the contract that needs to be addressed. It's just when there's - when the outcome is known or the next steps are known, the investigation almost seem moot.

And it can be a little tough to - and maybe where this goes is it looks like we - you're trying to define, you know, kind of a common set of rules for investigation - common set of requirements that you're going to clearly communicate to us to kind of help us conform.

And maybe that's where we address it is not necessarily in the contract. But maybe we can address it as when the outcome is truly known the burden of investigation can be quite light.

Maguy Serad: I don't have anything more to add. We heard you and let's see how we can - we'll work with Mike Zupke; see how we can address that.

Man: It's (unintelligible).

Maguy Serad: Yes.

Michele Neylon: So are you saying when in doubt just throw it to Zupke?

Maguy Serad: No. No. We're not in doubt. We love the contract. It's black and white. But there are so many ways of challenges that we're hearing. If we can maybe through this team share with us what are, you know, what I just - I'm sorry - I did not capture your name.

(Rob): I'm sorry. It's (Rob) with Momentus.

Maguy Serad: (Rob). Collect some of those challenges and we can have better clarity of what it is and how we can work on it. But from procedural aspect, maybe the team around this table and in this room can also share some of your best

practices because we are getting some valuable responses when we send an inquiry or a notice regarding this type of complaint type.

So there are some good practices amongst yourselves that I would highly recommend you talk to each other. I can't tell you who and what. Just share that. Have that dialog internally and surface to us what remains or what you think is valuable to bring to our attention.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. I see that Akram and Cyrus are trying to escape from the room. I don't know - we're not too sure exactly what...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: No. You're not escaping that easily. Are you bringing coffee for me as well? Okay. Good. Correct answer.

Michael Zupke: So Michele, this is Mike. If you'd like the Registrar Services Team can give our update while they're grabbing coffee.

Michele Neylon: Well I was just going to thank Maguy for her thing first. Thank you. And just so you're aware, the Registrar ExCom have been engaged in dialog with Maguy's team and with Mike's team on several of the issues that people have raised today. Some of this stuff is not new. So we have been working with them. Some stuff has been posted to the - to our member's list.

I know that you probably do find that your inbox is basically filled up with emails from me and I'm trying to certainly apologize for that. But there was a couple things there. We will be having semi regular calls or engagements or whatever the hell we want to call them with Maguy, (ike and others where we are kind of trying to resolve some of these ongoing issues.

Thank you Maguy, and your team for your update. Oh go ahead Maguy. You want to say something.

Maguy Serad: Thank you Michele for this opportunity and everyone in this room and not in this room. Two things. Please try your best to join on Wednesday even though it's a general update about all of compliance.

The reason we put this form together two years ago when I came onboard is to allow across all the stakeholders at ICANN. You know, we provide a service to all of ICANN including yourself, including ALAC, including IPC and what we have observed through the Wednesday session by having representation from this group in that session - guess what?

My role becomes a facilitator because you're helping each other address some of those challenges. So be present with us on Wednesday if possible, but for sure on Thursday is another opportunity to add more clarity to our work and efforts together.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Respond to compliance. That's the last - my message I leave you with. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: That was a party political broadcast on behalf of the compliance team. Thank you, Maguy. Okay now we're going to have a - an update from Mr. Zupke and his team and then Akram and Cyrus are meant to be reemerging with coffee and probably other things.

If anybody who has joined us a bit later in the room, you know, feel, you know, welcome. This is the Registrars Stakeholder Group meeting. If you're looking for the Registries they're in a different room.

If you're looking for another group I can't help you because I don't even know where they are. Okay so Mike are you comfortable down there?

Michael Zupke: I am. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Do you have any slides to share with us or anything exciting?

Michael Zupke: Well we have some interesting updates for you. I don't think we have any exciting slides, no animations or...

Michele Neylon: So it's interesting or exciting. I mean, it has to be one or both.

Michael Zupke: It's extremely interesting.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you Mike. Please go ahead. Go ahead.

Michael Zupke: Okay so thanks for giving us this opportunity. And, you know, one of the great privileges of being the Director of the team is that I have fewer updates and the team gets to give more updates.

So I thought I would sort of use this time to give a brief introduction and let everybody talk a little bit about what they're working on. It's short so the other thing is I'll let them each pitch some of the things that are going on later in the week.

