

**Transcription ICANN London  
Registries Stakeholder Group  
Tuesday 24 June 2014  
Afternoon Session (Part 4)**

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. On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>  
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Keith Drazek: Okay, so we're going to - I would love to have a conversation about that last session, particularly anybody's views on what you heard. Maybe we can just spend five minutes or ten minutes, just any sort of feedback or thoughts or next steps that we ought to look at.

You know, (Ken) had some suggestions about, you know, some concrete steps that we could take to, you know, give very specific recommendations for increased accountability. I think Bret did a good job in identifying a specific case that could serve, you know, that could, you know, be adjusted or amended.

But I just want to, you know, get people's feedback on that conversation that we just heard. And then we'll move to the discussion about 7.7. Anybody want to jump in? Bret go ahead.

Bret Fausett: Yes, I just want to underscore the point you just made because I talked to (Fadi) afterwards. And building on all of this comment in this session, they really want something more specific than accountability.

They actually want us to propose accountability measures, which I think we should accepted the invitation and go ahead and try to think it. You know, let's design where we want to go. And then try to navigate in that direction. So let's give them something concrete.

Keith Drazek: (Paul) then (Chuck).

Paul Diaz: Bret, did he give you any sense - on our agenda I was going to raise ATRT2 issues. You know, it's kind of frustrating to me that across the community, through that mechanism and through the comments, a lot of thought, a lot of effort went into very clear things that ICANN can do to improve its accountability transparency.

Under the AoC, staff is supposed to present an implementation plan. Fix thoughts after they're of course due, so by June 30. We understand - I've heard repeatedly that the board will approve/accept the recommendations that implies that the staff has presented upon, but we've seen nothing.

So all this talk about, you know, what else could we do. Help us think about it. What about all the things that have been done? There seems to be a tremendous disconnect between the community and staff on this issue now. And I mean any insights that you've heard, either private conversations or on the Council?

Bret Fausett: No. And it didn't come up in my conversation with (Fadi). And he doesn't, and remember, he and his staff don't have a lot of institutional history. And he had no idea about the history that I recounted in the meeting. That was all new to him, and he wanted to hear more about it.

So, I mean the AOC work is actually ongoing. And he, you know, ought to know more about that. But we may have to educate him on some of the conversations that are currently taking place.

Paul Diaz: And it's particularly frustrating because Steve Crocker was on ATRT2. And he was a very active member, contributed a lot of good thinking. And where is he? Where do we stand and when will the community understand how staff intends to go forward?

Keith Drazek: Next call, (Chuck).

Chuck Gomes: Hi. I do believe that they have said that they're going to respond to ATRT2 in this meeting. And I don't know what that means (Paul). But in Singapore, in the session on ATRT2, I pointed out to (Steve) and (Brian) who were running that session that their plan - the things they had mapped out there for ATRT2 responses didn't say anything about the ATRT1 recommendations, ten of which, about half, were not completed.

So we need to keep our eyes open to make sure that they not only address the new recommendations, but the ten that weren't completed yet. Now that's not why I originally wanted to talk.

With regard to taking up their challenge, (Bret), for - do you want to jump in before I finish my comment? Okay. If you want to talk about ATRT2, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Very briefly (Chuck), but thank you very much. I mean essentially I think where we're going to get to is perhaps a series of specific requirements. And the first two of those specifics should be - could be complete ATRT1, complete ATRT2. And then boom, boom, boom.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jonathan). Now (Chuck) again. With regard to the challenge to give them the specifics, that's exactly what should come out of the cross community working group.

One of the early things I think in that group hopefully, I mean obviously there's - the charter group is going to work unless, so yes, but some principles which I think will be easy.

But the second thing will be specific ideas for accountability majors that can be considered and evaluated and then worked on. So I don't know whether

its - we need to do it separately, but we should feed into that the ideas that we have.

Obviously if that doesn't fly for some reason -- I hope that's not the case, but if it didn't then we would need to do that separately. But that's really what should come out of that cross community working group. And then they'll zero down on them and give specific recommendation.

Jonathan Robinson: To follow on from that then (Chuck). It's (Jonathan). I mean I suppose the next question we have is a related point. Let me - there are three things really. The requirement for specifics, because if we don't have specifics it's very easy for the counter, both tactically and actually practically and realistically to say well, if you don't have specifics how can you expect us to be - have a dependency on them.

You need - so you're right. The specifics need to come out. The question is where are those specifics going to come out? Hopefully they come out of the cross community working group's work.

And I'm - the question of scope and what does the charter cover. And then the other point is what about the finish to - that's in public comments at the moment, the ICANN initiative on accountability? And how do we deal with that? Because (Fadi) just said to Bret and said to all of us, well that's open.

And he's even use our terms. It's interesting. They've begun to see things like working group. It's a working group. Then our (stuff) it says, it's a classic - either it's an accident or it's a political tactic where you start to absorb the terminology of that's what you seem to be in some way in opposition to what you're doing. So I mean that's a question.

Chuck Gomes: So (Chuck) again. (Jonathan), you raise something that's really critical. I know (Paul) is going to bring this up later. But we have comments that have

been developed. (Stephanie), is she here? (Stephanie), great. She did great comments.

And a couple of us have commented on those. And we need to - we don't have a very much time to finalize those and approve it them. So that will come up later in that. But we really do need to get those comments in. Nice job. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So just a very brief final response. And I think the challenge for us as a stakeholder group and in some ways at the Council level is just making sure that these sort of (cokes) intertwine because it's potentially confusing for any or all of us how to make sure all of this nicks together properly.

