ICANN 51, Los Angeles
New gTLD Applicant Group (NTAG) Meeting
13 October 2014
10:30 – 12:00 PDT
Transcript

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.

Cherie Stubbs: Good morning everybody. My name is Cherie Stubbs. I'm the Secretary for the Registry Stakeholder Group.

And I just will be starting. (Steve) will formally open the meeting. I just wanted to remind everyone we do have some that may be remote - remotely participating.

So if there is an open mic or a discussion please be sure to announce yourself before speaking. Thank you.

Steve Machin: Good morning everybody. Welcome to the NTAG meeting. There seems to be a lot more people here than there are usually so we thought we'd check everyone actually is in the right meeting. This is the NTAG meeting.

Cherie Stubbs: Now watch everybody...

Steve Machin: I know the membership is dwindling as everyone becomes registries but good morning to you all. Thanks for joining us this morning.

Thanks also to ICANN for making the room available for this NTAG meeting. Thanks to ICANN staff for attending. It's going to be very useful as usual to get some dialogue with you guys.

Thanks to the ExCom for all that work in the interim periods before these meetings.

You've all seen the agenda. For me personally I think that we are definitely moving towards and you can see from the agenda that there's a lot of focus on the future, the future of the NTAG, the future gTLD rounds.

And we're moving into a phase for NTAG membership of definitely into kind of operations and away so we can commence.

[Audio Lost for a period: update on auctions from Russ Weinstein]

So thanks for the update on auctions Russ. Do you want to add something about the use of funds from auctions? Thanks Christine?

Christine Willett: Good morning this is Christine Willett. So we've been getting a lot of questions about the use of funds.

So as Russ said the funds from auctions has been segregated for now. And the board has on their discussion agenda for this week how they intend to consult with the community on the use of proceeds for auctions - from auctions.

So they fully intend to consult with the community and collaborate on a direction decision-making process and how to use those funds. And they're beginning those discussions internally this week.

As Akram mentioned in an ExCom meeting last night we anticipate having more visibility into the amount of auction proceeds in totality early in 2015.

So after we've gone through a few more months of auctions we still expect a number of auctions to be canceled. It seems as though just having the auction scheduled is driving a lot of contention resolution amongst its applicants.

So it's a bit early to forecast what the entirety of the proceeds might be. If we're talking 14 million or 100 million what to do with those funds and the options could be significantly different.

So we expect that by early next year by the Marrakesh meeting that we'll have more information on a forecast of those funds.

Steve Machin: And a sense of what the process would be.

Christine Willett: Correct. And that will also give the board an opportunity to determine their process for consulting with the community and to put that up for discussion as well.

Steve Machin: Great. Thanks Christine.

Christine Willett: Thank you.

Steve Machin: Can we open it any questions from the floor about Auctions 10?

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer. Christine the one thing I would encourage, I know this is at a board level kind of discussion but the process for determining the use of the funds. Irregardless of what the amount might be I would encourage that to get started sooner than later and just at least put some parameters.

And yes I understand that 14 million versus 100 million is a different discussion for what the funds may be used for. But just to start building the parameters for the community to start providing input around how these funds might be used because this will not be an easy answer.

I mean I can just imagine this is going to have a lot of input from the community and it will take time. So the sooner we get started with that the better. Thank you.

Steve Machin: Thanks Tim. Any other questions or comments on auctions in the use of auction funds?

Jim Prendergast: Hi there, Jim Prendergast. Russ I saw in the net proceeds report that you put out for the auctions $10,000 fees for each cancelled auction. Is that - what triggers that?

If like it's the three folks decide to settle in the next two days then ICANN pays the auction house $10,000 fee or...?

Russ Weinstein: Yes. So in the statement of work we have a cancellation fee for an auction. And we determine schedule. A scheduled auction is right at the time when we send those confirmation of the dates to the participants.