So to my left is Amy Bivins. She joined our team in January. She's been in the community for a while. She recently was - before ICANN was doing reporting in the ICANN space - so Amy is currently heading up the - what we call the Underserved Regions Project so I'm going to let her talk a little bit about what, you know, what that is and what's going on this week on that.

Amy Bivins: Hey everybody. So the Underserved Regions Project - we had a session related to Underserved Regions Outreach in Singapore where we heard from audience members about some of the challenges that are facing domain name industry businesses in various regions, particularly where we have small numbers of Registrars.

We posted a report in May kind of detailing the input that we've gotten so far. The public comment period is open through June 30. The comments so far have been really, really good.

We have 13 but there's still time to provide more comments so please do. We have a session tomorrow from 4:00 to 5:00 just with Registrars about this, so please come because we want to hear your input on this issue.

Michael Zupke: And where is that?

Amy Bivins: It's in the Hilton 1 through 6. It's sort of in a forum by the staff meeting room so...

Michael Zupke: In the Tower Rent?

Amy Bivins: Yes. Yes in the Tower. And additionally also we distributed a Registrar Services Satisfaction survey a couple of weeks ago. We've gotten 50 responses so far so thank you.

There's still time to provide input. Basically we just asked for your feedback on our training, the communications and Webinars and other things you might like to see from us, so please provide your input on that. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Amy. Just wondered on the Underserved Regions the Registrars Stakeholder Group did actually submit a comment on that, and I believe several of our members have submitted individual comments.

And we've been encouraging people to, you know, get involved and share their thoughts and everything else. Do you mind if I hand it over to the gentleman on my right?

Michael Zupke: Could we have just another minute or two?

Michele Neylon: Yes sure. Okay.

Michael Zupke: All right. Thanks. So thanks Amy and then Caitlin is going to give a little update on what's going on with IRTP B.

Caitlin Tubergen: Sorry - feedback. So thanks Mike. This is Caitlin Tubergen for those of you who haven't met me. For IRTP B Recommendation 9 that deals with a new provision for the locking and unlocking of domain names, an announcement will be going out shortly this week about that recommendation and there will be an implementation deadline of January 31, 2015.

We also have IRTP B Recommendation 8 and IRTP C Recommendation 3, which have been incorporated into the additional WHOIS information policy. And that deals with Registrars and Registry operators that display domain name statuses in their WHOIS output, which would mean Registrars under the 2013 RAA to exclusively refer to domain name statuses by their EPP status codes and to link to an ICANN Web page where the EPP status codes are listed along with their respective meanings.

That will also be announced this week with an implementation deadline of the 31st of January 2015. We will also be circulating a WHOIS advisory that clarifies questions received through Webinars in the 2013 RAA questions queue regarding the Registrar data directory services specification in the 2013 RAA.

We don't anticipate anything in the advisory being surprising or contentious, however we will be circulating it with feedback being requested by July 15. And we're hoping to post the advisory by the 31st of July with a similar implementation deadline of the 31st of January 2015.

Michael Zupke: Thank you Caitlin. And finally our newest team member, Howard Li, who is probably familiar to a lot of people. He's been in the ICANN world for something like nine years.

But he's joining us in Beijing right now and in about a month will be joining our Singapore office. And I asked if he could maybe give a little bit of an update on some of the outreach activities he's done in his first month or so on the job, because I know that that's an issue that's of a lot of importance to I think, you know, people in this room and Registrars generally is, you know, the interaction with Registrars in parts of the world where English isn't the primary language and I'm trying to, you know, minimize friction in the marketplace particularly with regard to transfers and hijack and that sort of thing. So Howard if you could just give a quick update on that, that'd be great.

Howard Li: So thank you Mike. This is Howard Li and some old friends may know me as Guanghao Li so it's like a seeming alias thing, so it's me. Okay Howard Li or Guanghao - it's me.

So my ICANN email will be howard.li L-I, okay, @icann.org. We just - I'm carrying - will have assignment on improving the Registrar application questionnaire.

So any suggestion you might have you can directly email it to me. And two weeks ago I did some - I did a China Registrar outreaching in China. We have hold events in four different hub cities in China: Guangzhou, Beijing, Hangzhou and Shaman.

So during that outreaching we have giving out updates on what our team do, how the policy is developed in ICANN because the Chinese Registrar wasn't really involved in the ICANN environment before.

And some of others is like getting the RAAs done. Lots of people don't quite understand the new RAAs 2013 in there, so I just give them the update and those other compliance updates to them.