You know, we're giving comments to ICANN, suggestions. We're having initiatives of our own. You know, we've got the IANA transition drafting team. And does that cover our requirements or accountabilities sufficiently?

So it's important that we just (bake) coordinate some. And that's the challenge I guess for Council and stakeholder group leadership and to some extent all of us.

Man: And then GNSO Council chair.

Liz Finberg: For the record Liz Finberg. Just to follow up (Jonathan) on the comment that you made. I mean I think, you know, this idea of co-opting in each other's vocabulary. But I found very interesting was about what happened in the next room was that, at least in my mind when we were talking about the IANA transition and accountability, we were talking, quite clearly to me, about structural, a structural mechanism.

A body or a series of processes, right, that would build a (stock) app that will be - that will no longer exist when NTIA steps away. And (Fadi)'s reaction and

what we ended up talking about was really, it just seemed far more personal and ad hominem, right?

Oh, you know, I can't drive my car because I'm not awake enough. So, you know, maybe we just have to be really specific. And I know Keith, at the end, was sure to say structural accountability.

But I think it's really easy and maybe it's a political tactic and maybe not. But the ideas get really mushy. And I think we have to be really clear about what it is we're asking for. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: This is (Chuck) again, if I can jump in on that. And we have to be really careful, precise on our terms. Notice how he uses them - (Jeff) - (Jeff)'s not here now, is he?

But, you know, (Jeff) didn't mean what he was translating. He didn't mean not doing any work on that. You know, so we have to be really careful and precise on our words because he will misuse them.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, thanks very much. And, you know, sort of on that last point I think, you know, he clearly objected to the term prerequisite. So we probably need to take that away and come up with something more precise as it relates to, you know, sort of what we mean by that intent, or what, you know, what we're intending.

He also objected to the term backstop, or the so-called backstop at the very end there. And that's language that actually came from NTIA. So I mean he's clearly picking out certain words and trying to push back.

I'm also very troubled by his assertion that there are, you know, these groups in the community or people in this room who are object, you know, who object or oppose this transition happening.

I think that's really, really dangerous language. You know, he said, well there's people in this room. I won't point them out, but they're here among us. You know, I think that's really troubling.

And, you know, (Jeff) sort of put his hand up and said hey, (New Star) was one of the first apps to support this. It's not us right? And I mean I can say definitively, very clearly, concretely right here that (Verisign) is supportive of this transition, provided that there is meaningful accountability reform.

I think, I mean I think basically what I've said so far this week is pretty clear on that. And so I really am concerned about the language that he's using. And maybe there are individuals or groups or companies or whatever that are opposed to this ever happening. But I can tell you, we're not one of them.

Chuck Gomes: So can I take that further? (Chuck) again. Would you raise your hand if you're opposed to it? I wanted to know who they were.

Keith Drazek: So anyway, okay well thanks for - sorry go ahead (Jonathan). Sorry, my eyes are failing me.

Jonathan Robinson: We're not opposed to it. But I agree with you that it's really troubling that, I mean if we were opposed or if anyone else in this room were opposed to it, whether it's the company or anything else, this is a community view.

And their job is to take our input and implemented, not to drive community views. And so I mean I think we should be free to be opposed to it, even if we're not. And I'm troubled all of you.

Keith Drazek: I think that's a great point. Ray go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Yes, and to your point too, this is Ray Fassett., is what he was trying - what (Fadi) was referring to is there are some that want to keep the status quo. And I have not heard anybody say they want to keep the status quo.

What I'm hearing is that we are looking for improved accountability mechanisms as part of the NTIA transition. That is not somebody who wants to keep the status quo. So I'm not sure where that's coming from.

I really do - I just figured out who someone is - ICANN.

Keith Drazek: So okay, well we probably ought to wrap that up. And, absolutely. Go right ahead. Do you have a microphone?

Ken Stubbs: I think I can imagine who he was pointing out. (Up to here), at the (NetMundial) meeting, there was very, very strong position by Milton Mueller and many other people from the - from (unintelligible) society saying that the ICANN accountability will not exist if there is not accountable to NTIA.

It was said there. And so I think he's pointing to that point. And my perception I mean was, my own perception is saying that in looking at the say, we started accountability from ICANN, it was answering to that (unintelligible) meeting. And he - so I think - so that is a view. The people who are pointed out.

Keith Drazek: Thank you. Anybody else want to jump in before we wrap up? Okay. So is (Matt Ashianti) here from ICANN? Okay, all right so let's move now to the discussion that (John) proposed on the list over the last couple of days. The discussion about the possibility of initiating the process...

Man: Sorry (Keith), (Larissa) is here. And I think she has talked to the GNSO review...

Keith Drazek: Okay, yes please. Then we'll get to 7.7. Sorry (John), false start, false start, false start.

(Larissa Gurlick): Good afternoon, this is (Larissa Gurlick). I'm here to provide you with an update on the GNSO review. Next slide please. I know what the time is limited, so real quickly I'd like to touch on the review scope and approach. Talk about the timeline, review progress to date and talk about the importance of community outreach and engagement. Next slide please.

For the scope of the (EU), the examination, you know, and tended to look at organizational effectiveness of the GNSO and its structures. The starting point will be to consider prior review recommendations, look at how they were implemented, what impacts they've had and how effective the implementation has been.

