

**Transcription ICANN London
Registrars Stakeholder Group
Tuesday 24 June 2014
Morning Session (Part 2)**

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.

Woman: All right you guys, we're going to get started. Just want to welcome Marika for the GNSO policy issues update.

Marika Konings: Hi everyone. Thanks for having me again. For those of you that may not know me, my name is Marika Konings. I'm a senior policy director and team leader for the GNSO, the team that supports the policy development activities of the GNSO. My colleague Rob Hoggarth is also here is me as there was quite some time set aside for the policy update; I'm not really sure if we need that much. I thought it would be helpful as well if he can provide you a little update on your charter revisions. And as he needs to leave, he asked if he could go first. So if that is okay with you...

Woman: Sure. Please.

Robert Hoggarth: Great. Thank you. Rob Hoggarth here for the record. Very brief update. The comment period for the registrar charter changes took place on Friday - last Friday. There were no comments submitted in the public comment period, therefore there was no need for a reply comment period. I advised the structural improvements committee of the board of that non-event last week - just over the weekend they confirmed that from a staff perspective, all we need to do now is complete our reporting and they'll be prepared -- depending upon their agenda and what they're putting together the next time -- to be able to recommend to the full board some consideration and action on the charter documents.

So at this point, we have the changes that you all proposed, no community comment, to it'll just be a direct action by the board at the next available time they can do it. The procedures allow them a little bit of flexibility. You know, they have some other agenda items come up, but things should be fairly non-eventful at this point. I'm happy to answer any questions if anyone has any.

(Jennifer Standerford): This is (Jennifer Standerford) for the transcript. Do you have a proposed timeline?

Robert Hoggarth: I believe the SIC is scheduled to meet one time before the next big ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. So that could happen -- depending on the board's schedule -- sometime between now and the August/September timeframe. So I think realistically we'd likely see a board action in Los Angeles, if not sooner.

(Jennifer Standerford): Great, thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, thank you.

Marika Konings: All right, so it's back to me. This is Marika again. So maybe we can go to the next slide. Like in previous sessions, I have brought with me a set of slides that I presume will also get circulated that provide you with some basic information on all these initiatives. But instead of us going through them, it might be more helpful to actually ask what you want to hear about. So maybe some of those topics that you want to hear more about, maybe there are others that you're less interested in. I know several of the people around the table here and in the audience are active participants in these efforts, so hopefully they'll also contribute to the discussion as well.

So I don't know if there's anything in particular on this list that you would like to hear about or anything you heard over the weekend in the GNSO sessions

that you had questions about or wanted updates on. Otherwise I'm going to be done really quickly.

Woman: (Unintelligible). I guess we just proceed with the inter-registrar transfer policy and we'll move on from there. Okay.

Marika Konings: So basically (James Redal) is actually the chair of this working group -- sitting over there, as I'm sure he'll interrupt if I say anything wrong -- we've spoken about this one already quite some time. As you know, this is the fourth in a series of policy development process looking at areas for clarification or improvement of the IRTP. If you go to the next slide, this one is specifically looking at a number of issues related to the TDRP - the transfer dispute resolution and policy. Also question raised to panel (unintelligible) and one regarding the use of forms of authorization.

Go to the next slide. So basically the working group is moving toward the end phase of its activities. They had an initial report that was out prior to Singapore and they've spent the time between Singapore and now reviewing those comments and are in the process of finalizing the report, which is expected to be submitted to the GNSO council somewhere shortly after London, I would presume.

The working group had a meeting yesterday and I think they made quite a bit of progress on the open items they had. So the two specific items that they're - were looking further into - one in relation to abandoning the registry level as part of the transfer dispute resolution policy as the first level dispute provider. And also relating to whether or not to maintain FOAs. There were some feedback provided that maybe the working group should reconsider its recommendation to maintain FOAs at this stage. And that discussion I think continued yesterday and I think there's some further discussion that may be held on that point.

Go to the next slide. So as I said, there was a meeting here (unintelligible) and (James), two or three more meetings possibly, I guess, for finalizing; I'm not sure.

(James Redal): Yeah, I think we're very close. We're probably targeting a final report for the GNSO council meeting. I don't think we have one in August, so I think we're probably the first one after that we should have this thing buttoned up and ready to submit.

Marika Konings: Great. So basically once that happens GNSO council will consider -- provided that they have adopted the recommendations -- it will go out for another round of public comment before the board considers it and then it would -- you know, provided the board adopted it -- would move into implementation. And then our TDD colleagues will update you from there on.

Go to the next slide. Next. Another initiative that is ongoing -- it's - maybe it's less interest, I think, to this group so we may move quickly through it -- is a cross community working group for a framework of cross community working group operating principles. Or I think as it has been renamed CWG Square this weekend. It's basically a joint initiative with the CCNSO -- and there are also some other groups that participating -- looking at the development of principles that cross-community working groups should be working under.

As you know, we've seen an increase of the cross-community efforts and we're looking now at the NTIA coordinating committee. There's also discussion of a CWG on that topic, accountability efforts. But - so there's a realization as well that there's a need to have a common understanding of how these groups would work and operate as of course within the different communities there are different practices and ways in which these things are organized which in the past have resulted in some issues or misunderstandings as a result. So that's work that's ongoing. It - this group is still taking volunteers, so if you have - anyone is interested in this topic, feel free to reach out to me or the GNSO secretary to sign up for this initiative.

Move to the next slides. Next. Yeah, more information. Next one. So privacy and proxy service accreditation. I presume this is probably a topic that you're more interested in. I know that many of you are a members of this working group. As you know, this is one of the items that came out of the REA negotiations and the PDP that was initiated by the board in association with that.

So this working group is specifically looking at the policy around an accreditation program that will need to replace the temporary privacy proxy specification that is currently running until 2017. So we have actually quite a big working group that's looking at these issues. If we can go to the next slide. We're basically divided up all the questions that were incorporated in the chart or into seven categories and we're moving through those in a very systematic way trying to divvy up the work and make sure that we have very focused conversations.

So there's a category looking at general issues, maintenance and registration of privacy proxy services, contact points for privacy proxy services, relay and reveal procedures, and then also termination is one of the issues. So I think we've managed to go through one and two and half through three. And I think we're now getting to probably one of the areas that is - maybe one of the more contentious or the more difficult conversations about relay and reveal procedures. The working group is having a face to face meeting tomorrow morning, so if you're interested in this topic, you know, feel free to come along.