So during the meeting we have a lot of valuable feedbacks and they're well received and actually they voice us a lot of needs. One of the needs they do have - is because right now the domain, I mean, as always the domain name businesses are international business.

So they're - actually will really like to work closer with Registrars all around the world, you know, especially on some topics like stolen names. Like last year the - a couple of the big Registrars in China - they - their system got breached and the name got stolen and transfers through some other Registrars and even with the Registrars changed.

So within China they do that between them. They can work out a way to get the names back, but for some domain names that transferred out of the China to different Registrars in other part of the world they wouldn't be able to get those names back.

So that's one thing they want to work together. And second one is the secondary market tradings because you have name buyers all around the world.

Some was in China and they pay big bucks for the good name and they would actually like to work closer with everyone. And I think the third one is the technical know-how, sharing the technical know-hows on some compliance like especially the DNSSEC signing to find out it's among the over 40 Registrars participate in the event.

The - most of them did not know how to provide the DNSSEC signing to the Registrar as per the request of the 2013 RAA. And they were having difficulties to provide an IPv6 compatible WHOIS checking, because the men working in China wasn't kind of support IPv6 access.

So that's the issues they actually would like to work with everyone. And highlight or good news that came about over that event is we might just get a new member, a potential member, for the RrSG from China.

I think the current only Chinese Registrars in RrSG is the media but we are trying to get the people from ZDNS to join RrSG so we even have more representatives from that region.

And (Jin Chan) will you - do you want to stand up? Yes (Jin Chan) is the representative of ZDNS from China.

Michael Zupke: Thank you Howard. You know, I asked him to give this update because I think that we, you know, we - I had heard about this hijacking issue previously.

And when the Registrar said, "I'm having a hard time, you know, communicating with the North American Registrars, the North American Registrars said to me, 'We have that same problem.'"

And I think that it's really noteworthy that, you know, what we're hearing is they don't want to be excluded from the Registrar community. They want to be a part of this and we're going to do our part to try and make that easier.

And we hope that we'll also be able to facilitate membership in the RrSG to do that too. But without further ado I should hand over to the - microphone to my boss here. So Cyrus or Akram would you like to go ahead?

Michele Neylon: This is Michele speaking. Cyrus and Akram if you could just very briefly say who you are and what your role is within ICANN, because there are quite a few people in the room today I think who don't normally come to ICANN meetings and may not be 100% aware of your roles.

And we don't need a full biography and CV but just, you know, something brief.

Cyrus Namazi: Okay, be happy to. I'm Cyrus Namazi. I'm a part of ICANN Staff. I belong to the GDD organization. My responsibility is contract services and relationship sort of categorically.

If you saw the GDD presentation -- it was yesterday -- there was a lot more details in it. Mike and his team are a part of my organization in service of of course our Registrars.

Happy to be here today. Akram Atallah who is actually the President of GDD is sitting to my left as well. He will speak to you in a moment. Just wanted to give you a quick update.

I think Mike and his team already covered it really well. On the staffing side I'm not sure if it was mentioned or not but we're actually we have hired an additional staff member in Istanbul to help serve the needs of our mainly European, Middle East and African Registrar community.

She's not fully on board. We're actually working for her work permit to come in, which we expect to get sometime in mid to late July. So that rounds up our staffing I think around the globe nicely.

Mike is still actually looking to add an additional headcount in Los Angeles, so if you know of anyone good talk to Mike. We'll be happy to get some good resumes from you.

The other update that I wanted to give you was on the status of RADAR. I know a lot of you obviously use the system - are anxious to know when it's going to be back online.

We're - I'm delighted that our new Chief Information Officer, Ashwin Rangan, is actually in the room so I'm going to actually hand the microphone to him to perhaps give an update. Ash thanks.

Ashwin Rangan: Thank you. My name is Ashwin Rangan. I serve as the Chief Information Officer for ICANN. On RADAR we took the system down soon after we started to understand what the misbehavior was.

Part of hardening what we are doing is to look at these systems and the security shells that they have and redo the security shells. Several of the systems that we're looking at are ten years old, nine years old.

Back when they were first put in service the security shells that they had were adequate but things have moved on. The threat vectors have changed. Many of us understand that.

So reflective of the current threat vectors we are rewrapping them with harder shells. In RADAR specific case it's currently being tested and we expect to have it back in service by the first week of July.

We're pressing pretty hard on that and in course of pressing on the testing we're discovering a few last things and going back and reworking those. So I encourage our team to really test it hard before we bring it back on service so that you don't have to worry about its operating characteristics.