The review will consider process and accountability of the different structures. How each structure is organized and encourage its participation. And will consider the means of getting the work done by each of the GNSO structures. Next please.

There's been quite a lot of discussion and question about what is within scope of the review and the structural improvements committee, which oversees the implementation of the reviews that are mandated by the ICANN bylaws, provided some clarification.

So the review will include an assessment of the effectiveness of the structural changes that resulted from the last review, along with the assessment of how all the recommendations have been implemented.

If structural changes are needed as a result of going through the review process that would be considered as a topic for discussion after the GNSO review is finalized and possibly would be considered during the implementation planning. But at this stage we are just beginning the review. And there is certainly no predetermination of what the outcome will be. Next slide please.

This review is the first one of all the bylaw mandated reviews that's actually entering its second cycle. So the process will be a little bit different. And it we're looking to bring some improvement and streamlining into the process. And certainly it will play itself out through these various components.

The GNSO review working party has been assembled. And it includes about 20 people representing seven of the groups within the GNSO to serve as a liaison between the GNSO, the independent examiner and the structural improvements committee.

And that this is intended to ensure that the voids of the GNSO community and the particular needs and the nuances, as well as the very specific ways that things were done gets incorporated in the process of conducting a review.

And so there is ongoing dialogue and coordination between the working party and the independent examiner. And I have another slide that will outline more specifically the roles and responsibilities.

The independent examiner has been selected through a competitive bidding process, which included responses from seven firms. It was announced yesterday actually. And it's West Lake Governance that has been appointed by the structural improvements committee to conduct the review based on the scope that I already discussed.

The work methods will include several things. First, the 360 style assessment, which is an online tool designed to collect feedback from a broad group of participants, including the G (unintelligible) others, SOs and ACs, as well as other groups at the board and the staff.

In addition to that there will be examination of the various documents, records and reports produced by the various GNSO structures. There will be -

information will be integrated from HRT to review of which looked at the effectiveness of the PDP process.

And finally, there will be interviews to supplement the other methods of collecting information to ensure that the independent examiner has a broad and complete view of how the GNSO structures work. Next slide please.

Let's keep going to the next slide in the interest of time. The roles and responsibilities, structural improvements committee of the board provides that the oversight over the review. They confirmed the appointment of the examiner.

They will accept the report and make recommendations to the board. And they will also make recommendations on the approval of the implementation plans towards the end of the process. Have conducted the RFP process, gathered the information in order to make recommendations for the examiner's selection.

Is developing criteria and the methodology for the 360 assessment, along with input from the working party. Will be managing their reporting process, the common process and the preparation of the implementation plan.

The independent examiner will actually conduct the examination, will conduct a 360 assessment, analyze the results and conduct interviews. Integrate the work from the HRT2 recommendations and prepare the report.

The review working party will provide feedback on the criteria, and actually has been very busy doing that over the course of the last few weeks. Developing questions for the 360 assessment and providing feedback on the most useful way to conduct that assessment to get broad participation.

Will assist in the coordination of the interviews. Will provide clarification once preliminary findings are available and will be responsible for the preparation of the implementation plans. Next slide please.

Timeline -- the last several months have been spent in the planning phase. The review has officially kicked off yesterday with the announcement of the independent examiner and is expected to go through January or February 2015.

Next phase will be implementation. And depending on the nature of the recommendations and the implementation plan, this phase is expected to last for about a year, at which point the implementation of the recommendations begins to be operationalize.

Towards the end of that cycle there would be a self-assessment, at which point the cycle would begin all over again after December of 2018, or in the future. Next slide please.

I already spoke to the progress to date. So the GNSO review working party has been quite busy providing feedback and assisting (GEM). Wolf is leading that effort, and we've been working very closely with that that team. Staff has been working very closely with that team.

Online survey tools -- the development of that. Making sure that it's user friendly, and making sure that it's easy and reaches out to a diverse group of participants is really the next area of focus. Next slide please.

Community outreach and engagement activities are quite important to make sure that there is broad participation. So we really invite everybody to provide feedback into this process in a variety of different ways.

And from the staff per perspective, we plan to support this effort with a number of activities designed to reach out to the community. Next slide please.

There's various opportunities to participate, whether it's for the individuals or other groups or the SOs and ACs. And here you see the various channels. Providing feedback to the GNSO review working party, actually participating in the assessment, getting engaged with the independent examiner through the interview process and of course, public comment as well as any comments are welcome to be submitted to the structural improvements committee or to staff. Next slide please.

This concludes my comments. You can see information - you can see links to where information is available. There's also a brochure that is being distributed here in London that includes all this information, as well as frequently asked questions and answers to help clarify more details about this review. Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: If I can jump in here a second. This is (Chuck). I want to thank (Larissa) and complement her on the work she's doing in this - with this working party. I've been very impressed with the commitment she has and the expertise she has been contributing to this and supporting us. So thanks.

Berry Cobb: Okay. There was a question in the chat. I think you mentioned that the independent examiner had been assigned. Can you restate who that was?

(Larissa Gurlick): Sure. It's West Lake Governance Limited.

Berry Cobb: Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Barry). (Mason) and then (Jonathan).

Mason Cole: Thanks (Chuck), I mean (Keith). So I want to echo (Chuck)'s comment on the good work that you've done so far. I have a question, I mean as a former GNSO Councilor.

On one of your slides you had corrective action that would be taken it looked like immediately after the implementation time. I think it's up a little more. There you go. So corrective action is a March 2015, which is right after the February 2015 conclusion of the implementation plan. What exactly does corrective action mean and why would be so soon after the implementation?

