

**Transcription ICANN London
Joint Session with the Registry and Registrars Stakeholder Group
Tuesday 24 June 2014**

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.

Jennifer Standiford: Again, thanks to the Registry Stakeholder Group for joining us. I've got the list of topics for discussion. For the transcript it's Jennifer Standiford, Vice Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

First topic I have listed here is the GNSO Council issues and motions.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much, Jennifer. And I think for that one I'm going to hand it over to Mr. Robinson - Jonathan is over here at the end, Jonathan will lead us through at least on the Registry side our discussion about the pending Council motions.

Jonathan Robinson: I hope it's relatively straightforward, ladies and gentlemen, of the Registrars Constituency - or Stakeholder Group. There are two motions, the first being one to deal with - to vote on the charter with regard to curative protections - rights protections for - which follows on from the previous PDP on IGO and INGO names. And then the second is to initiate a discussion on the next round of new gTLDs.

So we expect to vote for both of those motions. And, I mean, it'd be good to hear where you're at and if we need to discuss any other elements of that. It may be quite straightforward depending on where you're at so, perhaps we should just hear from you first and then take it from there.

Michele Neylon: Where are our GNSO councilors?

Jennifer Standiford: I see Mr. Bladel...

Michele Neylon: I see Yoav is there...

Jennifer Standiford: Volker.

Michele Neylon: Where's Bladel?

Jennifer Standiford: Straight ahead.

Michele Neylon: Oh he's...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: James, what's this thing with you hiding in the cheap seats today? This is really confusing.

James Bladel: I'm doing stuff.

Volker Greimann: James, go ahead.

James Bladel: No, I was going to follow you, Volker. Go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Okay, mysteriously on our schedule this session we had not yet had the opportunity to discuss the motion with the membership at large so while we do not have a position as a Registrar Constituency, the positions are quite straightforward as they are following out of previous discussions.

James Bladel: And we are commenting on the motion for IGO?

Volker Greimann: James, go ahead.

James Bladel: I'm asking you. We're commenting on the motion specifically for IGO NGO?

Jonathan Robinson: James, we mentioned - I mentioned both of the motions...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...so in essence you could address both but the IGO/INGO one on curative rights - curative protection comes first.

James Bladel: Okay. So, yeah, I don't see anything particularly controversial about these. These are - were scheduled I think, or they were put up for a vote at our previous meeting and were deferred to give us additional time to review them. I don't see anything specifically material with these. I don't know, Volker, if you have any other thoughts. Yeah, they're just not really moving the needle for us. Yoav.

Yoav Keren: I'm on the same position, I don't think there's anything there that we should fight for.

James Bladel: Now a longer conversation could be had about a different IGO/NGO issue but I will - would you like to discuss that now?

Jonathan Robinson: Well I think we should--what I'd like to do is knock off the two motions if that's acceptable to you, get those done and then clear the next item on the agenda is Item 6, discussion letter from the NGPC regarding IGO/INGO identifiers in new gTLDs.

James Bladel: So I will save my comments for that.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: So are we done on the motions then? Great.

Volker Greimann: We are assuming to be voting in the affirmative.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. So the next item is Item 6 discussion letter from the NPGC regarding protection of IGO/INGO identifiers. This follows from a motion that was approved at the Council level and a series of PDP recommendations that were made to the Board. The Board elected to accept or - those components of the motion that were not in contradiction with GAC advice.

But to the extent that there was a contradiction with GAC advice sought to have more time to deal with those. And subsequently, having had various conversations, decided to refer them back to us for potential modification in line with GNSO procedures. So that's where we're at.

Personally, I'll lay my cards on the table, it seems to be, in my view, a good faith attempt by the Board to navigate something which is challenging. But I understand there may be other feelings on this so it would be good to hear where you guys are at. Thanks.

Jennifer Standiford: James.

James Bladel: Oh thank you. And thanks, Jonathan. And so any of the folks that were there on Saturday know I have pretty strong feelings about this. And I am really doing my best not to sound strident or disruptive. But I think that we really need to take a very close look at what - the bigger picture of what's being asked of us.

You know, I believe that that Board, the GAC via the Board, has initiated a PDP and the PDP was - reached a successful conclusion with unanimous policy recommendations, not for new gTLDs, for all gTLDs. And this has put the Board in a very sticky situation because those recommendations are fall short of what the GAC asked them for.

So, I mean, I'm thinking I've got my facts correct on this but I'm looking for Jonathan to correct me if I'm wrong. We're now being asked to tell - reconvened that - some form of that PDP - that PDP working group or some of those members and ask them to revisit those recommendations.

I think - first of all I think that this is perhaps inappropriate to ask us to do this. You know, the entire community have this opportunity to work on these policies and to make these recommendations.

Furthermore, I am at a complete loss of what we tell them. Did they get it wrong? Were they missing some data? Did they not follow a procedure? I mean, where did they go off course or were the outcomes just simply not satisfactory to another structure outside of the GNSO?