And aiming to produce a literal report by early 2015 for public comment. I see (James) at the mic. Go ahead.

(James Redal): So I just wanted to make sure that registrars were aware that this is going on. If -- as part of your product offering -- you have a privacy or a proxy service that you either have developed on your own and maintain yourself or maybe

you're offering it through an affiliate, it's -- or a partnership -- I think you need to be aware of this group at a minimum and involved if you can. This is going to dramatically change the landscape at some point in the future.

There are - I would say there are some elements of this working group that are taking very hard lines on who can be eligible for privacy and proxy services and let's just say that this is going to have a huge impact on that part of your business. So if anybody wants to talk about it offline one on one, just holler at me. I think (Foulker) is on the group, (Graham) is one of the vice chairs. Just, you know, grab one of us and we'll bring you up to speed with some of our concerns. Yeah, (unintelligible).

Woman: What time is this face to face meeting? Is this the 10:00 meeting?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Correct. 10 to 11:30 in Catogan.

Woman: Yeah, okay. Thanks.

(James Redal): And it's also every Tuesday, 9:00 my time, which is (unintelligible) 14:00 UTC.

Woman: So it'll be a (unintelligible) on the registrars. Could I join your working group, just to experience it? Because obviously this is something that...

(James Redal): Yeah, more and more - more reinforcements, more voices, more help on this, please.

Woman: Thanks.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So if you drop me an e-mail (unintelligible) we can get you added to the mailing list. And just as a reminder to everyone, the only requirement is that you complete a statement of interest and then you get added to the mailing list and will receive full details and...

(James Redal): And by the way, folks -- just as a heads up -- if you don't have a statement of interest with the ICANN -- this is kind of a side note -- it takes like five minutes. Fill one out and you can re-use it forever. It's basically, you know, just a formality that they put you through, but I've known people like, "Oh, I don't want to - you know, I want to join this working group but I don't have a statement of interest." Just, you know, just knock one out one day, you know, over a cup of coffee.

Woman: Yeah, I've never done a statement of interest, but I'll just - (McCauley) will help.

(James Redal): Can we send a link to the SOI form to the main registrar mailing list and then just say, "Everybody it's probably just a good idea to have one of these on file and keep it updated."

Man: Can you do that? Or one of you?

(James Redal): Well yeah...

Marika Konings: You do need a - like a sign in - a log in to do it. The secretary generated - just to see what is there. All of those are publicly posted and -- as (James) says -- it's, you know, a couple of questions. What's your name...?

(James Redal): Yeah, it's about 20 questions. I think 25 questions.

Marika Konings: I think it's like 10 or something.

(James Redal): Oh, it's like 10.

Man: Stop bickering, please.

Marika Konings: Anyway, it shouldn't take too long.

(James Redal): (Unintelligible) straightforward.

(Jennifer Standerford): (Jennifer) for the transcript. I'll send out the - set up process and encourage everyone.

Marika Konings: And maybe worth just mentioning as well -- because something we discussed over the weekend as well -- to make it easy for people to participate without immediately having to sign up as a working group member that we're going to pilot after London as well for any new groups that are formed the option just to register as an observer. So basically you'll get, you know, the e-mails but you won't be able to post to the list. You're not, you know, allowed to come to the calls, but there's always an opportunity if you want to become an active member then to, you know, change that around and become a full member.

But we hope as well that they lower the bar for some people to start following some of these conversations. You know, (unintelligible) are publicly archived, but, you know, having to go there is often more work than if you automatically receive that in your inbox. So that's something you may want to look out as well for, some of the initiatives that will be starting after London.

Oh, yep. And it kind of reminds me as well - something we've also started running is a monthly open house working group newcomer session. And again, I think (James) is one of the co-hosts for that. The idea is really for anyone -- they don't need to be a newcomer in the sense that you've never been to ICANN or you don't know what the GNSO does. It's really anyone that has any questions on what it takes to be involved in a PDP working group or any questions about the procedures or requirements, you know, is just invited to come along and have a chat.

It's co-hosted with council members at the moment and staff. We always have a slide that we can run through or questions, we'll just go through questions. It's really an open kind of discussion. I think it's very first Thursday

of the month and I think the next one is next Thursday, if I'm not mistaken. And I'm hoping as well that those announcements go out through the registrar mailing list when we send them out. I know I've sent them to all the mailing lists specifically.

Man: I generally forward them, but it's also seems that those announcements are going to several of the working group lists as well. So I - (unintelligible) like some of the stuff it's like we've - I've been sending out as much of it as I can and also conscious of the fact that if you're on a working group you'll end up getting the e-mail like five times.

Marika Konings: Yeah - and this is Marika. I'm aware. And I don't know if you have - do you have like a calendar of meetings that you share or something? Because that would be another...

Man: Actually that's an interesting - a very interesting question. One of the things that we have been discussing within the ex/com and -- you know, we mentioned this earlier this morning -- was with respect to making improvements and changes to the stakeholder group Web site and, you know, having some kind of calendar or calendar type function around, you know, different types of meetings and other events that are relevant might be a worthwhile addition.

The - I think the discussion we had was trying to, you know, strike the balance between making it more useful for everybody without making it one of those things where, you know, if the ex/com members change -- which of course they do -- that you end up where it's wonderful useful for like a year and then the next ex/com come in and they don't get around to keeping it updated or whatever. So we're working on a few different things there.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And then there's contact in the mails to be worth mentioning that we're going to start working on an kind of working group on boarding program which we'll try and need to gather some of the relevant

information and make it easier for people coming to the GNSO to find information or having little videos on what you need to do when you're a working group member, you know, how does the PDP work, what our consensus policy is. I know if we have that more in a more centralized place it becomes easy as well for people to find information and get up to speed before they maybe, you know, sign up for a working group.

So - and I think there we'll be reaching out as well to the different stakeholder groups and constituencies. Because I think the idea would be as well that they, you know, are able as well to find information on how can I become a member or what does a registrar stakeholder group do. And I know there's some recordings as well going on today -- I think -- talking to you and having little videos on the GNSO Web site again as well to share information and then make sure people are aware on how they can get involved, what the different groups do, and what it takes to sign up.