(Larissa Gurlick): Yes, thanks for pointing that out. Probably not as clearly articulated as what was intended by it. It's the implement - it's the discussion of what correction - corrective action might be needed based on the recommendations and planning for the implementations.

So it's identifying what that corrective action would be, integrating it into plans and budgets and beginning the implementation process. It's really implementation action I would say.

Mason Cole: Okay, all right thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much. Any other questions? (Jonathan) right, sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Larissa). Just a quick question. I mean I guess I should - I'm slightly more distant, although I'm tracking the email I'm not as involved as (Chuck is). But it does seem like you're doing a very thorough job. And that's great to see.

West Lake, have they done some things similar? I mean it would be good for any of us who might want to benchmark something else? Have they done similar work for ICANN before?

(Larissa Gurlick): Yes. They've actually conducted two other reviews, two other bylaws reviews. One was the review of the ALAC. And one was the review of the RSAC, as well as they've been engaged in other work for ICANN that's not review-based.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you. Any other questions? (Larissa) thank you very much for coming in and presenting to us.

(Larissa Gurlick): Thank you all.

Keith Drazek: Okay with that, (John) over to you, 7.7.

Jon Nevett: Thanks (Keith). So those of us with new registry agreements from the 2012 round have the opportunity to negotiate an amendment through our agreements.

Just to give a little history, group volunteers last year starting in Beijing in April negotiated some changes to the registry agreements, some clarifications, some enhancements.

There was a negotiating team keeping the registry - at that point, actually it was the end tag because we were all applicants at that point, and that none of us have signed agreements, keeping the end tag and the registry stakeholder group abreast of what was going on.

There was - there were a series of changes that went through that negotiation process. But at the point we hadn't rolled out any TLDs yet. We had no operational experience in the new - with the new requirements.

We were stuck with some things politically and stuck with some things based on the applicant guidebook. But one change we did make was giving us the right to have this negotiation process triggered every year.

So if under 7.7a, either ICANN or the registry stakeholder group share can send a letter to the other party asking for a negotiation process for potential contract changes.

So my motion is that we do that. And we can do that starting next week on July 1, 2014. That date is fixed and everyone's agreements. It's not like - it doesn't matter when you sign your agreement.

And to the goal of that would be to explore with ICANN potential changes we would presumably - part of the motion was to convene a working group or whatever term we want to use, committee or whatever, to come up with potential changes that we want to ask for and then start negotiating with ICANN.

I mentioned in the email a couple of ideas. It could be - and I'm sure other people have ideas. I know (Pam) approached me with some ideas and (Rubin) had some ideas about what not to ask for, maybe what to ask for.

But that's the whole point of the process would be to come together and see if there are changes. Fees is an obvious one. I certainly raised the point today in name collision, now that we're all delayed 90 days, for anyone who's part of that name collision process, they haven't been delegated yet.

And so they haven't - they won't be able to do the alternative path. We're automatically delayed 90 days. We should not be paying ICANN fees during that 90 days. We can't even sell. I think that's an easy one. I don't even know if that needs to go through this process. I'd actually encourage everyone to send an email to ICANN right now asking for that.

But anyway, other fees issues might be something we could ask for. You know, what's the risk that came up in the email chain? ICANN could ask for things. But ICANN could ask for things anyway.

And under the process we have the right to reject it. ICANN has a right to reject it too. So our experience with ICANN in the last round is that they were somewhat reasonable in some things. They in fact changed the fee provision so that we don't have to pay upon contract signing, which was in the guidebook. But they extended it out to a delegation date, which saved a fair amount for our community.

There were other changes that we asked for that they agreed to. So I think the requirement is that they approach the negotiation in good faith. And I suspect that they would do so.

Again, they may ask for things that we may or may not like. And we could deal with them. We may like some of the changes they come up with. There might be clarifications that help us run our businesses, but I think it's worth the risk.

And for the other new TLD registries that this would apply to, because it doesn't apply to the ones that don't have this provision, I think that I would recommend that we go through the process and see how it works this time. And take it from there.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (John). So we have some extensive, well maybe not extensive, but we had some back and forth on the lists on this. So for those who have been following it, you know, we sort of started the discussion. But let's hear what people think about (John)'s suggestion.

I think it's certainly logical and sounds reasonable to me. But, you know, I think we need to, as I said on the list we need to think through any potential risks of sort of initiating such a process that's never been tested before. Maybe this is the right time to test it to kick it off. But just want to throw it out and get people's views on this so we can make a decision. (Chuck).

Chuck Gomes: If nobody else will jump in, I'll jump in. I think it's really worth exploring. Do I understand that correctly? Is it only people that have signed agreements can participate in this?

Jon Nevett: Well the contract applies to only people who have signed agreements. So it doesn't mean that they can participate, I guess as a member of the committee.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jon Nevett: Because, you know, the contract is going to apply to them. But - so I would think that we should be open to anyone who is interested in those ideas. But legally it's only those who actually signed the agreement.

Chuck Gomes: That's helpful. Thanks. And then (Chuck) again. Have you looked, or has somebody else looked at the elements - the topics in my contract that are excluded if it goes to arbitration?

I think there's some exclusions, right? I don't have it in front of me. Are fees one of the things that's excluded? So if we went to arbitration, but at the same time, for the thing you're talking - the first point you made about these, not paying them until you couldn't sell names, they might agree to that without going all the way to arbitration. So that's probably not too much of a risk there. If they don't, that says something about them.