And I think that's the part that I start to get a little nervous about is that, you know, that a group - admittedly a high-level advisory committee can essentially start a PDP and then say, "No, we don't like the - we are unsatisfied with the results, we need to go back and do it again."

We had a lengthy discussion this weekend about participation and four volunteers not to get discouraged in the process. While the folks who were involved in this for 13 months - I believe we owe it to them to explain, you know, precisely what they did during that rehearsal PDP and why they are now being - it may not be - and to fairness, Jonathan, I'm probably glossing over some important details one of which is that this is not I think immediately directed or envisioned to be a PDP; this would be an advisory or consultation.

But, I'm still not clear what would happen if that advisory said, "No, our original recommendations stand," you know, or something to that effect and what the outcome would be. I realize this puts the Board in a very difficult position. I'm just not too keen on giving them this easy of an out because I think it sets a very dangerous course.

So if I'm alone on this, you know, I'm perfectly happy to take the rocks and the spears for this one unless, you know, the Registrars tell me, you know, shut up, Bladel; just sit down and go with this. You know, you're making a fight where none is needed here.

But I don't see it that way and I'm, I guess, really looking for some feedback from this - the joint Registry/Registrar, Contracted Party house is, what are your thoughts on this? Especially my fellow registrar councilors and the ExComm. I'm looking to you for some direction.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James.

Jonathan Robinson: I mean, I see Chuck there. I mean, I can give you a little more detail. I think, you know, James, together with the councilors, we thrashed this out pretty thoroughly on the weekend. I think there's some other details that we should work with one is that we have provision which this letter refers to in the GNSO Operating Procedures to modify or amend and approve policy.

So they're basically referring to our own GNSO policies to say, look - and, I mean, I would be the first to acknowledge it's an imperfect process that allows the GAC to come in very late in the day and either reassert early advice or bring in new advice.

But I think we all know that's a problematic process. There's another track going on which is worked between the GNSO and the GAC to try and improve the way in which that process takes place.

So acknowledging that imperfection, I also think it's worth looking at, regardless of the process or, if you like, political points around this, there's also the substance of what's being asked as well. And to me in this particular case the substance isn't that dramatic. And I think we've got some much bigger battles to fight along the way.

So I've swayed into opinion rather than fact. And I promise that I'll give fact. I suspect Chuck's probably a better position to give fact having done his service on the working group so I'll stand back for a moment.

James Bladel: Quick - just quick response on that. I agree with you, the material of this is probably, you know, not worth going to war over but, you know, it's also not trivial. I think particularly the - there are some questions on whether the notifications forever is, you know, implementable in some respects. But I agree with you, it's a minor add-on to the existing recommendation.

As far as using our process to amend or modify a PDP recommendation, my understanding is that was when a procedure was not followed or material data was missing from the PDP or that some element of the PDP was not, you know, that there was some flaw in that process.

And I guess, if we're going to invoke that I would want to know what is the - what is the prescriptive advice that we can give that consultative group or reformed PDP, working group, you know, we can't just say do it again; we have to say you've got this - these three things wrong and why? And I don't know that we have a good answer for that yet.

Chuck Gomes: Is it my turn? Chuck Gomes. First of all, we really don't know what the New gTLD Program Committee did. I got some information last night from one GAC member that gave me the distinct impression that the Program Committee may not have been talking with the GAC; they may have been talking with the IGOs. Now I don't know that for a fact.

So I think one of the first things that needs to be done is to talk to the GAC, Jonathan and maybe, as Chair of the Council, and Thomas Rickert as Chair of the working group, and find out whether that. Because I got a distinct impression that maybe what the Board Program Committee is asking for in the case of the IGO acronyms only, is maybe not a position that the GAC is

supporting. We need to know that. So I think that's the first step on that one issue.

Secondly, and let me say to James, and he knows this already, but for everybody else's benefit, I'm one of those that you have to explain to - explain why if you reconvene the working group because I was on the working group. We met every - as you've heard said many times, we met every week for two hours for pretty close to a year I think.

I think the right thing to do is to send it back to the working group and here's why: In the case of the additional Red Cross names, which are the regional Red Cross names, the way that was handled in the working group - and you can confirm this with Thomas because he and I have talked about this - the Red Cross brought those up late, after we had done a lot of work and we were trying to get to closure. And essentially the decision was made not to get into that and not to include it.

In hindsight, we had a - if it had been brought up at the very beginning, there's good possibility they would have been approved. So essentially what we're asking is, okay, let's take a little time and look at that, let's look at the impacts. Let's see if that's a reasonable request. And then the working group would come back with a recommendation in that regard.

And it could be like James said, we may decide no. And that's fine. We just need to give a rationale so that there's - so that they understand why we made that decision.

In the case of the acronyms, the working group was, with the exception of the IGOs and the Red Cross people, less so the IOC people, they wanted protection for acronyms. But we felt like there are acronyms that represent companies and nonprofit organizations and so forth, other than IGOs, that are much more known to the public than some of the IGO names.