Move to the next slide. Next one. Very briefly here, this is basically the PDP that was completed I think a couple of months ago. But there were a couple of recommendations as part of that that weren't in sync with GAC advice provided to the ICANN board. So I think the ICANN board has been, you know, trying to digest and try to find a way on how to deal with those differences. And the new GTLD committee has written a letter to the GNSO council noting that indeed there is a specific difference between the recommendations and asking the GNSO whether they would be, you know, willing or would like to consider changing some of those recommendations as part of the procedures that the GNSO has in place to do so prior to board consideration.

And very specifically relates I think to the timeframe for trademark clearinghouse notices; instead of 90 days moving that to permanent. And as well I think some specific protections for Red Cross regional organization, if I'm not mistaken.

So the GNSO council discuss it quite extensively over the weekend and it's another item that they'll be discussing on Wednesday. I'm presuming that's also a topic that your GNSO councils will be discussing with you to get an idea of where your groups stand. I think currently the idea would be to indeed at least commence that procedure and see indeed whether there is a need or interest to actually review those recommendations and potentially make those changes, which would then go back to the board for review and consideration.

Move on to the next slides please. Just skip through these. Again, if you have - more interested in these, we can leave these with you so you can look at it at your leisure. To the next one. So linked to that - or one of the recommendations that came out of that PDP relates to the PDP that has been initiated by the GNSO council at its last meeting on exploring curative rights protection measures for IGOs and INGOs, specifically looking at whether there should be modifications to the (unintelligible) or URS to enable them access or potential alternative mechanism if it is determined that UDRP and URS wouldn't be suitable for modification in such a form.

GNSO council is considering at their meeting on Wednesday the adoption of a charter which would be the first step before a working group is formed. So this is a specific item where we'll soon expect to launch a call for volunteers. So if anyone is interested in this specific topic, you know, please keep an eye out on the GNSO Web site and as well as your mailing list, because we'll be needing people to help us with this effort.

And as you are probably aware, this is also an area where the GAC is paying close attention as they have provided advice on this topic on a number of occasions and IGOs have also been active in some of the discussions at a GNSO level in the working group.

Go to the next slide. Again, if there are any questions, feel free to raise your hand. We can move through the next one; already cover that. So this

provides some details on what is covered. If you're really interested in the details I would suggest you look at the draft charter that's up for consideration on the meeting on Wednesday (unintelligible) details on what are some questions the working group is expected to consider. I think first of all trying to understand what are the specific nuances and why our IGOs and INGOs currently not able to use the UDRP and URS. And then, you know, moving into is there an option or a need to modify those procedures.

Move to the next - and next. And some of the other GNSO projects - these are, you know, relatively short. There's not much has happened since the last update we provided. Your translation and transliteration of contact information PDP, they came to talk to you at the last meeting. I think they're still quite keen to get some more registrar participation in that effort. I think they're - the last time they came they were really trying to encourage because they're really helpful to get some input as of course this is an area that has the potential to directly affect your requirements on what information needs to be provided in Who Is.

And they also have a face to face meeting here and I think that's also - I think it's right before the privacy proxy services meeting on Thursday - Wednesday, sorry. So they are basically validating the information they've received from different SOs and ACs, stakeholder groups and constituencies on these issues. I know that several GAC members have provided input, which is quite something new, so we're pleased to see that they - several governments have provided input on this topic.

So again, if there's anything from your group that is either forthcoming or input that you want to share on this topic, you know, please reach out to this working group. And if you're interested, they will take members as well and then join their meeting on Wednesday.

Data and metrics for policy making; I think I already spoke to you about that as well at the last meeting. So this effort is specifically looking at how to get

better metrics and data to help inform policy development activities, both at the outset of an effort - because we have had situation like - is there really an issue or, you know, do we just assume there's an issue because a couple of people have said so? But then we have had issues and need how do we actually get information? And some of that information, you know, compliance can provide.

But -- for example -- you know, you are one of the parties that probably receive a lot of information through either complaints or, you know, contact with your customers. So this working group is looking at ways to enhance that information and availability to help inform policy development activities. But also looking at how can we make sure that we set up metrics in such a way that we can actually evaluate the success -- or lack thereof -- of those policies and are able to adjust accordingly. You know, should the data (unintelligible).

So again, they're at the moment evaluating some of the previous efforts and as a way of, you know learning exercise that's looking -- for example -- at, you know, (unintelligible) post expiration domain name recovery, a grace period PDP and see how they use data or, you know, whether they had issues with actually gathering data and how that's being factored in. And from those lessons hopefully be able to derive some recommendations.

So again, I think this is an issue as well that, you know, hopefully is of interest to registrars and where registrars definitely can contribute to the conversation. We would like to encourage you to sign up for this effort. They are meeting face to face on Thursday morning, I believe, from 8 to 9. So feel free to come along and hear what they're up to. I see (James) at the mic again, so go ahead.

(James Redal): I just wanted to comment on this particular PDP. Do we have registrars that are participating in the data and metrics PDP?

(Graham): I'm - sorry, this is (Graham). I'm kind of hanging out in it, but I wouldn't clarify it as fully participating.

(James Redal): Yeah, I'm kind of observing it from a distance. You know, I would be interested in hearing other registrar's positions on this group. I think that the goal is what -- something we've always wanted -- which is stop, you know, using anecdotes and high profile issues and controversies to drive new policy and let's take a look at things on a fact basis using data and operational statistics. Make sure the cure isn't worse than the disease.

But I think it also - the paradox being that, you know, in order to do that we would have to cough up some real numbers. And do so in a way that would be, you know, treated confidentially, because this is everybody's secret thoughts and nobody wants to, you know, nobody wants to open the kimono, so to speak.

So I don't really know where - you know, where folks are coming from. I think that this group is concerned that they are lacking registrar visibility on this and that we have some really good data they know that we have. But I don't know. Does anybody have any thoughts on it? I mean, obviously you've got two registrars saying they're staying the heck away from it, but I can see the value of it.

Man: This is (unintelligible). I've been avoiding as many working groups as possible over the last year -- just being completely honest -- due to the fact that apparently I have a day job. So I've...

(James Redal): Well, I'm not trying to put anybody on...