But okay, that's helpful, thanks. Oh, I guess we should make sure we're all clear on which things won't be able to continue all the way to arbitration. But I think we'd be supportive of exploring that.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Chuck). Okay, we've got Ching and then Statton.

Ching Chiao: Thank you (John) for the - having that, a great idea. Just want to maybe help us to understand that once we trigger or initiate this, what would be the

process down the line? So are we talking about a collective negotiation and input and then those items that will be changed in the contract will be put for the public comment?

Jon Nevett: Yeah, sure. If you look I quoted the provision in the e-mail so you could see. In 7.7b it says there will be a negotiation period of at least 90 days. And then we'd all have the right to essentially vote on whether we support the amendments or not. And if we get a certain level then they would post it for public comment.

And if we don't there are certain topics that could go to a mediation or an arbitration if they're really pushing hard on it.

Keith Drazek: Thanks. Statton?

Statton Hammock: Thanks (Keith). Statton here from RightSide. (Jon) I think I understood from what you said it's also the period now that's opening on July 1 is a rolling period. So it would make sense for us to move fairly quickly on this because if we decided to make changes later on down the road that just pushes our window back over time.

So it would be better to - it would be advantageous to get our nose in now, and we don't know how long the negotiation process will take to get changes. But it would be in our best interest to start it sooner rather than later.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Statton. (Jordyn)?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah, the flip side of that I think is conversely if we finish the process right now and then we encounter the more significant issue with the contract we'll have to wait up to a year before we can address that issue. We've already taken our bite of that apple right away.

So I think for me the threshold is just like are we asking for changes that are significant enough that we care about them because we potentially push out at least a year our chance to engage in some problem that may arise that we haven't anticipated at the time of the negotiation. So that's the tradeoff for me.

I don't view these as - I wouldn't say no to negotiating on these necessarily. None of them strike me as being particularly significant at the moment, especially if we can get the fee issue addressed outside of this process.

Jon Nevett: If I could respond two points. One, it wouldn't be pushed out for a year because this is at least a 90-day process plus a public comment period. But the period is triggered by the letter. So if we file the letter July 1, then we have to wait till July 1 no matter how long this process goes. And we could take a fair amount of time with this as well.

And on the fee issue, yes, for name collision, as part of the name collision proposal perhaps they could agree to waive the fee. But true fee reform would have to come through this process.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah, so if we have a more substantive proposal on fees other than just this 90-day window, I think that seems more like the issue we'd want to take into this than a waiver that could probably be negotiated in a separate thing.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks guys. Any other discussion on this? Any other thoughts? Okay. Liz?

Liz Finberg: Hi it's Liz Finberg. (Jon) just point of clarification - whatever if we go forward - whatever's negotiated, it'll be a global change on everybody's new gTLD. All right, yeah, okay.

Jon Nevett: Yes if it's approved.

Keith Drazek: Okay any other thoughts, any questions or comments? I guess a question for (X-com) or whoever wants to weigh in, I assume if we're going to send this, initiate this process and send it to ICANN, if that's the decision of the stakeholder group, that we probably need to have a vote on it. Is that right? I would think.

Okay, so I guess then the next step would be as probably ought to draft something up, circulate it for comment. Oh, you did already. Okay, sorry I missed that.

Jon Nevett: I move that the in the e-mail for the (unintelligible) to direct you to send a letter and to convene a working group on coming up with ideas for changes to the contract.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Got it, thanks (Jon). Thanks for the clarification. I was jumping ahead to the drafting of the letter rather than forming a working group. But I think you're right, that's appropriate. (Chuck)?

Chuck Gomes: Once we do the letter we've committed ourselves, right, to this process? Is that right? What I'm getting at is before taking a vote, it would be really nice to - and it's partially related to what Jordyn is saying. Make sure we know what issues we're going to identify. And which ones will fall out later in the process if they go that far.

I think I would be a lot more comfortable knowing that stuff before I voted. Generally I'm supportive of investigating this further. But I think we ought to have all the facts in front of us before we get to that point.

Keith Drazek: Yeah thanks (Chuck). I guess I was jumping ahead, but my expectation is that we would vote to approve the substance of the letter that comes from the working group. I'm fine with initiating this process, no problem. I certainly if the stakeholder group wants to do this then I'll be more than happy to send it.

I'm just thinking in terms of making sure that everybody has the opportunity to provide input on the working group draft and then we have a vote to say go.

Jon Nevett: Yeah, if we trigger it, it's the date of our initial letter. Could be a one-line letter that says we'd like to enter into negotiations pursuant to 7.7. But if we go through the process that I think would give (Chuck) a little more comfort, that could take a couple months, and therefore we lose the optionality of that two-month period.

We're going to push back that rolling period that Statton referred to. So if we have to wait until we get every idea on the table up front and then decide whether to trigger or not we're losing all that time.

Keith Drazek: Okay so if I understand correctly what you're saying is that it's not a rolling 12 months, it's literally on July 1 every year you have the option to move forward. So what's the problem...

Jon Nevett: No, it's a rolling 12 months. That's the difference. If it was July 1 then it's easy. So you can't do it more than once in a 12-month period. So if we wait, for example, and do what I think (Chuck) was perhaps suggesting, which is get all the ideas on paper and then decide, that could be September, let's say.