And it didn't - so why would you protect the IGO acronyms and exclude them for these other organizations? The working group was really strong on that with regard to the IGO full names. And - excuse me, acronyms. And so we were clear on that.

What the New gTLD Program Committee is suggesting is what if we gave them this notice that there is, you know, the claims notice, just - and I think - and we're going to have to clarify on this - I think that just means the notice after the fact, not the pre-notice that somebody is trying to register your name; that has to be clarified.

James is absolutely right, we have to look at the impact of that. What does it mean for registrars, for example, to do this indefinitely? Is there a cost involved? Is it a significant cost?

So the working group - it's a format we have to take a look at that. Now like I said, we really need to clarify is that a GAC position or is that an IGO position? That's very important information.

So, as you can tell what I'm saying is I think the best thing - once we get the clarification from the GAC is to send this back to the working group. And Thomas has said he would be willing to continue chairing that. I don't know if everybody in the working group will continue; I will. Some will, some won't probably.

But that's the mechanism we have. And the Board has a responsibility to get GAC advice. We have to find out whether they really did or it's IGO advice. And then make a response.

And so I reacted the same way as James did when I first saw this, same exact way. And looking at it in a little more detail I think that's - if we find out that it was consultation with the GAC and not just an affected party, then I think the right thing to do is to go back to the working group.

And in the case of the Red Cross names I absolutely think that because it's something that we really didn't do adequate justice to in the working group.

Jennifer Standiford: Thanks, Chuck.

Jordyn Buchanan: Hi, Jordyn Buchanan. So those on the Registries of this room in particular probably have heard me give part of this speech before. But I do think that one of the most critical things that we can do as the policymaking part of our role here at ICANN is to make sure that we have a successful and effective policy development process.

We can't complain as a community, you know, when ICANN staff does stuff that we don't like because, you know, they haven't gone through the policymaking process, etcetera. It's much harder to have that argument with them when we can't get our act together and have a strong policy development process.

So I think this process, up until the point it got to the Board, was great like, you know, there was a problem, the GNSO Council would do something about it, there was a PDP, relatively, you know, ICANN-scale rapid results. And then things sort of got waylaid and we sort of yelled at the Board about that.

But I think we're left in the position of wondering like in this situation that we're in the GAC, you know, we've submitted a policy, the GAC has an opportunity to, you know, the Board has to consult the GAC as Chuck pointed out earlier, and to the GAC has an opinion on this.

And if we look at this in the broader context of the multistakeholderism discussion going on right now like there has to be some voice for government in that process. And so I don't think it can be our position that we just say oh, we don't care what governments think about this.

And as Jonathan said like this is certainly not the right way to do it and I hope we can reform that. But there has to be some way for the policy development process to take on board that advice that comes from the GAC. And I think this is the only way.

And Chuck's talk to the substantive reasons why that's the right way but I just don't see a way to say that we have a good policy development process if there's no way for the government to meaningfully participate in it. And so I just - I personally don't see a way other than sort of the path that we are set upon, even though I don't like particularly the way we got here.

Jennifer Standiford: Jordyn, thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Move on next item.

Jennifer Standiford: The Registrars - the understanding you're seeking - the guidance of the Registrars we will be sure to provide you with that feedback.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, I was having a conversation with Jordyn.

Jennifer Standiford: That's okay. I was just - you had asked a question previously...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Standiford: ...I am looking for direction from the Registrars.

James Bladel: Correct.

Jennifer Standiford: And I were the knowledge and that and saying that we would provide you with the feedback.

James Bladel: Okay. By tomorrow.

Jennifer Standiford: You got it.

Keith Drazek: Okay, hi everybody. This is Keith Drazek. Next item on our agenda is just a brief discussion I think of ICANN's operational accountability or service delivery to contracted parties. And I would include in that the soon to be contracted parties of the new TLD applicants.

We had - well let me back up, a couple weeks ago the Registry Stakeholder Group and NTAG sent a letter to Akram Atallah, head of the GDD, copied Fadi and Steve Crocker, outlining a long list of concerns and issues that we'd identified about ICANN's delivery of service to us including specific recommendations for resolving and addressing the list of concerns that have been raised.

That was the result of a pretty comprehensive working group or drafting team that we put together. There was a survey conducted of the members of Registry and NTAG. And the letter was sent.

We actually had provided an advanced copy of the letter so they weren't surprised when it was finalized after the vote, which actually generated a call, not surprisingly, from - it was Cyrus that reached out to me and said, "Hey, we'd love to have a conversation before London to sort of talk through these things."

So we had that call a couple weeks ago. I think it was actually fairly constructive. We ended up also having a joint ExComm call. And this may have been -you may have already addressed this - a joint ExComm meeting, I'm sorry, with Registries, Registrars and NTAG with Akram and his team two nights ago that, again, I think was very constructive dialogue and I hope, you know, sort of lays the groundwork for, you know, working better together and

establishing, you know, certain expectations and predictability around ICANN's delivery of service to us.