Man: No, no, no. Just, you know, you asked. I mean...

(James Redal): The spot. I am genuinely asking.

Man: I mean, I've ended up doing like a couple of others I've done with a couple of the working groups where I've joined primarily just to kind of keep an eye on things. But I think across the board we are spread a little bit thin. There's only about six to ten registrars who are actively participating in working groups other than the privacy and proxy working group where there's a very large number of us. I think - with all the other stuff it's been a bit difficult finding anybody really.

Man: So here's my concern with this. This could go a long way towards improving policy development at ICANN. Right now we're all doing stuff like validating e-mail address because a certain fraction of a percentage of e-mail addresses were considered to be fraudulent or invalid. Now everybody's got to be punished for that. And if we had had some data like this, maybe we could have made some more effective arguments to, you know, back when those requirements were being imposed upon us. So I feel like this is something that's worth, you know, jumping on. I just don't know how to go about it in a way that makes sense.

Man: (Unintelligible) I mean, you know, if someone can come up with a way of anonymizing data point that we're all willing to share with, I mean I'll say it first, I'm happy to do that. I mean...

Man: Let's put it on the radar.

Man: Yes. No that's...

Man: A cheap shot, I'm sorry.

Man: You know, we've used the registrar stakeholder group has used people before to help us sort of outside of being a registrar. If we wanted to do the same again in a way of sort of collecting data and providing it to another person. And I mean I feel comfortable with that.

Man: That's a good idea.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. And I think that's exactly what -- at least from the staff side -- we're hoping for, because we now get some information from compliance, but again that's, you know, just a fraction of probably all complaints or, you know, registrar or registrant feedback, anecdotal stuff. But we don't have, you know, a way to say look this is really a big issue because look at, you know, what we can learn from registrar data or really this is a non-issue because, you know, we have the information to back that up and I think it will really help in the data-driven policy development which I think is what we're all hoping for.

Man: So maybe...

Man: That sounded like staff saying that they were happy to do that.

Man: Yes I mean that's the key, Marika, is that we're very, very gun shy about sharing that information with staff or with each other or getting it out. You know, I mean if I say here's our statistics on product X, the next thing I see is 100 ads going out and like are you experiencing problems with GoDaddy's product X, come to our product X. I mean you can see how this is just nobody wants to put this stuff out there but we all want policy to be made from a position of intelligence and using actual real world data. So maybe let's kick this around on the list about some ways that we can find some trusted third party that's not ICANN, that's not a registrar that we can...

Marika Konings: And I think that's exactly what the working group is look it, you know, how can that happen. Indeed is that a third party that should be engaged, are there other ways in doing it, is there certain information that you are wanting to freely share where there's no, you know, concerns. So I think that's exactly what the working group is looking at. As (Dan) said, you know, it's really important that your input and feedback is considered in that regard.

Man: Briefly let me just pile on here that this is a really good idea and I think it's going to benefit us a lot as a stakeholder group the more get more we get better at using data to make our decisions and collecting it. So let's really ponder this one and figure out maybe how to participate in this carefully but really have a think about it individually and let's do that.

Man: Sounds good. And actually I might -- it just occurred to me -- I might have somebody in mind that I think everyone here knows that might be able to help. And we could send one representative with aggregated and anonymized registrar data to this group, something like that. Anyway, thanks.

(Arthur Sandberg): Good morning or good day. (Arthur Sandberg) here from Hostnet. About the data, I am particularly fond of data and numbers, statistics, perhaps VeriSign or the registries can dig up some detailed reports to give us more numbers alternatively or indeed some way to make the registrar data anonymous or give a percentage of your metrics instead of the real numbers.

These are things that would really improve the effectiveness of policy because we're now able to create policy, we're able to have a PDP and create new policy, but are we able to reduce the unnecessary policy, are we able to remove ineffective policy that's not really contributing, for example to security, that's not really contributing to what it's intended to do, and for that really need the data to back it up to see where the number are. It would really help.

Marika Konings: Thanks. And again I think that's exactly the idea. Of course we're not only looking at registrars but as well as other parties, you know, registries or, you know, third parties that may be investigating certain things, like anything to help to get more and better informed both policy making but also review mechanisms to assess indeed whether are, you know, policies are having the intended effect or do we do need readjust or, you know, consider just removing some.

Man: Yes and perhaps really take a fresh look at policies that we've been using for tens of years, you know, we've become so accustomed to and so grown used to, perhaps it should be time for a fresh look or new start. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks. And just to mention on this topic as well, (Maggie) who you saw earlier this morning will also be providing an update to the GNSO council as part of the open meeting on Wednesday because they also still have an outstanding action item to report on the improvement and efforts they have made to help us, you know, get better access to data and information.

And I think I've shared with you in the past as well some of the, you know, the dashboards they've created and the ways they're gathering data. So that is part of that system we hope as well, but that will feed into that effort to as one of the elements from where we are able to assess data and information. And of course they play an important role as well in the assessment of whether policies are working as intended, whether any specific issues that we're encountering, and again I think that's part as well of the audits they do and the efforts they run, they can see as well certain areas very quickly with new policies if they see that certain things are not clear or not transparent or need to be enhanced, so I think that's another mechanism that we'll be looking at.

Go to the next slide please.

The policy implementation, again not much has really happened since the last meeting. They're obviously continuing their conversations and I think as most of you know, they're looking at a number of aspects of GNSO policy and implementation, how to make sure that those two areas align, that there's clarity on what happens when a policy moves into implementation and who's doing what, what happens if certain policy issues arise as part of the implementation conversation, what needs to happen then.

They're currently looking at a potential policy guidance process for the GNSO that they can make use of for those issues that don't require a PDP. As you

know currently the only formal process GNSO has as availability is doing a PDP which, you know, has - it's very clear what needs to happen but at the same time it's quite a lengthy process to go from start to finish, and in certain cases you may not need such a formal process but you still do what to have some formality so it's clear to everyone as well on how certain decisions may be taken.

So that's what the working group is currently looking at. They're evaluating some previous efforts in which the GNSO has provided either advised, had input and used ad hoc processes and tries to evaluate, you know, which of those worked well, which of those worked less well and how can we distill from those principles that any kind of new process or processes should follow and then they will move through some of the charter questions, looking as well at the use of implementation of a few teams, how are they functioning, is there any further guidance should be provided as those kind of groups. And then again, the eventual objective is to have kind of a framework for implementation-related conversations and everything that's related to that.