We do that about seven weeks in advance of the auction to give all the participants enough time to get their bank account information set up properly with the auction provider and the escrow provider to get those funds transferred into the auction account in advance of the auction so that there's not a last-minute panic to get several hundred thousand or more dollars wired in...

Steve Machin: Well more than...

Russ Weinstein: ...internationally.

Jim Prendergast: So it's seven weeks out is the...

Russ Weinstein: Right...

Jim Prendergast: ...sort of cutoff date for that?

Russ Weinstein: ...now we're doing it at about seven weeks out. It's something I'm willing to talk about with the community as an opportunity to possibly save more proceeds.

The auction rules state we need to confirm the auction days to the participants 21 days in advance of the auction. It's now I believe two weeks to get the funds into...

Jim Prendergast: Right.

Russ Weinstein: ...the into the deposit account. We've been trying to do it earlier to give participants about a month to do that process.

So it's really we've been doing it because we heard feedback that, you know, it's going to take some time to get these funds transferred, there's international participants that make it a little more complex.

But we're here to facilitate the process for the community. As long as it's a level playing field we're comfortable sliding back closer to that 21 days as long as everyone's okay with it.

But we've been operating on a 35 day cycle to try and give everyone enough time to get that money and not have a panic six days before the auction or something.

Jim Prendergast: Thanks.

Steve Machin: Thanks Jim and thanks Russ again. The next agenda item we have is indirect contention as it relates to auctions. And there has been some discussion around indirect contention.

There is a separate session for applicants who are directly involved an indirect contention scheduled for later this week.

So I think unless there's a burning desire to talk in detail about this probably a quick update on the process for the indirect contention would be good Russ. Thanks.

Russ Weinstein: Sure. Sure thanks Steve. So we've been working real hard with the auction provider over the last several months now on a solution for indirect for having an auction with direct and indirect contention in the same set.

It's a complex topic. There's a lot of trade you've got to do to make sure that you're being fair to everyone and that it's clear to all participants what's going on in the auction at any given point and the time that you're respecting those contention relationships.

And what I mean by that is you're not creating direct contention where only indirect contention exists. So there's potential where more than one applicant can prevail from an indirect contention set because they're not in direct contention with one another.

So we've been working really hard on that. I think we have a real good solution in place that we're ready to roll out.

We'll - we're going to put that for public comment to make sure we get community feedback and buy-in on the process. We're staying true to the guidebook. It's going to use the ascending clock auction.

It's going to be second price based result. And I can share more about that in the direct session and free to take comments from you.

Steve Machin: Thanks Russ. Anybody got any questions or comments on indirect contention?

Great. The next agenda item is to concerning community priority evaluation which again I'm looking to GDD first and a brief update.

Christine Willett: So last week we published three more community priority evaluation results. There's currently one in process that's been invited, one other applicant that's been invited to CPE.

And there are I believe it's ten more who are yet to be invited that are ineligible for various reasons, change requests, GAC advice, accountability mechanisms.

The results of some of the evaluations for CPEs has gotten a lot of attention. I would just like to state that.

The outcomes and the results of the CPE evaluations are not a judgment by ICANN or the panel on the existence of communities on the existence of such communities.

It is an evaluation of the application as they were submitted against the set of criteria in the guidebook and the detailed evaluation criteria as were published for CPE.

So there is no - there's no intended reflection on the various members of those communities. Simply it is an analytical evaluation by the panel of the applications.

Steve Machin: Thanks Christine. Do we have comments on the floor on the community priority evaluation topic?

Susan Payne: Hi. It's Susan Payne here from Valideus. I did have a question about the process now in the sense of when - and others may already know the answer to this but when there's been an evaluation decision what happens then?

Is it something - does the board have to in any way adopt it or does the applicant just go back into the contention set?

Russ Weinstein: So similar to the other evaluations and other processes on the program the board doesn't have to get involved under.

So if an applicant prevails CPE they earn 14 or more points and earn priority. They win the rights to the string and win the rights to the contingent side

assuming no other members of the contention set also prevail in community priority evaluation.