So, you know, I think this is an opportunity I think we ought to seize. They've indicated a willingness to address a lot of the issues. The one thing that we are really calling for is some level of SLAs that, you know, in a sense we have contracted parties have SLAs.

If we violate our SLAs we could be found in breach of our contracts that frankly ICANN, as a service delivery organization to us, really ought to be held to the same standard particularly as Fadi talked about, you know, the focus on, you know, hardening ICANN's operations and systems and, you know, sort of trying to mature the organization from an operational perspective.

SLAs, to me, are a no-brainer. So we raised that they in our conversation with the Board. And it's something that I think you'll continue to see the Registries and the NTAG engage on and really push for. So to the extent that we have contracted parties can all work together on that type of messaging and be specific in terms of the things that we would like to see in SLAs, I think that would be really productive.

So I would suggest - and we haven't really had a chance to talk about this in any detail - at the idea of a joint Contracted Party House and NTAG drafting team or working group to come up with some specific types of metrics and recommendations that we would like to see turned into SLAs on ICANN. So I'll stop there and see if anybody else was to jump in.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Keith. Sorry. We had discussed this on, I mean, prior to this meeting. I think we had a call did we? Yeah, sorry, my brain is a bit fried so I'm not too sure whether I'm having calls or face-to-face meetings with people at this stage. And while we have - we spoke about this and we had an interesting -

fairly productive meeting with Akram, Cyrus and Co, the other evening, Mr. Zupke, was in the room as well. Hi, Mike.

One of the things that we have been doing I think with both ExComms at this stage is trying to engage with ICANN senior staff on a kind of more regular and less confrontational way in between public meetings which tends to happen - at least in my personal opinion is that we leave everything until the public meeting and then it becomes a little bit ugly.

Man: Venting.

Michele Neylon: Venting, lots of venting. I mean there was also a few other things I think were brought up specifically with respect to our, as a community our behavior and attitude with respect to ICANN staff which we need to - probably need to address. Do you want to speak to that, Keith? I'll hand this one over to you because this is more of a...

Keith Drazek: Yeah, what was the topic again?

Michele Neylon: Behavior.

Keith Drazek: Behavior.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...towards ICANN staff. You don't recall this? Have you got like kind of collective, you know, whatever the word is over there?

Keith Drazek: I may.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Oh, selective memory. Okay this came up specifically in the context of people being quite abusive to ICANN staff during webinars.

Keith Drazek: No.

Michele Neylon: And it's just to do with community standards and everything else.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Well not just in relation to chat, I mean, I actually heard somebody - and I don't know who it was, whether it was contracted party or non contracted party and was - yesterday was kind of screaming at ICANN staffers when they were trying to seat people during the opening ceremony which I thought was a little bit inappropriate.

Jennifer Standiford: This is when they proposed a code of conduct.

Keith Drazek: So let me jump in, yeah, so what Michele was referring to was there was a proposal in that joint ExComm meeting with Akram and his team that's on the webinars that are conducted I think primarily for the NTAG they got rid of the chat box in Adobe Connect; it basically took it away and there was no ability for you to submit comments or anything like that through the Adobe chat.

And as we learned, that was in reaction to apparently a sense at ICANN that a lot of the stuff that was being typed into chat was abusive and disrespectful and inappropriate, unprofessional, you know, whatever word you want to use. I wasn't on those but, you know, I take them at their word that it was at least offensive to them.

So, you know, we got into a little bit of a back and forth. And it turned into a conversation about, you know, professionalism and sort of expected standards of behavior. We pointed out actually that now when you log into

Adobe on any of the various community calls there is actually something that you expect to say that you will abide by certain codes of conduct.

And that turned into a discussion about the need for a community groups, you know, Registries, NTAG, whatever, to sort of self police and if there's somebody who's acting inappropriately or, you know, typing something that's, you know, not professional or not standard, you know, sort of accepted behavior that we like sort of call them out and put a stop to it. And I think that's perfectly reasonable.

I think, you know, we're all professionals and we ought to act as such. And I think that, you know, the hope is that we have the tools that we need. I did point out to Christine that, you know, I think maybe what they were sensing was real frustration from the community. You know, this wasn't coming from nowhere, right? And I didn't go so far as to say you need to, you know, sort of picking your skin a little bit because I wasn't aware of the actual content so it was hard for me to make that, you know, argue that point.

But, I do think that we as contracted parties need to make sure that we all, you know, sort of work to make sure that we are keeping things professional. But hopefully they'll bring back the chat feature and we'll be given another opportunity. (Matt).

Michele Neylon: And just before we go to (Matt) let me just - don't worry, Matt, I'll let you go in a second. I mean, the kind of thing that we were saying to ICANN around office was, you know, most of us are in service-based businesses. We understand the concept of customer service. You know, if you're - if somebody has an issue with whatever, be that as a registrant or a registrar in relation to - registrar in relation to a registry - you'd expect a certain degree of professionalism and turnaround and etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

So, at the moment we feel that it's kind of one way; it should be more two ways. But when it comes to the professionalism and everything else that has to be from both sides very much so. (Matt), go on, you know you want to.