We don't want to stumble yet again when once we bring the service back up for your benefit. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Matt go ahead.

Matt Serlin: Yes hi, Matt Serlin, MarkMonitor. I wonder if you could talk to any additional security safeguards that'll be in place when you bring the system back online,

things like two-factor authentication, IP address restrictions or any other safeguards that will be in place to ensure that that system remains secure.

Cyrus Namazi: You will only see minimal things change from your point of view. In the background we're taking care of other things, so we're not going to have you go through two-factor authentication necessarily.

But we will have a - security password resets as a part of the - bringing back up for service. We do not have any anticipation of IP restrictions going in place as a part of the redo and the harden.

Matt Serlin: Can I just ask why? Why won't either of those be an option? I know many Registrars in the room. Well first of all the way we communicate with Registries is all IP restricted, and I know that many Registrars have things like IP restriction and two factor authentication.

It seems to me that ICANN should have the same level of security as we have offered our customers.

Cyrus Namazi: We've - I'm sorry. We've done two things. One is to have a robust dialog on what is more convenient. That talks to the two-factor authentication piece.

On the IP address restrictions piece we've been talking about doing that but it will link from the time that the service is out of service. Now if the community comes back and says, "Do that and take the time necessary," I'm happy to go back and have that as a part of the dialog.

Michael Zupke: So Matt this is Mike Zupke. One thing I just wanted to add to that is that, you know, RADAR has a pretty short life expectancy. At this point it will be integrated eventually to the GDD portal.

So that, you know, that might be a, I mean, given the type of data that's in RADAR that might be something that, you know, might be more along the

lines of something we might incorporate in the GDD portal if people are more eager to have RADAR up sooner.

Cyrus Namazi: So may I suggest something Mike? Why don't we actually have some Working Group or this - just for like a couple of hours just to do with Ash so that he can hear from the team what they would like to see, what is it - what their concerns are and then we can figure out a plan and come back to them on what we'll do on RADAR and what we'll do on the GDD portal, and even give some timelines for this so that they also understand our priorities and where we should spend the time and the work, okay? Thank you.

Michele Neylon: I'm more than happy to facilitate that. I mean, we - our first exchange was specifically around operational matters.

Cyrus Namazi: Right. Thank you. I would appreciate that and I'd welcome that.

Michele Neylon: Okay well anybody have any questions for Cyrus? He's sitting here. He's sitting duck. I mean, sorry. He's more than happy to take your questions.

Cyrus Namazi: Obviously you haven't tasted that coffee I just gave you.

Michele Neylon: Well I think this is a new method of dealing with me to give me cups of coffee and keep me...

((Crosstalk))

Cyrus Namazi: To put - hide behind the coffee, yes.

Michele Neylon: Yes okay. If I keel over we all know why. Please go ahead.

(Marcus Shaffer): (Marcus Shaffer) from the GBH. My question is will these stuff or something be back within the European Union and when, because I feel that I can really, really need to understand issues like privacy and so on.

And if you work with ICANN and the German Registrar we really feel the lack of understanding of the legal background we are working on. And, yes, we really miss ICANN within the European Union.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Cyrus?

Cyrus Namazi: Yes thank you. This is Cyrus Namazi again. Thank you for your question. We have actually been engaged quite a bit in the European continent and like I said we have a new staff member coming on board.

She's actually Dutch herself so she speaks like 25 languages to begin with kind of thing. And on data privacy issues since the last time we actually had this stage I'm happy to say we've made a lot of progress and this is essentially since Singapore.

We have waivers issued since then. We've had waivers issued for Ireland. We have one posted actually for Germany, which I don't expect to run into any issues to become a waiver.

Prior to that we had issued waivers for France and Belgium. We are in active discussions with the Spanish relevant parties. That one has proven to have a bit more difficulties in it but I think we'll be able to find a path forward.

So I - at least from my perspective the data privacy and waiver issues as they pertain to the RAA are for the most part under control, unless you think otherwise.

I think we've identified a path forward with it. We've recently posted a paper on WHOIS issues and seeking your input - the community's input in finding a way forward for that.

That one to me was even more broken then the data privacy waiver issue. And those are the two things that we're actively engaged in and following up on.

If there are other things that you think we should be doing and we're missing, please let us know. You don't have to wait for this forum to take place to educate us. By all means let us know.