And if they don't earn the 14 points on the priority then they go back into the contention set and eventually we get it scheduled for an auction and either itself resolves or we resolve it through an auction.

Christine Willet: So we don't wait for the other applicants in the contention set like with an auction. After an auction the prevailing applicant moves forward and we consider the concession set resolved. The team updates that contentions that page.

The contention set shows a status of resolved, that little graphic changes. So we reflect that.

And I'm sure you're all aware that there's been a number of accountability mechanisms triggered.

So those contention sets are - those applicants who are prevailing are moving very quickly to the process due to some of the other mechanisms.

Steve Machin: Thanks Christine. Statton?

Statton Hammock: Statton Hammock, Rightside. If the contention set can now move forward after CPE does it get scheduled at the end of the auction schedule?

You know, right now we plan to go through March or April I think, March or can it move up in the schedule based on, you know, available slots if other strings dropout?

Russ Weinstein: Hi Statton. This is Russ. Yes it can - we all assess where it fits into the prioritization. Based on the lowest priority number in the set we'll assess the lead-time to get to an auction and then the availability or capacity within an auction.

As you know we try and hold the actions to about 20 contentions sets or so when we schedule them each month.

And so if there's capacity say in February but we have auctions scheduled in March we try and get in, in February. So hopefully that answers the question.

And then as you know we have both the advancement possibility and the postponement possibility. So up to 45 days before an auction takes place all the members of the contention set can request to advance the auction. And that would need to be 45 days before the desired date.

And if you wanted to postpone the auction at least 45 days before the current scheduled date we need to get a form from every member of that contention set requesting to postpone.

Jim Prendergast: I have a follow-on question from that I see as an interest of the Auctions Working Group. What is the process that triggers the kind of the initial placement of the set back into the auction, I mean the usual auction rules that too, you know, drag forward and drag back and all that stuff applies.

But is there a sense of that are those sets already placed in auctions and they were just on a hold status or they - can they get opened up to auction or do they need to be slotted into if there's an auction that was filled up with 20 slots do they get - do you make extra slot available?

Russ Weinstein: So Jim we - what we do is we wait for the eligibility criteria that are outlined in the auction rules before scheduling the auction. So we wait until it is theoretically eligible to go to auction and then we scheduled into the next available auction according to its priority.

And then if something later puts it on hold we'll leave it in that auction for the time being until we get direction to put it somewhere else.

But on the off chance that holds, resolves itself well in advance so the auction will be able to maintain the auction date.

Steve Machin: Great, thanks Russ. Any other comments or questions, John?

John Styll: I guess as one of the applicants that did not pass last week I'd like to make a, you know, maybe just say this on the record.

We found the process very difficult to navigate particularly where it seemed to us that some of the rules or the application of the rules in the guidebook seemed to change from the time we filed the application to when the determination was done.

And I don't want to get too granular here but it seemed like, you know, we just completely didn't understand maybe what something meant. And, you know, pretty intelligent people worked on the application so it shouldn't have been that hard.

I will say anecdotally when we saw that we opened up the evaluations saw that we got a three out of a possible 16 it was kind of like okay that was funny. Now send us the real one.

So it does seem that there was some criteria applied inconsistently between determinations. We feel like we wished we had gotten one of the other panelists.

And speaking of that we really have an issue with the total opacity of the EIU process. Unsigned determinations feel unfair. We don't know who said or did these things, what their qualifications are. That just seems inconsistent with the transparency that ICANN typically seems to exercise.

Steve Machin: Thanks then John. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: So just this is Jeff Neuman. Sorry my voice is going. Just to ask a clarification question. So you said I know ICANN has no role in the evaluations.

And so when the decision gets to you do you just then post it whatever it says or is there any review by anybody at ICANN of the decision or is it literally just posted?