(Matt): Yes, thank you, Michele. So the point, Keith, you made earlier about looking for a drafting team for the contracted parties, I'll raise my hand and participate in that.

You know, I think we had an interesting exchange with them - ICANN staff - this morning about (Radar). And they started talking about bringing the system back online. And I asked about, you know, additional security features that were going to be there and they said well, you know, we've heard that two factor authentication was too onerous and this and that.

And I'm like, well, we're the customers of that portal and we all have those kind of security services in place. So I think to the extent that we can team up together and kind of work on some of those SLA items is great. So you can put my name down for that.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much, (Matt). You know, I mean, they said they were receptive to input and that they were really seeking input so they can help measure themselves and make sure that the priorities that we, you know, what we think our priorities are something that they are responding to.

But they did ask for specifics so thank you for that, you know, for volunteering. And to the extent that people can start thinking about the types of metrics and the type of, you know, things that we would like to have measured as a, you know, related to a possible SLA it's really critical. And we have a unique opportunity here.

(Matt): Yeah, thanks.

Michele Neylon: And just actually going on a bit about the (Radar) and other things like that, in a meeting we had this morning with Cyrus, Akram and - I can't remember his full name, Ash...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Standiford: Ashwin.

Michele Neylon: Ashwin.

Jennifer Standiford: Ashwin. Sorry. You know, they are definitely interested in engaging with us and following up on what kind of things would like to see. So it's just really a matter of - I suppose of following through. Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah, so one thing that I asked for a commitment on and didn't actually get it back but you guys may want to press this as well it's just to get a formal commitment from ICANN to do, whatever you want to call them, postmortems or root cause analysis, whatever, a formal turnaround time to provide the, you know, to provide affected parties at the very least or probably the community, with some sort of postmortem after any significant operational failure.

Because right now when stuff happens and they sort of - we get very various levels of sort of responsiveness and sometimes it's an official very short statement and sometimes it's - they come and tell us - sort of explain later on. But having some sort of formal, you know, most big companies that provide online services have some place where when they have big operational outages they post what happened afterwards.

Michele Neylon: Just as an FYI with respect to the (Radar) issue that impacted registrars probably more than registries, we did get - we did engage with them on this and they did provide us with a - well, with a better kind of explanation than the one that was publicly posted. So we have - we did get more from them. We still don't have obviously timelines and when it'll be back up and all that. But...

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah, I mean...

Michele Neylon: ...they are listening.

Jordyn Buchanan: I don't think anyone can reasonably commit to fix problems in a certain amount of time that you can commit to respond back and explain what happened in a reasonable amount of time and make an ongoing commitment that you will do that which is I think what I asked for and may resonate with you guys as well.

Jennifer Standiford: This is Jennifer. I don't think there's any difference between us seeking those SLAs from ICANN and ICANN staff versus us having to provide those today. In all of our contracted party contracts we have to adhere to timelines. So I think to that point that's what we're seeking.

Michele Neylon: Yoav.

Yoav Keren: I think you - talking about this I just wanted to take another point that we've discussed the ICANN staff on the GNSO meeting with them, which is kind of - it relates to that, and I've asked them the question is where's (Eris), where did that system disappear? Sorry?

Jennifer Standiford: So during the joint session on Sunday we did get an update on (Eris) I believe from Mr. Gift.

Yoav Keren: Yeah.

Jennifer Standiford: It is - there's a dependency there on the new portal in order to launch (Eris), that was my understanding. Did anybody else have any further...

Yoav Keren: Yeah, no - we got that answer also. They were saying that this is - the whole thing, their integration (unintelligible) and so on. But one of the issues that they raised is what I wanted to speak about.

We believe that this is very important for the new GDD program and make it easier now and for onboarding and down the road for managing for most registrars, actually, to do it in a simpler way.

One of the reactions was that there's no match buy-in by the Registries and that's an issue I thought was important to raise in this meeting because it does work in the benefit of all of us. At the end it's a simple system that just helps everyone to the management of contacts and on porting issues very easily. Sort at least or it's supposed to do that.

So do you have anything - did you discuss this at the RySG? Is this an issue at all?

Jennifer Standiford: I believe it is an issue and the issue that we have is we were not given a timeline.

Yoav Keren: I've actually talked again with Cyrus today and they're really close, they kind of - in a few weeks they can put that out or something like that. One of these issues, by the way, that he thought would be for the Registries is that they cannot take their - Registries cannot take the data from that system and have separate systems so I just (unintelligible) to, you know, a simple API for that.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: The API thing was discussed with ICANN oh I don't know, a year and a half or two years ago. Bennie, you were on that - those calls as well I think. Anything about an API, that came up. No? Didn't it? Thought it did.

Yoav Keren: Never mind.

((Crosstalk))

Yoav Keren: The issue is - what the position of the Registries on this? Are you - was this discussed? Is there any way that we can get more registries on board?