(Marcus Shaffer): So just a remark on the waiver thing. Well I think it took much too long to got improvement there and well we had to go to our GAC member. We had to join forces for the German Registrars using the (HIKU) organization, and it was a lot of effort and we kind of - well there was a lack of understanding for a very long time from the ICANN side.

It was - for me and for some other of my colleagues was quite frustrating. Yes I see. I think we will run and - a few more privacy issues. As soon as I handle you over some data that think about compliance requests and you will like to get data.

I have to put out the data out of the European Union. This is not a simple task for me as I know that you might have problems on keeping information secure regarding to RADAR and regarding to the system of the - applying to the new gTLDs.

So as a company in Germany I am liable to the information I hand over to you. So I have to go and to have an audit on ICANN, on the whole security process of ICANN and ICANN must state that they can handle the information I hand over then because it's privacy information.

Let's say a pea drift in Germany is private so I feel there much difficulties as ICANN left the European Union, so Geneva for me it's not really an improvement.

And I really like that you should consider or reconsider the decision to leave the political European Union as we have a huge amount of Registrants living within their European Union.

And we are responsibility for their data, for their privacy. It's our job. It's ICANN's job. It's my job. It's the job of a whole lot of people thinking here and well they're paying us.

They're paying us to do the best and so I expect everyone here to do the best in this sense.

Michele Neylon: Just a reminder please state your name clearly and slowly before you speak for the remote participants.

(Marcus Shaffer): (Marcus Shaffer) from Host Server.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. That wasn't just for you. Please go ahead Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thanks (Marcus). This is Cyrus Namazi with ICANN. I heard a couple of things in your remarks. First one, I totally agree with you that it took a very, very long time for us to finally come to terms on the waiver issues related to data privacy.

And a big part of that challenge was really that this is an issue that does not have well defined boundaries. You know that. I know that. And it's kind of like trying to play a soccer match or a football match I should say here without actually know where the goalposts are to put the ball in and score a goal.

And finally, I'm happy that we have made the progress that we have made. So from that perspective yes it took a long time. It was painful for you obviously and it was actually quite painful for us as well.

It ties up resources that we otherwise would be spending on servicing your other needs. On your second note I want to make sure that everyone understands that we have not left the European Union.

In fact we just recently opened up an office in Geneva. We still have our staff in Brussels. We have actually people in United Kingdom. It's really just the team that's under Mike that's the Registrar Services Team whose staff is going to be located in Istanbul.

We work very closely actually with our global stakeholder engagement team, which is a parallel organization to us and they're quite plugged in with all issues related to the Union - European Union, particularly actually the data privacy types of work that's going on. So we're not losing sight of that or access to that information I assure you.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Cyrus. And just FYI Geneva is in Switzerland. Switzerland is not part of the European Union. I have Volker and then John Berryhill. It may be in the middle guys but it's not part of the European Union. And then (Mohamed).

Cyrus Namazi: No you're right but I did mention Brussels as well so...

Michele Neylon: Okay. I'll let you off. Volker then John Berryhill.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Michele. This is Volker Greimann speaking. Okay. Anyway I was just concerned. We've been talking to compliance earlier today and they've been taking a very literal approach to the RAA that we all negotiated in good faith for a long time and had thought we'd come to an agreement on certain points.

So from our perspective it may become necessary to go into the procedure to reopen certain issues within the RAA to address these misunderstandings within compliance and clarify the agreements that we've made for example

with regards to the verification of existing registrations in the - i.e., Registry registrations and a certain couple of other topics.

And I just wanted to give you a brief notice ahead that we are considering this at this time and we'll approach you later on with more details.

Michele Neylon: Mr. Berryhill. Okay you're John. (Mohamed)?

(Mohamed Gif): Thank you. My name is (Mohamed Gif). I am from hill.com Senegal in Africa. I have three - well two issues. The first one is regarding the waiver. I think that ICANN have to be prepared that the trend that we have seen from European country will be standard to other parts of the world.

Specifically I can tell you that the African continent have also adopt a cybersecurity framework document recently just last month. And from what I know, I mean, starting from my country they have an organization that asked to get the data available and we need to submit all our database because - for some reason locally that in protection data.

And they have put it as part of the law so I think that ICANN have to be prepared since they did not as I say put safeguards regarding the location of the data and how they're going to be manipulated by a third party organization.

That may be in a very short term it will have more than 54 waiver demand coming from African countries as well, and I think that is going to be a little bit disturbing from the whole practice of why we are set up in this sense, why we are trying to protect this data in other - a failure or whatever. I mean so we're just missing the focus of this - of these recommendations.