Christine Willett: So thank you Jeff. The - we receive preliminary reports from the panel that are reviewed. We look at completeness. We have conversations as we have with all of the initial evaluation panels about the process that they followed.

We endeavor to ensure that the criteria were applied consistently. We - where we have questions about rationale we have those discussions. So yes we do see the preliminary versions of the reports before they are published.

And then once the panel finalizes their report then we do publish that report. We probably put it on our own. Do we publish - do they create that template?

Man: They (unintelligible).

Christine Willett: Oh they create the template and that is the report we publish.

Jeff Neuman: Just a follow-up. I think it might be interesting for those that have been reviewed to actually see the questions that ICANN asked of the panelists to understand I mean you can imagine if you asked questions about the rationale you actually get answers.

But I'm sure John and others that have did not prevail in community evaluation have their own questions but they don't have the same opportunity to get their questions answered.

So to the extent you can at least post the questions that ICANN asked back and the answers that you got back that might be helpful.

Christine Willett: So I don't know that we have but there was a written exchange. There was a review. You know, we received a preliminary report and we had a discussion about it.

So I don't know that there's anything more we can publish.

I want to thank John and acknowledge the professional way in which you raised your concerns. We certainly appreciate the sensitivity and the importance of these issues.

And as I said to you privately we encourage you to utilize ICANN's accountability mechanisms as many applicants and other parties in the community have done so as part of the program.

John Styll: Thanks.

Steve Machin: Okay moving on to the next agenda point regarding the ombudsman which I don't believe the ombudsman's is here. No.

So there was a sense that from the previous meeting that there would - there was a sense of wanting to have more transparency to some of the timing and processes of that from the ombudsman.

I'm not sure if there's a formal process that we can use to kind of rat those issues from within the NTAG or there's some channel that can be used just outside of the process. Krista?

Krista Papac: I'll just lean. So your request is to - you want to get some sort of interaction with the ombudsman to ask questions about - I think Donna is going to clarify. Sorry this is Krista.

Donna Austin: Yes. Just to be clear at the NTAG session we had in London the ombudsman gave an update on some of the accountability requests that have gone to him in relation to some of the application processes.

And it was more and I think Krista you and at that time you said that you would provide a little bit more transparency into how those are managed within the process.

And I think the ombudsman at the time said that he would come back to us and give us an update. Because we have no visibility into when people are making inquiries of him or, you know, requests of them.

And there's no time frame or whatever into how long he has to make a determination or anything like that.

So and to me it was still an outstanding item that we hadn't heard back on how long those processes are taking or where he was and how they impact I guess as well.

Christine Willett: Thank you Donna. This is Christine Willett. I think it would be appropriate for the ombudsman to speak on his own behalf.

As you can appreciate the matters brought before the ombudsman are considered confidential unless the parties choose to make them public.

So but let's put it on the list. How about if we put it on the scorecard?

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: I'm going to - well I was just thinking we'll just take it as an action item.

Christine Willett: Okay, great.

Krista Papac: And I have a last minute request but you can tell me no. But since he's not here for the ten minutes I was hoping to maybe just give you guys a five minute update on what the registry team is doing to support applicants.

If you - it can be later if you, you know, I know you have other agenda items. We can wait till the end of the meeting to make sure you have time to get through your agenda items.

But I will take the ombudsman topic specifically as an action item and come back to you to let's figure out what he was going to do and then we'll come back to you with an update.

Steve Machin: That would be great Krista. We'll do that at the end of the agenda. That's great. Thanks.

So the next item is concerning the future of the NTAG with an update from the Working Group led by Samantha Demetriou.

And first before we get into that I would like to make a, a kind of formal initial announcement that we'll be holding ExCom elections for the NTAG in mid-November I believe.

So if anybody is interested in participating in the NTAG at the ExCom level then do feel free to reach out to any of the current ExCom or the secretariat or previous ExCom members and find out what's involved. But yes do get involved more and November will be the elections.