The working group is having a face-to-face meeting tomorrow afternoon from 3:30 to I think it's actually 5:30, so if you're interested in this topic, please feel free to come along. I think several of you are also subscribed to that working group, so. They're aiming to have an initial report by Los Angeles, but I think at the rate we're currently going that's probably not achievement. But again, the working group does its best.

Can you go to the next slide? I think this is probably the last one. I just want to briefly mention (Matt) I think is coming to talk to you this afternoon about the GNSO review, so I don't think I need to say much about it apart from the council has formed as GNSO review working party and I think they're registrars reps probably on there as well that are working with staff on preparations for the review which is expected to kick off on the first of July. And their focus at the moment is looking at questions for the 360 assessment that will be part of the review process.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Marika, just one question there on this GNSO review. There was an announcement made last night I believe that a company had been contracted by ICANN, so I'm just a little bit confused. I mean on the one hand it's something that you're asking the community to work on and then the other hand you're outsourcing it. So could you clarify that please?

Marika Konings: Yes. And this is Marika. And (Matt) can provide all the rest, I don't know who's coming this afternoon, and he can give you more details. It's an independent examiner, so it was seen as part of a review process that will be an independent examiner that would be responsible for conducting the review but, you know, working closely with the community for example on identifying the questions for 360.

And an independent review I think will also, you know, review any kind of materials that groups may send, you know, him, her, them, that people believe are helpful to review as, you know, they assess at the GNSO. I think it also foresees potential interviews with people. So it's really a review of the independent examiner which I think based on all the information that they've review and assess will provide recommendations that then will go back to the ICANN board which then will turn them back to the GNSO and say look this is what, you know, we conclude on the review and these are our recommendations to you, now please go and implement.

But I think as well that and those are some of the conversations as well of course, nothing will prevent the GNSO to either, you know, respond to the findings of the independent examiner or even, you know, conduct its own review in parallel. And that is one of the things that is being considered to have another set of data points to compare it to what the independent examiner may find.

So I think it's very important to take into account that it's not intended to be a one-way street. You know, whatever this independent examiner finds will be

seen as the truth and, you know, everyone will need to follow what it says. I think there's a - it has been made very clear as well that this is as well intended to be a dialogue and, you know, giving the GNSO as well opportunities to, you know, provide feedback and respond or challenge anything that may come out of it.

And I think that was my last slide. So again I mean this is just a snapshot. There are, you know, quite a few other efforts that are ongoing. The GNSO website has a lot information. If you just want, you know, a quick overview of what's going on, I would recommend that you review the GNSO project list. That's something that we update prior to every GNSO council meeting. I think it's a four or five page document that has just as a snapshot all the different initiatives that are going, in which stage of the process they are, you know, what are some of the next milestones, where can you find more information. So that may be a good starting point if you do want further information.

Now as you know, it's not only me on the GNSO team. Several of my other colleagues are, you know, supporting these efforts, so whenever you have any questions or comments, you know, feel free to reach out to us either, you know, by e-mail or if you see us here and we'll do our best to respond.

Woman: Marika, thank you for joining us today, appreciate it. Any other questions at this time? Comments? Anybody (unintelligible)? I'd like to make the announcement that the registrar stakeholder group is celebrating their 15th anniversary. In light of that we have cake and lunch so we invite you all to join us for that, and we are going to discuss and prepare for the ICANN board session.

Michele Neylon: And just a reminder, lunch is for registrar stakeholder group members first and we are also inviting the (unintelligible) team to join us. If there are leftovers and you're in the room, that's fine, but our members have paid for this out of our budget so they do get first dibs, just so we're clear.

Woman: Thank you, Michele.

Woman: Hello, everyone. We're going to get started in the next ten minutes in reviewing the proposed board topics.

Michele Neylon: There is cake down the back, boys and girls. There is cake down the back.

Is Jeff Eckhaus in the room? Okay. Jeff, the - one of the topics for the board, general public outreach activities, proposed policies impacting registrars, was that yours? No. Okay.

Woman: Was that yours? Jeff, was that yours? And I just recall an e-mail string where your name was on it. I apologize for that. I'm trying to recall which one that was but I'll come up with something on that one.

Michele Neylon: Okay so I have (unintelligible)

Woman: Yes. So if we - we should start.

Michele Neylon: Well hold on. (Unintelligible)

Woman: This is the working lunch section till 1:30.

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible)

Woman: Yes.

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible)

Woman: But we didn't start the recording.

Michele Neylon: We don't need it.

Woman: We don't need the recording. Okay. So we don't need the recording at this time. Thanks, everyone for returning. We're going to take the next ten minutes to prepare for the board presentation or the board meeting with the registrar stakeholder group. We've got the list of topics up on the screen as you can see. We have submitted the topics at this point in time except for number six, but we can speak to that one because that was just brought to my attention.

Michele Neylon: What is number six?

Woman: Number six...

Michele Neylon: I can't see because I'm half blind.

Woman: Should we go down...

Michele Neylon: Is that RAA or RRA?

Woman: RRA, revision process. This stems from recent registries submitting revisions but not including the entire document, having a comment period. Okay. So I recommend that we start from the top and work our way down through these items so the members are aware and can express their opinions and inputs prior to the meeting with the board.

So the first one is along the lines of accountability. This was proposed to us I think in conjunction with the ICANN IANA transition as it relates to checks and balances and measures with auditing and such within ICANN, and we proposed that James would speak on this topic, Michele?

Michele Neylon: I'm sorry. Think about this - the way, just to explain I think just at a higher level the way this normally works, we have a meeting with the board which lasts for about an hour. Generally speaking the best use of that time is to talk about very high level topics, not just kind of getting down to the weeds on

operational things, because if you start talking about operational things, they're just going to defer it back to (Akram) or (Cyrus). And we already had (Akram) and (Cyrus) in here this morning, and if there are things that should have been raised with (Akram) and (Cyrus) this morning that weren't raised well that's fine, but we can raise that in other ways.

What we should be doing is focusing on the kind of real high level -- what's the word I'm looking for -- can I just say high level, is that okay?

Woman: Strategic.