The second thing is on the BNS - under BNS investment (unintelligible), I just want to be clear if that's a question, you have put in the new - the notion of resellers. Are they going to be part of your global (unintelligible) program, like

the training they need? Because we know that in some areas, we've got more resellers present constituting the ecosystem. Are you seeing that ICANN has some role in term of organizing them, helping them, training them get most use in other (unintelligible) of the community?

Because the whole objective is how are we going to protect our registrar that the interface is going to have, know - I mean what type of commitment and provision - or the provision that we have in the new contract. Is that going to be part of the responsibility series or are you saying that it's just we put the words like resellers in it, but nobody's going to care about how we're going to manage this issue - going to be the whole responsibility of the registrar to organize this whole distribution thing?

And we mentioned them, but we did not really put provisions on how we're going to manage this (unintelligible) that just come into the new contract and have never been in the previous contract of ICANN.

So we have seen, for example, ICANN have initiated a number of outreach programs for registrar in different regions. In Los Angeles, in Europe, in Africa, we're eager to see these program be expanded because we need it. But my question is, if we look at the whole player that we see back from the ICANN -- because if you look at the contracts you get the (unintelligible) and in front you have the registrar and between you get sometimes the sellers -- do the sellers have to be seen as part of the ICANN? Because the registrar is going to just see the whole organizer, resellers, registrar and the registry as a whole.

And in front you're going to have the registrar. So my question is regarding our outreach program, do we care about the resellers as being part of people that need to be trained to know really what are the provisions that we're getting in these new area or do we let (unintelligible) just to the registrar, we're going to see how they're going to manage it to be (unintelligible)?

Because we put that provision in the new (unintelligible). In the previous contract, there was no mention about the reseller, so nobody cared about it.

So every single (unintelligible) known (unintelligible) way an policy and stuff, but now that can be part of the contract, really needs to tell how we're going to manage this society that we do not (unintelligible).

Volker Greimann: Yes, go ahead.

Man: Thank you, this is (unintelligible). Thank you (Mohammed). Two things I think you brought up. One was that the issue of waivers for data privacy related laws obviously don't have (unintelligible) to the European Union. We are mindful of that, you're absolutely right. We've already heard issues percolating in South America, obviously in Africa you're saying there is initiatives going on. In fact, one of the new exercises that we've begun has been to put some resources behind tracking all the issues related to data privacy in different jurisdictions.

To be honest, it's actually a problem of monumental scope because just about every legal jurisdiction has got some variation of some sort to how they want this stuff to be handled. And I'm not sure how it's going to pan out but we are beginning to track it so that we stay educated and sort of hopefully ahead of that curve. In terms of whether the outreaches that we organize and conduct should actually extend to the resellers, I think that's a good idea, but I'm going to leave it up to Mike and you guys to decide what that agenda should be.

I think it can take two forms. It can actually include the resellers and whatever is down the line essentially from the registrar. And we can even include them in the outreaches for the registrars or we can arm you with the, you know, additional information for you so that you can pass it on to them. To me, the more educated and up to date our entire distribution channel and ecosystem is the data for the registrars, which is what we're here to do. Thank you.

(Mike Suarez):   James, if you don't mind, I'm just going to go through participants first. Is that…

James Bladel: Totally fine.

(Mike Suarez):   Okay, get it kicking.

Woman: This question comes from (Deetmar Jevitz). The question is will the registrar group look into the matter of .xyz registration and .NET Fall pushing domains to accounts without permission?

(Zach):   This is (Zach) on the phone. This is a compliance question, but I want to say that compliance looks into all of the issues that we are aware of, whether the complaint directly as to ICANN or if it's something that we hear about or know about, we would actually investigate and look into it. But this is a matter of compliance I think.

Man: Mr. Bladel, you have the floor.

James Bladel: Thanks. Thanks, (Hirus) and Akram. Appreciate you coming in. Just a couple of quick points. To Volker's earlier statement about initiating the RAA amendment procedure, I want to emphasize that this is not an adversarial - this is not an attempt to call out ICANN or ICANN legal or ICANN staff, this is an attempt to clear up and codify some issues and really just sand some of the rough edges off of the operational realities that this contract has caused now that it's out - been out in the wild.