So Samantha.

Samantha Demetriou: Hi everyone. So I sent an email around over the weekend with a quick update about what the Working Group has kind of circled around based off of the conversation we had back in the London meeting in June.

The big take away that we really took from that was that everyone has really appreciated, the NTAG members have really appreciated the ability of NTAG to, you know, give everyone a unified voice.

But the concern is that, you know, as people sign their registry agreements they no longer have a voting mechanism in NTAG.

So the solution that we've kind of come up with as a proposal is to establish a second interest group within the RySG the new TLD Registries Group.

So effectively it would function in similar ways as they NTAG but it would allow existing - like sorry, once you sign your registry agreement and you become a fully-fledged RySG member you would also have a vote in this interest group.

So what we're thinking is for a time they would coexist alongside each other, the new TLD registries group and the new TLD Applicants Group.

So we circulated a draft of a charter. I guess at this point we can open it up for questions and discussion.

Steve Machin: Great, thanks Samantha. Please comments from the floor or questions about the future of NTAG and the proposed methodology?

Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes so can you Samantha just sorry, I missed reading that. Can you just go over kind of the rationale for a new TLD registry interest group as opposed to just being part of the Registry Stakeholder Group because there's going to be a tremendous amount of overlap? So can you just kind of explain that a little bit, the rationale?

Samantha Demetriou: Sure. And I'll open it up to anyone else in the working group if they want to chime in as well.

But my understanding was that, you know, as we move into people delegating their TLDs and we're having their registry agreements there are still issues that are unique to operators that have emerged from the 2012 round.

And that those operators had an interest in having a place where they could have a unified voice that may be different from registries or I guess traditional or legacy registry operators. I don't know if that's the best phrase for it.

But one of the things we wanted to discuss today is potential areas of overlap and potential areas of distinction and how we can think about some processes to put in place to make sure that those are really differentiated and so there isn't too much overlap.

Jeff Neuman: I mean just thinking about that it seems to me that rather than creating another structure for the group is you kind of do it on an issue by issue basis.

You know, it just seems like otherwise people are going to go to two sets of meetings, discuss the exact same things except for those areas that don't overlap.

And many of the existing TLDs are moving over to the contracts or will eventually move over to the contracts that the new TLDs have.

So you're going to see less and less areas where maybe one or two registries don't have the same contracts, but everybody it's the expectation of the legacy TLDs that they'll eventually move over to the new TLD agreements and it's all going to eventually be unified.

In a lot of respects for example .biz we have a lot of the same things as the new TLD Registry Agreement, not everything but a lot of the similar things.

And then so for .biz for example which one we do we belong in and do we get a vote? It just seems to me that when issues come up rather than create interest groups around a group of people you create interest groups around an issue.

And I think that's - that's how it was initially kind of conceived. So I totally understand like interest groups on gTLD and community TLDs and brand TLDs.

But to me just to create a new TLD Registry Group seems like a lot of groups that people need to belong in unless there are issues right?

Right and so, you know, one of the issues are that the Jon is dealing with right and Stephanie and others of the amendments right? That's unique to the new TLDs.

But we didn't need a new TLD Registry Group to create a working group to deal with that issue. Anyway that's just my 2 cents.

We can spend a lot of time talking about voting rights and all these other things of the charter. I from my personal opinion I think it's more a better use of time to do an issue interest group as opposed to a, just setting up a new TLD Registry Group but that's just my opinion and personal opinion. It's not company or anything.

Steve Machin: Thanks Jeff. Any feedback there from the working group members? Jon?

Jon Nevett: Sure I think it's a good idea. I think there's issues that are unique to new TLD registries. The contract one is probably the most prevalent at this point.

There are other issues, name collision -- things like that -- that apply only to new TLD registries. And to have an organization and ability to speak on behalf of just new TLD registries is warranted.

It's not taking a lot of time or effort. You know, we have a charter pretty majority drafted thanks to Samantha and it just gives us the opportunity to speak from the perspective of a new TLD registry. Thanks.