Michele Neylon: Over to you, Keith.

Keith Drazek: I'm going to have to differ on this one because it's not an issue that I've been following super closely. Is there anybody else that can jump in on this one? Anyone? You want to tee up the question again? So the question, the issue so anybody can try to respond.

Yoav Keren: I think...

Volker Greimann: Basically Yoav is saying is there any interest in the Registries to support this once this goes live to make the life of the Registrars easier? I think that's frank enough.

Michele Neylon: Or are the registries opposed to it and if so why I suppose. Maybe, I don't know, something like that. Some clarity would be helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll just volunteered that we haven't discussed this and it hasn't been something that's been covered in our group so, I mean, my suggestion is not to sort of take it into the long grass or anything but just that it's good to us ideally in writing that I'm sure we're capable of remembering it as well. And we'll discuss it at our next meeting. I'm not aware of this being something on our agenda. Maybe someone can remind me.

Michele Neylon: Well there was at least one registry - one or two registry participants involved in the (Eris) Working Group going back over, I don't know, two years a bit more. And then kind of ICANN had some kind of demo of it in, I'll say...

Chuck Gomes: Buenos Aires.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, it was Buenos Aires. In Buenos Aires. And then it kind of disappeared.

Yoav Keren: They promised they'd have it in a month. And that...

Michele Neylon: Yeah, and that disappeared. I don't know, kind of went off to somewhere strange. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thank you. I'm not, you know, I'm not sure if I'm speaking as a registrar or registry here but I think I would say the best path forward here is to ask ICANN to give everyone an update of what the system is going to do.

Because I know from the - I doubt many of the registries - any have even seen it or what the functionality is supposed to be. I think it was Roy from Neustar was working as part of the working group on (Eris) back then.

But I think that nobody even knows what it's supposed to do. It's gone through so many different iterations. And I think as Yoav said, Buenos Aires was, you know, was that November and they said it was going to be up in a month and it's now almost July 1.

So I would - before asking, you know, if one particular stakeholder group as opposed or against I think it would be great to see what the system is actually supposed to do and for us to get another demo of it and maybe some functionality. Because I've never even seen it exist.

Yoav Keren: So that's perfect because (unintelligible) actually should be a positive thing for all of us and just, you know, (unintelligible) is communicated...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah, I have a feeling nobody knows what it is or what it does.

Yoav Keren: Generally, you know, instead of - as much as I understand and what I've seen is that (unintelligible) for the registrars to put in their contact details and all of the information that we provide separately to each one of the registries and have one place to do that. And you can also provide a document for the RAs and so on in the same place. Not only not on the on boarding it's down the road when you need to change contacts and so one (unintelligible) to do that.

Michele Neylon: All right. Yes, Yoav, you are correct. Thank you. (Maxim).

Maxim Alzoba: (Maxim) (unintelligible) they recognize paper documents only thus participation won't be universal.

Yoav Keren: That's okay (unintelligible) the contact and other things in one place would make life easier for most of us. (Unintelligible).

Maxim Alzoba: (Unintelligible) on behalf of a company you have to provide power of attorney or something which is - should be always in paper.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, but, okay I think...

Yoav Keren: (Unintelligible) you just put the documents there for us to download and send it over to you. That...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yoav, Yoav, we can take this offline. At a high level you it was meant to - high-level it was meant to be for exchanging some of the contact data - to the technical contact, admin contact, marketing contact, legal contact, which isn't an actual contract, it's just - sorry, it's just a list of contacts. And then there were other aspects of the system that were looking at contracts of various

other things we're these complications came in. So we'd probably need to get a proper status update from ICANN.

I see a gentleman at the microphone and that would be the gentleman from Neustar I believe.

Jennifer Standiford: Mr. (Roy).

Roy Dykes: Yes, so I was involved in the working group - this feedback almost 3 years. And then I also lost track of the project because there was a lot of delays from ICANN. In the last that I had seen anything of it was an online demo more than a year ago now and I was not in BA and I was not in Singapore so I don't - I can't seem to what it was and was not done in.

But I think we're all in agreement that we do need to see a demo - an updated demo. And that's all I had to share. So, yeah, I was involved in the working group and provided significant impact and tried to rally the troops more as a supporter and a champion of the project from the Registry side. And I made it very clear to - I made it very clear to ICANN at the time that I could not run it but I was happy to be a champion of it.

Jennifer Standiford: Thanks, (Roy). We'll take that as an action item and get a contracted parties webinar set up to review the latest version of it. Mr. Waldron.

Joe Waldron: Nice to be here. So just to follow up, so I have seen a demo of it last - late last fall some time. I don't remember exactly when. But so I know there's a live demo. I think Michele - it is a little bit more capable than what you were describing. I think they do intend to have the ability to execute contracts and enter all of those in in a - it's supposed to be an onboarding system that simplifies the ability for registrars to be able to exchange those documents. It is the contact database.