So just want to make that point and then also, make sure that your team -- because I believe it started with this group -- that the notion that the - the report on the underserved reasons we submitted as a stakeholder group, we submitted a comment on that issue and I would ask that - did you have any

immediate reactions to the comments that we submitted, the comments received from the community, where are you guys going with this?

Because I think that we're - while we're sympathetic to the idea that there are some markets that need to be, you know, need to have greater choice and greater variety of services, I think that as a concern about ICANN wading into what is essentially a market function and, you know, deporting some players or some regions at the expense of other players or other regions. Or even perhaps supporting fully accredited registrars in place of resellers who may be having success in some of those regions that are currently designated as underserved.

So just I'm interested in where you guys are going on this and what you see as a potential outcome of that report.

(Hirus):   Thank you James. This is (Hirus) again with ICANN. I think I did hear both you and Volker about, you know, the potential movement for amendment of the RAA. And as long as you guys promise not to hurt me as much as you did in the first round when we did the 2013, I think we're okay with - I'm still recovering from -

James Bladel: I don't think you should assume you're going to be dealing with me and (Walter).

(Hirus):   I'm still recovering from that one. On this exercise in figuring out what to do in underserved regions, I guess you mentioned it and it's important for us to highlight the fact that we're not trying to lower the bar. We're not trying to enable a particular region at the expense of other regions, that's not the objective. The real objective is to find a way so that we can provide perhaps a boost and facilitate the proliferation of the infrastructure, mainly the registers and the registrars in the regions where, you know, they might be lacking.

That's the overarching goal. But, you know, I would highlight and emphasize the fact that it's not intended and it won't come at the expense of lowering the bar, the standard, and, you know, for the (unintelligible) of the established registrars.

James Bladel: Because the - as we've seen, the bad guys will certainly just gravitate to -

(Hirus): For sure. In fact this is why we're seeking your input and your comments because you are probably much more in tune with how this could be gained, for instance, than we would be. I -

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: So we have your assurance that no ICANN funds would be spent directly - I'm dancing around the word subsidized, but no ICANN funds would be used to promote effectively competitive registrars where none currently exist?

Akram Atallah: So James, let me - this is an issue -

James Bladel: This is a yes or no -

Akram Atallah: But - but I cannot promise you this because I cannot promise you what the community will agree on doing and the board will agree on doing. That's reality but let me just walk you back to how we got where we got and how we would hope to move forward from here. So this is an issue that has been coming up over and over that basically barrier to (unintelligible) for businesses in the developing regions is too high to be a registrar or registry.

This is start from there. So this initiative is looking into what are those barriers, what are the issues, what are the alternatives that could be possible, and I think that you - your participation into these discussions is very important so that you are part of the solution -- if there is one, or if there any (unintelligible). Now, if you want to ask about our, you know, our concerns,

they're the same as yours. I don't think lowering the bar is a solution, I think that we - the bar needs to be set at the right place to make sure that the - everybody is treated equally and playing in an equal playing field.

Also that actually it meets the protections and the - the ability that we have already in the system. So we don't want to come and actually change things and make things worse just to include a few more registrars or few more registries in some development areas. So that's not our goal. Now what will - what recommendations come out of these comments and what we will see and the next steps will be determined based on those. But I personally don't think that we will be recommending any effort that will go along the lines of subsidizing somebody from somebody else's expenses or to actually lower the bar on one area and not across the board.

So I guess if we find that there are things that maybe originally were requirements that now we feel maybe they shouldn't be requirements anymore now that the market is where it is and stuff, that would be benefit for everybody and that would lower the barrier strategy. So let's not look at the worst scenario, let's look at what could come out of this exercise.

Man: Okay, thank you Akram. I mean just for those of you who may not be aware, this has been kind of an ongoing dialogue over the last few months. I can recognize you, (Graham). Of course, then again I have met you before so the fact that I recognize you is not strange. During the Singapore meeting, there was a small meeting held between myself, Akram, (Cyrus), (Felicia Hardian), several people from the African Union. There has been some other sort of dialogue since then and Akram and I also met in LA a few weeks ago briefly.

I think Akram, (Cyrus), you both heard our concerns here with how to submit a comment, other members can submit a comment. I'll take the gentleman who was standing at the mic who I don't recognize and I can't read his name tag from here and then (Graham). Please go ahead. Just please state your name for the remotes.

Man: Okay, this is a gentleman from (unintelligible), Chinese registrar. Another question, just three quick comments. First find that we do appreciate the outreaching activity, as mentioned by (unintelligible) and I think more needs to be done to engage the local registrar.