Steve Machin: Thanks Jon. Any other questions or comments regarding the future of NTAG from the floor? Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks, Jordyn Buchanan with Google. I guess I sort of land halfway between where Jon and Jeff are coming in.

I do think it strikes me that it would be useful to have some coherent set of people that pay attention to issues around new TLD issues.

I do worry a little bit that for a while it seemed like we with NTAG we were - we saw a lot of overlap in terms of agenda and discussion in topics between what was being discussed at NTAG meetings versus in the Registry Stakeholder Group meetings.

So I guess I'm just curious if you have thoughts on how we would manage that in the new group so that we just to Jeff's point we don't waste a lot of time talking about issues in two places because that's probably not very efficient.

Samantha Demetriou: This might be you speaking to my unfamiliarity with the process but one possible solution that I can think of is instead of having, you know, a separate hour and a half block for an applicant group meeting and then also the full day

of the registry meeting for example we could just combine them and have - I note already the RySG meeting has a slot for NTAG issues.

So, you know, instead of having two separate meetings where everyone talks about the same things we could have one meeting where everyone's in the same room and discusses it but then if it does come down to oh there's an issue that one group wants to speak our vote or act differently on they have the means to do that.

Steve Machin: Thanks Samantha. Go ahead Jon.

Jon Nevett: Yes thanks. And it also gives us an opportunity to add weight behind a position. So if even if the Registry Stakeholder Group as a whole takes a position if it's especially if it's unique to new TLD registries to have a another voice can't hurt us. It'll just help us in the political process with ICANN.

So again I think that's absolutely right what Samantha said. We - it shouldn't take a lot of time. It's self-organizing of an interest group is the whole point of having the provision in the Registry Stakeholder Group charter.

And if the new TLDs feel a need to get together and want to add a voice and have a voice to represent new TLD registries then I'm supportive of that.

Steve Machin: Thanks Jon.

Donna Austin: So I guess when we started this discussion it was about the future of the NTAG. And I think we kind of acknowledged that the numbers in the NTAG are dwindling. So the NTAG do we see it become dormant or, you know, how are we going to manage it?

Because we understand that there's a next round coming up. So maybe conversations need to happen within the NTAG as those start to wrap up again.

Explain?

Steve Machin: We lost connection.

Donna Austin: Okay so we're not being recorded but I don't know that that's a big issue at the moment.

So I think this is in my mind this is kind of a phasing stage as well because, you know, there will be a time where the NTAG will be dormant. But we still need to have a place where we can have discussion around things that are particular to new gTLD stuff.

And particularly, you know, I think compliance is one of the issues that it's going to bubble long for us for some time. So, you know, maybe we just need some way to see it so that we can have those conversations.

So maybe this is part of a phasing as the NTAG kind of slows down. Then perhaps those issues that we think are specific to 2012 registries then there's some way to have that conversation. So I think that's kind of part of the context as well.

Steve Machin: Thanks Donna. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I - this is Jeff Neuman. Again I think having a place to discuss issues is great. I was more commenting on kind of the formalistic rules, the charter.

Again I haven't looked at it and maybe I just need another copy sent to me. But I know there was a lot of discussion early on when we sat up the NTAG. If you voted in the Registry Stakeholder Group you couldn't vote in the NTAG.

I mean although similar types of rules or, you know, and I know like if you look at this mailing list today - and I keep two separate ones so it gets, you know, almost invariably it's identical. You get the same email sent to both lists and almost everybody sends them both to the Registry Stakeholder Group and to the NTAG.

There's very few different mailing lists. And all I'm saying is it may be more appropriate to do issue by issue kind of mailing lists as opposed to just two ones that copy. Again it's not a huge issue but I'm trying to unify us a little bit more and that's all.

Steve Machin: Thanks Jeff. Jonathan?