And then we send the letter. Then that 12 month trigger starts in September. We couldn't do it again till September 2015. And that gets to Jordyn's concerns I think. So I guess my preference in the motion would be trigger it July 1, get all the ideas together, get the committee together, get all the ideas, send it around to obviously the stakeholder group and get support and then send it to ICANN.

It doesn't mean we have to get it to ICANN right away. But at least we stop the slippage of the 12 month period.

Keith Drazek: Understood. It basically means that we can initiate the second one that many months earlier. So I've got it. Okay thanks for clarifying. (David)?

David Maher: I'm not sure about that. I'm looking at 7.7a - may not propose provisions or submit a negotiation notice more than once during any 12-month period beginning on July 1, 2014. Isn't it every July?

Jon Nevett: It's no more than once during any 12-month period, right? So if you trigger it in August, you could not do it again in July 15, 2015.

David Maher: That's not what it says.

Jon Nevett: I think it does.

David Maher: The last line of 7.7a.

Jon Nevett: Yeah, that's what I'm reading, (David).

David Maher: So am I.

Jon Nevett: "Proposed revisions or submitted negotiated notice more than once during any 12-month period." So beginning on July 1, right? So we can't do it before July 1. We got that done. But then we can't do it more than once during any 12-month period. I could tell you that was the intent of this provision when we negotiated last round.

David Maher: Well it doesn't say that.

Jon Nevett: I think it does but...

Keith Drazek: Okay guys so I think maybe this is an opportunity for us to ask staff for clarification. I mean we've got - (Jon) I'm not opposed to sending the one-liner that says we want to initiate the process for the reasons you described.

But if (David)'s correct and staff interprets it the same way, then we have time.

Jon Nevett: Another point, I don't agree that it's going to take two months to decide on what we want to negotiate. I don't think - I'm comfortable with voting for this on the basis of not having any idea what it is we want to renegotiate. I'd like to see at least a very brief summary of the points that are worth renegotiating before we trigger the notice period. And I agree, we need an interpretation of what this 7.7a means.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (David). (Jordyn)?

Jordyn Buchanan: Two quick notes. First is I agree with (John) as to both the intent of that language, certainly what we were negotiating as well as what it actually says. But we feel more comfortable getting additional opinions that's fine.

But I do think (John) that there's probably a fast path between the two. I would be a lot more comfortable saying yeah, let's go ahead if we at least knew that sort of set of issues that were likely to be there. And I think that could probably be - it doesn't have to be comprehensive, doesn't have to be perfect as to what exactly we're looking for, but like (unintelligible) are we really going to ask for significant fee reform right now? We've got - if so, that's probably something that we would - this process makes a sense for.

But if it's a bunch of sort of really minor issues, we might want to hold off and say let's keep the option in six months if we see - once we have a little bit more operational experience, we may find something that's really bugging us that we would really want to get into. So I'd like to get a sense of the character of the issues that are likely to be negotiated, just as like a brainstorming exercise before we decide to pull the trigger.

Jon Nevett: I think that's very fair. Why don't we get together while we're all here and if everyone brings their issues we could - I or someone else could collect them

all and share it back with the list and we could look at it. And fundamental fee reform is definitely something that I personally would be pushing for. I think there might be some - they may be amenable to that; let's put it that way.

Keith Drazek: Okay, sounds reasonable to me, if I can speak.

Jon Nevett: Should we take a list of volunteers or people who want to participate in that, in a meeting or do you want to just send to the list or to me to collate? Whatever, I don't care. Do you have ideas? I know (Pam) had some ideas. Edmon has ideas.

Keith Drazek: (John) why don't you circulate an e-mail to the list saying that basically a recap of what we just discussed and call for volunteers, particularly for people who are here this week or can send via e-mail?

Jon Nevett: Sounds good, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay good. All right, next up on our agenda then we have the interim report from the IRD Expert Working Group. Is Ching in the room? I see Steve. Come on up, welcome. Thanks for your patience. I'm sure Ching will rejoin us here shortly.

Steve Sheng: Hello everyone. My name is Steve Sheng. I'm with ICANN staff. I was asked to provide a quick update on the interim report for our Expert Working Group that defines the requirements for internationalized registration data.

So actually I saw Edmon here is also on the Expert Working Group as well. What the Expert Working Group was formed as part of the implementation for the (unintelligible) review team effort, in particular recommendations 12 and 13 to define requirements for the internationalized registration data as well as data model.

There are eight - we did a call last I think September. We have eight experts. So for the registry side we have Edmon Chung. And we also have Jim Galvin from Afilias that's chairing the Expert Working Group.

We also have registrar representatives for example from GoDaddy and others. And we also have linguistic experts and also technical experts. So the expert Working Group deliberated for about four months and issued an interim report.

In the report what the Expert Working Group did is they first did an exercise compiling all the data elements output by every major - not every major - actually all of the gTLD directory services and put them into categories of data. And then they deliberated the internationalized requirements for each category, what those requirements with name, address, status, telephone number, fax number, and propose requirements for each one of those.

And so this - and they issued an interim report that recently finished the public comment. What they're doing now is the working group is deliberating on a final report which will include a data model that we expect for the community to review after the ICANN London meeting in late July or early August time frame. That's where the community gets one more opportunity to comment on it before the report is finalized.

The next step after the report - when it's finalized this will be - it goes to the ICANN board for consideration and it's up for the board to decide what to do with the report, with the proposed requirements. One part of the pass is come back to the community to rectify through some kind of a policy process. Or the board can take action based on the community input.