Michele Neylon: Strategic, thank you, strategic type stuff. So at the moment the topics - well these are the topics that we've put to the board. The way that this works is that we normally have to submit the topics to them about a week or so in advance. Generally we miss the deadline but we do get it to them at least a day in advance. So the topics, the ones that are there, are pretty much the kind of higher importance, higher interest topics that a lot of the - a lot of groups are talking about at this meeting.

So accountability is an obvious one. We were thinking that maybe Mr. Bladel could speak to that. But if there's somebody else here who would like to speak to this, please don't be shy. And thousands died in the rush, okay. Well you never know, I live and hope. I'm waiting for the day, you know, (Kelly) or somebody kind of jumps on one of these topics. She's giving me...okay. I'll keep trying.

So anyway for now anyway we have Mr. Bladel. We volunteered him for this even though he's not in the room. On the underserved regions which we've - we spoke about earlier this morning, does anybody want to speak on that? (Jennifer) has suggested that she would do so, that she's going to lead that discussion because she feels very passionately about it.

Woman: Anybody is welcome to join me on this topic or any others listed. The LAA success metrics, this is a topic that we've prompted (Elliott) to bring in the Singapore discussion at the Singapore meeting and in order to keep his notable points on the record and made the board aware, we've asked him to speak on this topic as well, and I believe (Graham) and Michele are going to provide him some additional input and data here. If anybody else has any input on this topic, please speak now or you can speak to (Graham) one on one.

(Graham): Yes so we -- sorry this is (Graham) -- we collected a bunch of stats from as many registrars as we could -- thank you to those who participated, boo on you who did not -- around how many domains had been suspended because of the registrant verification process. We've committed to sharing these numbers with the board in Singapore when we got them together. We're thinking about doing that now. We need to be relatively strategic with this number because it's important how we release it and how the community thinks about it.

So if anybody is opposed to sharing the number of suspended domains with the board this afternoon, you should raise your hand and give us some perspective on that. Otherwise I think we're going to move forward with that.

Michele Neylon: And also bear in mind that if you didn't share any data with us for this exercise, you're opinion on not sharing the data or not is going to be kind of glared upon by (Graham) I can tell. He's going to glower at you.

(Graham): I'll have my fierce Canadian scowl.

Michele Neylon: Yes sorry, his fierce Canadian scowl, because a Canadian scowl is different to any other kind of scowl, obviously. You know, this is something that we raised in the past because if you remember the thing that Marika was talking about before lunch about this concept of fact-based policy development as opposed to fluffy stuff being pulled out of people's ears, as we say in English,

the verification validation stuff that is imposed on us in the 2013 contract, it's not like something that we definitely did not ask for, it's something that I know quite a few of you feel very strongly about. And as a result of this, we know that quite a few of you have had to suspend quite a few domains.

I have a sneaky suspicion that Mr. (Golding) has an opinion. Please, Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Have you managed to break that stack down into legitimately disabling domains, i.e. because the data provided really was perhaps on a level that the registry could be contacted versus domains which have been, you know, broad brushed turned off because of time you have to respond or because the registrar decided one day that they're going to give every single registrant 15 days to renew that, to update their details before they blanket turn them off.

(Graham): The short answer is no. It's just all domains that went into suspension.

Robert Hoggarth: So we've got no way of saying at one point 6% of the domains suspended are for legitimate suspension reasons.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: We came up -- sorry, I'll just explain how this was handled -- this was discussed at the meeting with the board in Singapore. I know some of you were here, some of you weren't. So I'm just going to assume that you weren't. After that meeting (Graham), myself, James and a couple of others kind of thrashed around a few things and (Graham) came up with a simple enough template, an Excel spreadsheet template, that was kind of acceptable to anybody provides any input on this.

Part of the problem that we did identify is that while some of you know exactly - might know exactly how many domains have suspended or something like that, you might not be tracking other data points. So we're trying to actually

get something which everybody could agree on, were data points that you all have. Because I know that you personally go out and get your registrants' blood types, Rob, I mean we have discussed this.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes well, you know, how else are you supposed to prove that they were the ones that really sent that e-mail unless you take DNA every time they click send.

Michele Neylon: Exactly, exactly. I mean how else do you sell their data for, what was it, 27 pounds?

Robert Hoggarth: That's the figure (unintelligible).

(Graham): I also don't think it particularly matters how or why a domain was suspended, it's just, you know, domains are going into suspension. It's a big problem. There's lots of them. Segmenting them out by good or bad is not the point. All of these domains are innocent until proven guilty, and we have yet to see any guilt.

Michele Neylon: Microphone, Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: I like the innocent until proven guilty analogy. That's good.

Michele Neylon: Yes I mean the thing is this, what we're looking at here is at a very, very high level I know we'll get pushback from LEA, GAC on this because they won't like it, I mean they really won't, but, you know, the kind of question at a very simplistic level is has this had a tangible impact on (unintelligible) type of bad behavior here be that how we're fishing spam, (unintelligible) in general, crime, whatever.

And I'm sure, I mean if Interpol or the FBI or somebody was able to turn up in L.A. with metrics on this, then we'd all have to shut up I suppose but, you know.

Robert Hoggarth: Right. The measurable benefit was (unintelligible) were promised to make a measurable difference. (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Rob, I know that this is going to come as a shock to you but public floggings aren't legal in most countries.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Within the U.K.

Man: I'm sorry. We were also told, were we not, that we were going to get those stats in South Africa and they were being monitored so this is us kind of coming back saying, where's our stats? Where are yours?

Woman: (Jonathon)?

Man: (Unintelligible) is taking the microphone.

Man: Thank you. So one thing I'd want to say just to think about when we're saying this at the LEA scores and metrics and something that I have brought up to this group about amend the process.

I mean is the thought process here? Why we're asking for the scores and the metrics because if not, we want to try and back this out.

Man: Because if not it's just complaining.

Man: Well I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Go ahead (Jenny). Ladies first.

(Jenny): Thank you. This is (Jenny). I thought the thought process was being that we create mechanisms that LEA comes back with something that says whether they can measure it or not measure. And if they can't because they provide statistics to (HAL) by measuring it.

But for the registrars to come up with a way to have a more efficient and effective process rather than what's the language in the agreement versus the intent and something that we can attempt to modify, that's in the best interest of the registrars and in the best interest of the registrar.