I think many local - I mean Chinese registrar, they do know ICANN, have heard ICANN many times, but few actually come to take part in the ICANN meeting because they see little value added to their business. So I think more need to be done to engage the local registrar. I think the most important point is to enhance (unintelligible) understanding what we can benefit from taking from the participation.

Second one is that we actually - (unintelligible) actually is a potential registrar. By potential, I mean we still are in the process of negotiating with some new registry. You know some new TOD registry, they don't see their business model like as a sufficient registry - registrar business. Like they (unintelligible) a registrar as a competitive market. They only choose (unintelligible) because it's closed the registrar so the registries are still - they only choose one registrar to do their business. So I think it's kind of a new model.

We may take that role. So we see a lot of challenge and difference as a traditional registrar business. So I think this is a place we just need to take part in this place and also think of this community provide a platform to exchange how do this kind of new business, because we don't have much (unintelligible) on these. We need more (unintelligible) on the best practice and we want to learn from other registrars.

Thirdly that - I just feel that the Chinese registrar market may be a little different from Western countries. As you all know, yesterday, a high level official, Mr. (Luwei) from the Cyberspace Administration Department, he - I think he frankly (unintelligible) we face comment challenge in the internet governance. But he also admitted that China and the American, they have

little different opinions and approach on how to do Internet governance. So I think the Chinese government (unintelligible) may also - their privacy may also have impact on the market, just as a registrar in a Chinese market, we sometimes have to face more requirements from government.

So I just wanted to mention that for those registrars they want to do business in China market, they may have more complicated issue to face. So I think as a registrar - as a new registrar in China market, we'd like to cooperate with other registrar to do our business. That's all, thank you.

Man: Thank you. (Graham)?

(Graham):   It's actually not me.

Man: Yes, you can't see me down there.

Man: Oh, okay, so it is actually (Elliot). (Graham) is his (unintelligible) assistant.

(Elliot):   Yes, he is my literal right hand in that case. It's (unintelligible) we talk about the hand of God, but now we're talking about (unintelligible) pretty weird. So with the issue of underdeveloped regions -- and I guess Akram it's a question for you -- you know, it seems - I think it would help to better understand next steps. And I say that because, you know, I think what I heard you say in response to James and (Mohammed) was, you know, well we'll see what the community wants.

                And I think that as (Mikale) mentioned, it was a registrar stakeholder group submission that was I think five or six specific submissions, you know, individual companies on top of that from the stakeholder group. You know, so it's kind of like what comes next in this process and dialogue? It's more of a question possibly for Amy or I don't know, it's - I'm just - I'm (unintelligible) the two gentlemen need to run off, but do you guys want to (unintelligible) or try to bounce that over to Mike and (Jamie)?

Man: I think quickly I can do it because - and then I'll let Amy actually walk you through the details. It's really the next step is going to be consolidating, taking all the input from the public and then see what's the best course of action. Like I said, the overarching goal is to enable a better ecosystem in what we call underserved regions, but obviously with the caveat that it's not (unintelligible) the standard of quality that we have for the established registered - accredited registrars.

                  But the specifics of it, I don't know yet is sort of what I'm trying to say. I don't know if Amy, if you have anything else you'd like to add?

Amy Bivins: I'll take this opportunity to plug our session for tomorrow again. We'll be talking more about next steps there. But just a high level, we're waiting obviously for the end of the public comment period and after that, we'll do more study and think about the issue more and obviously we want you to be very involved in this whole process. So if you have thoughts about next steps, also come tomorrow and talk about them please, so.

Man: When? You just said tomorrow, but tomorrow when?

Amy Bivins: Yes. The session is tomorrow from 4:00 to 5:00 in Hilton 1 through 6. The session isn't on the public schedule because it's just with registrars, but from 4:00 to 5:00.

Woman: We'll send an announcement out to the group, 4:00 to 5:00 tomorrow in Hilton 1 through 6.

Amy Bivins: Right. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks again.

Amy Bivins: Akram, thank you for - thank you as well. Unfortunately, we're running behind, so just - so I just like ask everyone if - (unintelligible) if she is in the room hopefully? Great. Can we welcome you to join us? Apologize everyone, we're going to have to pass at our break in order to stay on schedule. (Unintelligible), no. Anyways, we're going to have to pass on our break. We can stop and start the recording as soon as she begins, so we can just take a minute and we'll get set up. Thanks.

                                    END