I want to stress and say this is not the first time that this effort has been. I think in 2008 there is a GNSO and ESAC joint working group looking at some of these requirements. So this worked good on that work and produced a kind

of final set of requirements. So that's a quick update. And with that I'm happy to answer questions. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Steve. Any questions, comments, feedback? Don't see any. Any at all.

Steve Sheng: I also want to take the opportunity to provide a quick plug for another initiative that we did recently, a study on the feasibility of translation and transliteration systems. As you know there isn't a policy initiative in this area to debate whether our registration data - when they're internationalized there should be a requirement on translation or translation and transliteration.

And if so, who should bear the burden in that requirement? And what the study team did is they go out and evaluate the accuracy to find out first what are the current practices that registries and registrars are doing in this area. Second, look at what other popular e-commerce companies are doing with respect to this area.

Obviously this is not a new problem that we encounter in the ICANN arena. And third - I think it's most interesting - is look at the current set of tools, both commercial as well as open source. And we did a test I think in four or five scripts on the accuracy of the translation and transliteration systems. So that study is also out for public comment. And I encourage if registry, the stakeholder group is interested to provide that.

I want to preface by saying this issue largely goes under the ICANN radar but is actually a very important issue if you consider some of the potential implications for operations for registries and registrars. So I just want to bring this up on your radar for your consideration. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much. Go ahead, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. On that particular subject I think I guess I know it's pretty silent on the subject everyone but it is - I'd like to raise the awareness of everyone. This is a pretty important piece of work in terms of transliteration and translation stuff because this could very well could be kind of an input into what registries and registrars eventually will need to implement.

So I do encourage everyone to take a look at it. And I actually have a question as well. With the EWG on the who is in general, do we foresee any adjustments into some of the thinking in terms of the internationalization and as well as translations, transliteration, given the report? Or how important the data is, what the data is being used for, that could very well sort of inform how accurate or how transliteration, translation might work, might need to work.

Steve Sheng: Thank you Edmon for that question. Our group definitely is looking at the studying the EWG report, which has recently been released. I was also at their public session yesterday. It looks like it's proposing changes and also about kind of the usage of the data. And I think those have implications for internationalization requirements. So yes, yes, we're looking to that too. And we'll reflect this in the final report. Thanks.

Edmon Chung: Sorry, so I should raise this in the working group, but I guess it's important for people to think about this too. That creates a kind of moving target for the group because that report itself is - when we're still expecting parts of it to come out - not the report - parts of the working group results to come out later.

And then it's we don't even know what it's going to be used for in the follow-on processes. But I actually do agree that we need to take a look at that and see what the implications are. But I just wanted to raise it so that - this creates a little bit of a moving target for the work that we're doing right now. But that shouldn't stop us continuing because the internationalization part is pretty important in my mind.

Steve Sheng: Yes Edmon, noted. I think the internationalized registration data was first flagged at an (IABRC) in 2007. And this year we are 2014 and we still haven't - have a solid solution. So I think there's an urgency, call of urgency on the ICANN community on this. So duly noted. Thank you Edmon.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Steve. Thank you Edmon. Any other questions or comments?  
Okay thank you very much.

Okay so I think there were a few things from our agenda from earlier that we need to get to. Before I hand this over to (Paul) for a discussion of our open public comment periods, I noted that (Sherry) is online. And she's in Adobe chat. And I think as everybody knows she had to have some surgery last week and wasn't able to travel to London to support us as she always does. And I just thought it would be nice if we gave her a round of applause and sent some messages.

I hope she didn't step away for that. Anyway, so (Sherry) we miss you. We're sorry you're not here. Somehow we're struggling through, but you know we look forward to seeing you again in L.A.

Okay so with that, maybe I'm going to hand it over to (Paul) and ask (Paul) to go through any sort of critical open comment periods, and then we'll get back to the other items on the agenda.

Paul Diaz: Thanks (Keith). Okay I'll try and make this quick. We've touched on some things earlier. Thank you for those who have voted on the outstanding things. If you still haven't gotten the vote in, please do. We will be submitting comments. Due dates are coming up, specifically the strategic plan is due the 27th, Friday, so we will get that in on time.

We have other issues open. For this group the most important one is approval of the stakeholder group budget. I'd like everybody to weigh in on

this. And if the very least let's get to supermajority level support. We're not there yet so please take that one seriously.

Other drafts that are circulating - we had comments around ICANN accountability. I believe (Stephane)'s currently holding the pens for the most recent version that she's put out. The challenge we have is that those comments, the reply period closes this Friday.

So given the shortness of time, I think we'll take (X-Comm) prerogative here and say we're going to put that out, that draft, as a call for speak up if you have a problem. Otherwise it will go forward with a notice that there was not a formal vote but there was support and no vocal opposition. We're just running out of time. They're very well drafted. I think everybody will be supportive. But please look for that.

Other things that are coming up - there was this question about supporting the domain name industry and under certain regions. There are comments that have been circulated again. Those are due Monday the 30th. So the same thing.

If we will put them out clean as a final hey, unless you have a problem with this, this is going to go forward again without an official vote. We've run out of time, but noted with the support of the stakeholder group. So those two, please keep an eye.

They're going to come up tonight and I will get them out or post them before the deadline. But if you have any last minute concerns just weigh in or else they have to go forward.