Man: Okay. I'm a little confused but (Kelly), you were, did you say you wanted to speak after her or...

(Kelly): I mean I'll let (Kelly) go first. I think we all have slightly different views on this. I mean personally, (unintelligible). Chair's prerogative. I think maybe it wouldn't be a, it wouldn't be about ideas, I mean the cross-field verification language we would like to, you know, to back and choose as a concept.

And if we're already able to show that what has been done to-date has had negligible, zero, positive impact, I mean we always get plenty of negative impact. If we can show something on those lines or whatever, then I think that strengthens certain arguments.

Man: Which argument because, you know, in the...

((Crosstalk))

Man: But it's, it could be but, you know, it's a trap. You know, it could be this, the numbers aren't good so now we need cross-field validation because it wasn't effective so now we need more. I would just be careful of what we say and what we, what we're asking for.

Just, I think, I won't say it's (unintelligible) with you. Just say that we have those changes in mind if we don't see any metrics or anything there because at this point, you know, I have a feeling that the number's going to come back that it's successful.

No matter what, if it's reality or not it's going to come back as a success so we should just think about that in mind walking into this. That it could be used again as sort of a push for the cross-field validation which I agree, it's something that I would love to have removed.

Man: I think part of the stuff we discussed in Singapore said about one of the things to bring this was we all kind of said this wouldn't have much effect in advance and we didn't feel we were listened to. And we want to kind of make that point. Please listen to us next time.

Man: I think that's actually a great point. Hopefully we do make sure we bring that up just to let people know that we are the ones who speak to registrars. We're the people on the ground.

Man: Yes and I think that's a great point. And hopefully, that's something that we do bring up to them.

Man: And hopefully that's what this should prove. Please talk or listen to us. We weren't just being belligerent. We actually had what we think is a good, correct opinion and now here, we're trying to prove it and we're happy to listen if you can prove it's wrong. But otherwise, please listen next time.

Woman: Jeff I have to think through that. Referencing the transcript as we did the last time during the, was it the (Durbin) meeting where (Bonnie) stated that he wouldn't ask the registrars to do any additional processes to work until the (unintelligible) in the groups would come back with some success metrics.

Man: Mm-hmm.

Woman: It's a point that we want to continue to drive home with them.

Man: Okay. And it's me. I just want to make sure we're all on point when we bring it up to them that we have the message clear because I'm just worried that they may be using it against us to introduce further validation and further measures. I guess, that's all. Thank you.

Man: Mr. Brueggerman.

Jeff Brueggerman: Yes I mean I think it's important that they, the correct roadblocks are there to stop having to extend this into making sure we phone every registrar in (Hampton). They, you know, really do answer that phone number. Write a letter to them to make sure that, you know, post is delivered. Run round there and make sure that they really are their children that they put on, you know, deposit to be, you know, executed in the case they have sent the spam and so on and so forth.

So unless we get these positive metrics and that proves that patients had an actual impact of things that we were promised, we need to make sure this doesn't (unintelligible) into making us do even more work that isn't going to make any difference.

Man: Thanks. Does anybody else have any thoughts on this particular topic? (Christian)?

(Christian): No.

Man: Okay. That's okay.

Woman: On topic number 4, the general public outreach activities and then the example, the proposed policies impacting registrar. General public outreach activities that pulls from the string and which we were discussing support for

registrars in the EU and the hiring to make sure that we had the 24 by 7 support. That's something that we want to...

((Crosstalk))

Woman ...kind of reached an agreement on that one.

((Crosstalk))

Man: We spoke to...

Woman: (Cyrus)

Man: ...(Cyrus) (unintelligible). I know that, I believe he's 100% happy with where they're going with that but I think, personally I don't think raising it at the Board at the moment is going to be particularly productive.

I mean sure we can but they're probably going to punt back to that (unintelligible). (Rob).

(Rob): Yes.

Man: I can see, look, I can see the cocks turning. Go on.

Man: We've been told that they're, you know, extending into Turkey and getting staff. I don't think asking (unintelligible) to say something we've already been told is going to help. (Joey).

Woman: Next topic being the (unintelligible) of transition.

Man: Okay. One exciting topic. Are you on transition everybody? (Mexican wave). So, okay. Who did you say was...

Woman: You and (James) can pick from number one? Number five?

Man: Okay. Does anybody else have any feelings about this? (Ben)?

(Ben): No.

Man: Okay. Have you all been kind of following this transition thing? Some of you have sort of, maybe, perhaps, a little, a little. Okay, anybody bored with the topic already?

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay. Anybody really excited about the topic? For the record, nobody moved when I asked that question. Yes, okay. Oh, sorry, oh, (Mohammed) is excited about us. Okay. So we'll let, we'll let Mr. (Blidell) talk about that at length.

And the last topic...

Woman: Last topic was proposed to me during the break. So we added it here but it's not on the Board agenda that's been submitted already which is around RA revision process as it relates to registries submitting changes, the registrars are seeking and we've discussed this with (unintelligible) and team. The registrars are seeking the full, complete RA as well as the red lines and not just the addendums that incorporate the changes from registries.

So the item to be discussed here was around process in which they're submitted, period in which the registrars can review, provide comments but there seems to be a period in which they're absent and we're to allow the registry to modify based upon that comment period.

Man: So who are you suggesting would lead this topic?

Woman: Was talking to (Walker) and (Tom Keller) regarding this topic. If we have time, as I said, it's not currently on the agenda.

Man: Okay, so there's a German double-team.

Man: Oh, no, no, no. There's nothing wrong with that. That's perfectly okay. It's a statement of fact. I mean, you know, (Christian), you're so excited about today I think you should probably take all these topics as well but, maybe not.

(Christian): No, I just wanted to use your energy.

Man: Mr. (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: I just, on that last point, I know we did, I'm still not sure how that one has not kicked back down to (Christa Ogram) and as an operational piece and what do we expect as the ICANN Board of Directors to do on this?

That's, I don't see this as being something for the ICANN Board. I think we can go to Fahd and Akram and (Cyrus) and (Christa) but I don't see this as a Board issues.

I mean even if we have time for it, I'd rather just depart early than put this up because they'll just say, what do you want to do about this? We've seen that in the past.