And for me the one key feature of this was that it would be completely optional, that no one would be required to use it. So I think I was going down that path. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. I think we - we're a bit - we're behind on the schedule so just want to move forward with the last couple of topics, Jennifer.

Jennifer Standiford: The next topic we're going to skip down a little bit is around the joint submission of the proposed draft regarding the IANA transition and accountability. The Registry and the NTAG group was kind enough to draft up a response. We're seeking the Registrar support for the submission that will be published on Thursday. Any comments, input, feedback? It's been distributed to the list.

Keith Drazek: Yeah so just maybe - this is Keith. Maybe just some additional context. I think coming into the session the London meeting, you know, and the fact that, you know, the IANA transition discussion obviously is one track; there's another track on ICANN accountability. And Fadi, to his credit at the NETmundial meeting, acknowledged I think maybe finally but acknowledged that the two tracks are interrelated and interdependent; that was the language that he used.

That in fact you - in order to have a successful and trusted IANA transition, in a sense, NTIA disengaging and handing over the keys and the title of the car to ICANN, that there needs to be meaningful incremental and independent accountability structures on ICANN.

In other words, if NTIA is going to disengage then what is the replacement backstop? What is the mechanism by which the community ensures that ICANN remains committed to, for example, the Affirmation of Commitments principles, accountability and transparency, opportunity for the community to lead and not have decisions made in a top down fashion.

So we've been having conversations with a lot of different folks in the community this week already and leading into this week about the idea that ICANN accountability and a sort of a new accountability structure for ICANN really needs to be in place before the IANA transition takes place.

The target date for the IANA transition right now is not a deadline because it's not a hard and fast date but the target is September 2015. So we have more than a year for the community to come together and to identify some reasonable ICANN accountability reforms that can be implemented by September 2015 to basically give us, the community, the confidence that ICANN is prepared to stand on its own with out having any sort of, you know, backstop.

So we've had some conversations, we've circulated some drafts. We've shared discussions with other folks in the GNSO. The IPC appears to be on board. The BC is considering but appears supportive. You know, working with others, the Registries are on board for the most part right now. I think we're very close on some language.

The idea is for the GNSO community to come together if we can, you know, make this happen, and make a joint statement at the public forum on Thursday basically calling for enhanced reformed accountability structures prior to the finalization of any transition.

Yeah, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, and just to add to this. I mean, saying the entire GNSO - what do we actually mean I think in this context, Keith, and correct me if I'm wrong, it would be - this would be a statement that would be signed off on by each and every stakeholder group and constituency. Which as - as opposed to a message from the GNSO Council or anything like that. And I've been informed that that's never happened; this would be a first.

Keith Drazek: So, you know, it's unclear at this point whether we'll be able to get everybody; that's the hope. But everybody I've spoken with I think generally agrees with these principles, this idea. And it may be a matter of tweaking some language but I think through several revisions now we are getting close to some, you know, fairly high level and principled language that would send a strong signal to Fadi into the Board to say that community is taking ownership of this process.

In other words that we, the community, the site went ICANN is accountable enough; not ICANN the Board or ICANN the staff or ICANN's legal advisors. So I think, you know, I've said this in the Council discussions over the weekend is that I think we have a really unique opportunity here.

We have I think one opportunity to get meaningful accountability. And really what we're talking about is making sure that the Board is not accountable to the Board or ICANN is not accountable to some vague description of the world, you know, accountable to the community. It needs to be truly accountable community and there needs to be mechanisms in place to ensure that if the Board makes a decision that we as a community have an opportunity for redress in the event that something goes poorly or really off the rails.

At the end of the day what we're trying to accomplish is to protect the multi-stakeholder model and ICANN for the next 20 years to make sure that we're putting mechanisms and structures in place that will protect all of us for a long long time because we're not going to have this opportunity again. Once the transition takes place there's nothing holding ICANN to the accountability obligations that it's already signed up to let alone something more.

So, Ken, I see you at the mic.

Ken Stubbs: Real quick. So what are you asking for is you're asking for a vote for support, then call for the question because I think - you're not going to find anybody in the room I don't believe is going to argue with you.

Keith Drazek: Yeah, thanks Ken. I guess it's important to follow up with specific asks for details. So the Registries have had this document going around on the list today. We've got (unintelligible) feedback. I forwarded the latest draft that has the IPC and Registry and a few other support to Michele and Jennifer. And I expect that you're going to circulate it and ask for input? Okay.

Jennifer Standiford: We have circulated and we've received support feedback thus far.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Okay so thanks, Ken. The ask is please let us know if we can count on the Registrar Stakeholder Group support for this joint - hopefully unanimous joint GNSO statement and the goal - the plan is for the leaders of the stakeholder groups and constituencies to stand together at the microphone in a public forum...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...interesting considering there's so many of us. We can all stand on top of Keith.

Jennifer Standiford: Volker, please.

Volker Greimann: I support this initiative. I think the accountability is most important for the transition. We can't have an ICANN that is only accountable to itself and the corporation - ICANN the Corporation not the community.