Other things that are out there - the question about the ICANN budget. So we have comments that (Chuck) started and others have weighed in over time. Same thing - these are due the 1st, next Tuesday. This is kind of more important or at least rises to a different level because we're talking about a

spending plan. We've talked about accountability in our sessions with the board.

And the things that we're specifically calling out we want to be on record. It would be nice to have a vote for this, but again, recognizing the clock's working against us. (Chuck) if you're comfortable with it I would recommend we do the same thing. I will take your most recent version, put it out, and say look, folks, unless you weigh in, otherwise they'll go forward as supported by the stakeholder group. But we did not have time for a vote.

Chuck Gomes: This is (Chuck). I'm supportive of that, but it may not be my most recent version. (Pam) was it your version, your edits were the most recent? I think so, it's probably her latest version with the red lines that include other people's red lines as well. So I think that is the case.

And if I could back up (Paul) and ask (Stephane) I just sent around the version with my edits. Was there anybody else that provided edits to that?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Those are the only ones I've seen. And I don't have any concern with going forward with your most recent version.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so if everybody wants - I meant that's like a one-pager. So that's really - the budget thing's a little more involved - a lot more involved actually. But it's really take a look at the accountability process comments and my edits or red lines. So take a look at that if you would.

Paul Diaz: Okay and then for the group there are other comment periods that are coming due, starting next week and carrying over the week after. Those are the standard comment periods. You all saw just before we came Dave Olive, head of the policy staff, had sent out a note saying we heard the community and we're changing the system. They're going to do away with a reply period.

There will only be the comment period. What is not clear - and I've not gotten a straight answer from staff is - starting when. So dates that are currently published with reply periods, I think that may continue to be the case. And then their ask - so anything that opens up after London, from now on, we're only going to have a comment period.

So as part of a longer term goal for our group we're going to have to get more effective at identifying our issues, drafting them, voting on them, getting them in, because we won't have the luxury of putting in the placeholder and saying we'll get to it in the reply period.

It's going to be tough because that's going to be probably 21, maybe 30 days to assess issues and come up with comments.

Chuck Gomes: (Chuck) again. I think it's 30 days, isn't it at least?

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: They did make it longer.

Paul Diaz: It used to be 21 and they stretched it out.

Chuck Gomes: They did make it longer for the one period I think. The issue going forward that they're going to be looking for feedback. One of the reasons for the reply period was put in there is so that when people said things that needed a response, you had some time to do that because many times comments are filed the last day.

So we're going to lose that ability. And so we may want to look for okay how can you deal with that? Obviously it requires any reply period to be in force as a reply period. But maybe there are other ways, so people can be thinking about that.

Paul Diaz: Okay and the other issues that are out there as I quickly look over them, I encourage everybody if you have comments to make - you can raise up to the stakeholder group level, but a lot of those are probably if you care might be better at the individual level, not just a stakeholder group. They seem very narrowly focused but happy to work with you all if there's a difference of opinion on that. Basically in the comments please remember to vote for the budget.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much (Paul). Questions, comments on any of that? All right very good. So could we just scroll back up the agenda? Bear with me folks, hold on.

Okay so I think that brings up close to the end of our planned session. We're going to meet with the registrars at 4:00 in their room, 4:00 local time. So any additional topics for discussion or do we want to chat before we go to the registrars about any of the topics? Are there anything else that we ought to talk to the registrars about? (Jonathan)?

Jonathan Robinson: I think I've got two things, maybe - I know we didn't bring to a conclusion our representative, but it's starting to strike me that if we're going to try and get together as a drafting team before the end of this meeting, it'll be really good to sort out the representatives for the drafting team. So that feels more urgent.

And I think (Chuck) kind of volunteered. And I didn't see any other volunteers. So we've got a half a volunteer and no completely volunteers.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't actually volunteer but I said I would do it if nobody else wanted to do it. But if somebody else does want to volunteer, I will support them, okay? So I can do it, but it's also something that somebody else could do. And I could just help them.

Jonathan Robinson: Here's the deal. What I'll do is I'll put out a note to the registry stakeholder group mailing list calling for a volunteer and noting that he will support that volunteer so they can feel that they will be supported. And I'm afraid if no one does - and no one does then you might be - that half volunteering might be turned into...

Chuck Gomes: I understand that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Chuck).

Chuck Gomes: But I hope people won't just use that, not consider the opportunity.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I'm also thinking (Chuck) that actually this may make the reach a little broader in the group as well. I may put a couple of points down as to sort of criteria or what we're hoping for from that person including your ability to support. So thanks very much.

The second point is I'm slightly concerned that the registrars might react quite strongly to the letter from the NGBC. My view is that I don't know. I haven't really got a sense of this, that they might feel that this is sort of interfering with the GNSO type of point.

My feeling is as I said at the - when we discussed it - it's a genuine good faith attempt to resolve a thorny issue and navigate our way through the sort of multi-stakeholder model and the various positions.

Personally I don't think it's something we should spend a lot of time fighting over. I think we've got much bigger fish to fry. And I don't feel this compromises us substantially to cooperate with a letter from NGBC and try and navigate our way through this.

So I guess what I'm saying is if the meeting starts to take that direction, I don't really want to be standing on my own saying, "It's fine, it's okay." I'd really like some help to sort of calm that discussion. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you. Any other additional business or discussion points for our engagement with the registrars?

Okay I think that brings us to a wrap then. Thanks everybody. We will reconvene in the registrar's meeting room at 4:00 p.m., which is the sovereign room. Thank you everybody. Great meeting.

END