Man: True. Anybody else have any thoughts on this?

Man: I agree. It probably will be kicked off of the Board's...

Man: Okay, if we think this is something which isn't appropriate for the Board, if people feel strongly about that, well let's just, you know, let's deal with it using

another method. I mean, you know, we can reach out to them. We can email them. We can write to them. Whatever.

Woman: I see it as being incorporated into the registry, registrar joint session this afternoon.

Man: Okay.

Man: Second it.

Man: Gentlemen with the scarf.

(Neil): Hi it's (Neil) (unintelligible). I mean I'm, for us, we think it's a big deal, right. So obviously we get these RA's to look at, review. Obviously (unintelligible) and say hey, I'm willing to take this registry on or I'm not willing to.

As soon as you've signed it and they start coming with amendments, in theory you asked (unintelligible) not signing any amendments. But once you've got a few thousand names in your system that makes it almost impossible to do, right.

So for us, when (Tom) brought the topic up, for us it's mostly about how's this processed and if, well, if the Board is aware that it really has a purpose and affects our customers and if there's another way that these third-contracting parties can say the registrars can play some part in that rather than just getting the final amendment and not having to like it or lump it effectively.

Woman: Yes. Any others that are not on this list? Any comments? Questions before we move on?

Man: Is (Matt Astrami) here yet?

Man: Yes.

Man: Okay.

Man: Okay. Because I, we, I'm (unintelligible) a brief thing for them on the (unintelligible) review.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Woman: We welcome you to come.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Lisa Gernic): Good afternoon. This is (Lisa Gernic). I'm part of ICANN's staff. And I'm here to give you a brief update on the GNSO Review. I'd like to provide you an update on scope and the approach for the review, talk about the timeline, give you a progress to-date and brief you on the community outreach and engagement process that's underway.

But the GNSO Review, this is part of the bylaws mandated reviews to take place under five year cycle. And the GNSO Review is actually the first of the structural reviews that is now having its second review cycle.

The scope of the review is focused on examining organizational effectiveness of the GNSO and its various structures. And as a starting point for this review, there will be a considering to prior review's recommendations looking at how those recommendations were implemented, the impact that they've had and how effective the implementation has been.

Part of the review will also look at the purpose of each structure, it's accountability, will look at the way each structure is organized and how it encourages diverse participation. We'll look at the execution of its core means of getting the work done.

There's been quite a lot of questions about whether the scope will include structural changes so there's been clarification provided from the structural improvement committee of the Board that provides oversight over the bylaws reviews.

So the review, will, in fact, include an assessment of the effectiveness of the structural changes that resulted from the last review along with all the assessments of all the other recommendations that were implemented as a result of the review.

If structural changes are, in fact, needed, it's, those changes will be considered for discussion after their GNSO Review is finalized depending on what those findings are and that would be taken up during the implementation planning phase.

As a summary of the process, the GNSO Review will have four different elements associated with it. The GNSO Review working party is a group of individuals that's been designated by the GNSO council to serve as a liaison between the GNSO, the independent examiner which was the announcement that took place yesterday. It will be (Westlake) governance that will conduct the independent review. And the GNSO working party will also serve as a liaison with the structural improvements committee.

The independent examiner will work based on scope of work that was part of the (unintelligible) process and the work methods will include a 360 assessment which is an online survey that will go out to the entire community and look for input from the GNSO community as well as all the other SOs and ACs aboard the staff and community and a whole in addition to the online

survey, which is a 360 assessment. There will be an examination of documentation of records and reports, integration of the work of HRT2 as well as interviews, one-on-one interviews with the community to supplement the work methods of the independent examiner.

As far as the roles and responsibilities, structural review committee has the responsibility for the overall oversight of the reviews. They confirm the examiner. They will receive the report and make recommendations to the Board and they will also receive the implementation plans and approve those.

From the staff perspective, staff was involved in developing the (unintelligible) and supporting the selection of the independent examiner, developing the criteria as well as the 360 assessment mechanism and will be involved in preparing the implementation plan along with their GNSO working party.

The independent examiner will conduct the examination, will conduct the 360 assessment, summarize the information and the result and conduct interviews, integrate HRT2 recommendations as they're relevant and prepare the report and findings.

The review working party, as I said already, first as a liaison will provide feedback on the questions included in the 360 assessment. The criteria for the examination will help coordinate the interviews and make sure that the independent examiner covers a broad base of individuals during their interview process.

And this is the team that will also provide clarifications and rebuttals to the preliminary findings and recommendations and finally prepare the implementation plan.

As far as the timeline is concerned, the review started this week with the announcement of (Westlake) governance as the independent examiner. And substantive work will be conducted between July and November. Public

comment period is expected to take place between November and January with the wrap-up of the final report in early part of the year, January, February.

After that, the implementation phase will begin which is expected to start in March of 2016 and go for about a year at which point the implemented changes would be operationalized and the next cycle would begin after 2018.

So that's a very rough timeline. To-date, 20 member representing 7 groups have been participating in the GNSO working party work. They've had weekly calls. (Jen Wolf) is the one chairing this particular group.

The group has been providing feedback on the 360 assessment and we invite everybody here to take a look at the draft of questions and the methods being proposed and provide your feedback and ideas to the GNSO working party as they finalize the questions and the methods.

Community outreach and engagement is really important so we want to make sure that the work of the independent examiner is based on broad and diverse data that's collected that's representative of different points of view from the community.

So there are some brochures that have been circulated through this group. We have information available in multiple languages posted on the GNSO Review.

(Unintelligible) and certainly would welcome any feedback as well as spreading the word about the work of the GNSO Review working parties. There's some information here for the different ways that people have an opportunity to provide feedback on the GNSO Review including direct interaction with working parties, responding to the 360 assessment which will be announced in July, providing feedback to the independent examiners through the interview process, responding to the public comment process

which will be launched later during the review, as well as providing comments directly to the structural improvements committee and of course, through staff.

I will leave you with some information about the resources that are available to provide additional information and ways to engage with this process. And that concludes my presentation.

Man: Thank you. So does anybody have any questions, comments, feedback, queries? Nobody has any questions? (Christian), you're happy?

(Christian): Yes.

Man: Okay, for the record (Christian) says he's happy. When he's not happy in a week's time, please remind him. Okay, thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

END