Jon Nevett: Yes I agree. I don't think we need a separate mailing list because it's an interest group, not of members. So everyone by definition will be part of the Registry Stakeholder Group unlike NTAG where it's an observer interest group and it's a different situation.

But getting back to Donna's point I absolutely still see the need for, you know, a strong NTAG. We still have plenty of issues to work through in this round where a lot of us are still applicants and, you know, working through auctions and CPEs and other things that we're still - that are still outstanding. Timing there'll be stragglers.

And so I think having NTAG remain in place in the current form as an observer interest group would be pertinent and helpful and getting ready for the next round that would be good to have it standing. Thanks.

I apologize. I have to leave. I got called to the principal so...

Steve Machin: Thanks Jon.

Donna Austin: Sorry team. So I think going back to Jeff's point and we have had this discussion about the NTAG in the Registry Stakeholder Group previously.

I think we need to get clear delineation about, you know, what's, you know, what issues sit where. I think, you know, we started to have that conversation with the RySG and NTAG.

Maybe we need to spend some time kind of thinking about that as to, you know, where the buckets are going to fit in order to get more clarity around how we think this will work.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer. I just want to kind of add to what Jon and Donna have been saying. I really don't think that we're going to find that the NTAG will have that much time where it is "dormant."

I think ending the first round is well out in front of us still. And I think then the looking ahead to round two, the role that NTAG can play with GDD on starting to, you know, get an advance look at lessons learned and where do we go from here.

I think a lot of shaping of how we may, you know, round two and what it looks like will be a key thing I think NTAG will be doing.

So I think NTAG and may have a slower period but I'm not sure it's going to have a necessarily a dormant period. Thank you.

Steve Machin: Thanks Tim. Any further input from - we have no input.

Maxim Alzoba: (Unintelligible) and now before we move to 50 and magical number all cases that be it.

Also there is a sorting working for the yes, by time operation, the reason, et cetera, et cetera, you just push - you have working filter which allows you to filter by the consent of cases, by the subject of cases which is useful because I use it in daily job and yes it's more interesting.

There are more things ongoing and things the meeting during ICANN meeting of GDD portal user group -- unfortunately it's closed -- is going to be in one or two days. I expect more things to come.

Also during the last meeting one thing which interest all of registries is to have API, A-P-I to the ICANN system so we don't just see anybody else from ICANN saying that something's wrong with your system, please check it.

There is going to be something where your system could check like new cases, the what ICANN thinks of about health of your services, et cetera, et cetera. Because it's extremely useful for your internal trouble ticket systems.

So what I can say the progress so far was great because all things which were not on for the GDD scorecard workgroup.

Sometimes we have new information through the new GDD, through the GDD portal user group. Yes we exchange information.

And I think it's going to the situation where we will have the best interface which will save a lot of time. And yes, it will make our life at least easier. Thanks. Do you have any questions?

Steve Machin: So no questions for (Maxim). Any input from GDD on the portal, any updates, didn't have to be?

Krista Papac: Yes, no I mean I know that we did deploy those. There - it's enhancement package that was, you know, a lot of little things that add up to I think better functionality.

And, you know, curious to hear from you guys not necessarily right now but just, you know, how that's working and if you're I mean I think that this group's doing a great job.

I know that Leon Sanchez who's our Technical Product Manager at ICANN that's leading this effort has just found the input from the users of the GDD portal to be extremely valuable. And it seems like that group is really working well together. So thank you for that.

Maxim Alzoba: One small thing. If any from and one from registries is interest in - interested in becoming part of this group just drop a Leon email or maybe to me and I will ask them to add you to the group.

Because each place where it can influence the how this interface works how yes, basically to cut your time expense on the process.

Steve Machin: Thanks Maxim.

Krista Papac: Krista again. I just wanted to add one more thing. So as part as we're working on the roadmap for the tools that support the technology and tools that support our customers, you know, contracted parties applicants, et cetera, the next wave which will I think affect some of the people in this room because of vertical integration but will be rolling out shortly and this is being, you know, it will be facilitated by my counterpart on the registrar side and Leon Sanchez as well.