We had a very fruitful session with the boards today where the Board was actually telling us that they were looking at us to tell them where and how the accountability procedures would look at. I think that would be the next step. And we might want to hint at that in the letter as well that the community is

ramping up to provide those exact accountability measures that were looking for. And will provide suggestions to that effect to the Board and the rest of the community.

Keith Drazek: So, I mean, the Registries are basically taking the approach that, hey, it's out there; objective you have objections, provide language or recommended changes if you have any. You know, and if we don't hear anything we'll assume support on this one.

Volker Greimann: I think that's a good...

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Standiford: So thus far the feedback that we've gotten from the Registrar Stakeholder Group has been in support of submission.

Keith Drazek: Yeah.

Jennifer Standiford: Last item on our agenda is Privacy Proxy Services.

Michele Neylon: Okay this one I'll just give you a quick brief view on this one. The Registrar Accreditation Agreement, 2013 version, includes a specification on - there are running out the door, bye - on privacy and proxy, which is temporary. It needs to be replaced with a proper accreditation process.

So a PDP was kicked off on us. And where - how do I put this diplomatically?

Jennifer Standiford: The PDP was kicked off on it and it was comprised of members representing the registrar and the community. There are some specific questions that we have around it.

Michele Neylon: Well it would be great to see registry interaction...

Jennifer Standiford: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: ...for one thing. But the other problem we're having is that part of the discussions around this has gone from how do we accredit proxy privacy services into should people be allowed to have proxy or privacy, which we feel is a little bit broader than we'd like.

Jennifer Standiford: Beyond the scope.

Michele Neylon: Beyond the scope potentially. At the moment - okay maybe James can give a bit more on this.

James Bladel: So, you know, I know we're getting close to the end of time so I'll just sum it all up. We want to know where the Registries are on this one - I think Registrars because we are - into this when I think we've got a lot of folks participating. That Registries - I don't believe there are any Registry representatives on this working group.

Michele Neylon: Officially there is one, at least one.

James Bladel: Okay.

Michele Neylon: But as far as I'm aware that person hasn't been active.

James Bladel: So, you know, right now it's real easy to say that this is a Registrar only issue but it's certainly easy to imagine in post accreditation environment where completely unaffiliated entities our privacy proxy services or their affiliated with registries or registrars or whatever.

You know, so I think that we would really welcome some additional input from registries on this working group if not for long participation then at least maybe, you know, informally let us know if there are some things that you're stakeholder group sees that we need to be steering towards or away from.

And definitely - I'm hoping we can count on you to weigh in on the public comment because let's say the other side is very active and the knives are out. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Yeah, thanks a lot, James. And you and I had a conversation about this last week. And, you know, I completely understand. And I think we as the Registries haven't really sort of engaged or discussed this in a whole lot of detail. But, you know, frankly what's good for our customers ought to be good for us and this is something that we ought to take a closer look at.

Can you give me a sense as to what the next steps are, the next timeline is?

James Bladel: Well, we're trying to wrap up a few of the remaining outstanding issues. I think we're driving towards an initial report out for public comment towards the end of the year but I think that we'll see some community feedback opportunities perhaps even sooner.

Michele Neylon: The thing is is that, at the moment it's like a kind of a - how do I put this diplomatically? It's like we are fighting a battle...

James Bladel: Yeah.

Michele Neylon: ...it's a battle over the most ridiculous thing imaginable. I mean...

James Bladel: It's a contentious - it at times has been contentious.

Michele Neylon: It's been more than slightly contentious; it's...

James Bladel: It's gotten personal on a couple...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: It's gotten very personal. The ombudsman has been involved...

Jennifer Standiford: I haven't taken opposition.

James Bladel: You know, the point is for Registries is this could result in a completely new type of contracted party so maybe the question for you guys is how do they fit into our GNSO structure? Maybe think on that one, I don't know. I'm just trying to make it interesting for you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, James. Any thoughts or feedback, any other views? Okay so I think we'll take an action item to discuss this on one of our next calls and actually get back to you with some feedback. Apologize, I don't have more at this point but we didn't talk about it today in our meeting.

Jennifer Standiford: Thanks, Keith. We appreciate that.

Michele Neylon: And at this juncture I'd like to say oh hello Jonathan.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: We're all done. But we do need a volunteer from you ideally for the Cross Community Working Group on the IANA transition - the drafting team. Have you discussed that? Do you have a...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yes, we have discussed that and unless the word implodes Mr. Bladel, I believe, is our lamb. Is that you right, James? Okay.

Jennifer Standiford: Regarding the IANA transition drafting team.

Michele Neylon: Something to do with policy.

James Bladel: Yes.

Jennifer Standiford: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: You volunteered yourself.

James Bladel: Probably, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...Working Group on IANA Transition drafting team. You're the one are you? Wonderful, welcome.

Michele Neylon: Okay perfect. I think we're done here. Thanks to the Registries who did stick around. For the Registrars who stuck with us throughout the day you have wonderful stamina and well done. We are now adjourning this meeting.

END