But a similar group for registrars to come together and start talking about what they would like to see. And once we, you know, bring them from the legacy system that they're on into the GDD portal how all of that looks. And so I think that they'll be - need to be some cross collaboration with the Registry Users Group as well.

Maxim Alzoba: One last thing. In - currently in the interface there is no things about RSEP. And it's planned to have like you have cases, B2B cases. And you will have the special top for set cases where you can exchange information. It's in the system and not numerous emails (unintelligible). So that's that.

Steve Machin: Thanks Maxim. The next item is the RA renegotiation topic. And sadly Jon had to leave us so I don't believe we're going to get an update on that.

Susan Payne: (Unintelligible).

Steve Machin: You want to do an update at the end?

Susan Payne: I'll do it.

Steve Machin: This is a brief update.

Susan Payne: Yes.

Steve Machin: That'd be good, thanks.

Susan Payne: Okay. So this is Susan Payne here speaking. This is a process that if we recall we kicked off under Clause 7.7 of the registry agreement which is the opportunity to have a negotiation with ICANN above provisions in the registry agreement as there's a sort of Joint Working Group Working on this.

                  From the Registry's Stakeholder Group, the NTAG and there are also people inputting from the Brand Registry Group as well to the extent they're not sort of Registry Stakeholder Group members to make sure that we - we're as inclusive as possible because it's a process that will affect anyone who is a signatory to the agreement in due course assuming any amendments are made.

                  And we put together a sort of list of suggested amendments that we wanted on our side and submitted them to ICANN and then a week or two ago got back their responses to those requests and also a number of suggestions from ICANN as well about the changes that they feel would be sensible to make to the agreement too.

                  A lot of these are relatively sort of minor corrections of errors and things that people have noticed as they start to work in practice.

                  There are and actually as well some sort of more substantive points that people are - that are being discussed.

And we had our first sort of kickoff meeting yesterday to discuss and try and understand each other's position on various points.

And I mean some, you know, it's very clear on both sides what's being asked and why. And on some both sides I think we all felt we needed a bit of discussion to understand. So that's where we got to yesterday.

And I think we've sort of on both sides gone away with a few things where we're going to do a bit more work.

But so it's an ongoing process which I think probably also will take a little bit of time. It's not something that's going to be immediate.

And we'll obviously be doing a more full report back to the mailing list so that everyone's aware of what's being proposed and discussed.

And in due course assuming that we reach agreement on some suggested amendments it does call for public comment. So it's we're not sort of unilaterally amending everyone's contract.

Oh, and if anyone else wants to ask any questions or if anyone else who was also in the meeting wants to make any comments please chime in.

Steve Machin: Any comments or questions regarding the negotiation track? No.

Okay moving on to an update is (Brett) in the room on the new gTLD Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group? I don't believe so.

There is a session devoted to this later on in the week. I believe it's Wednesday.

Susan Payne: Yes.

Steve Machin: ...from my recollection. It's Wednesday morning. And I would recommend anybody who is interested in paying attention to that topic that they attend that session.

It is an open discussion group. Anybody can join either as a participant or an observer but yes definitely go to that session for an update on the process.

I don't think that currently discussing content of subsequent rounds. It's more a process discussion. Go ahead Donna.

Donna Austin: So the group itself it's like an issue identification and I think they've come up with 40 odd or something at the moment. It could be a lot more than that.

And the idea is just to identify issues and then decide to what extent these need to be dealt with.

I think Brett has identified this as policy or implementation issues but I think that's a little bit too sensitive to put them into those buckets.

So this is more issue identification and then try to work out the process that will be required to feed this into a next round.

Steve Machin: Thanks Donna. Go ahead Krista.

Krista Papac: I don't - I was not listening for one second because I - we were just double checking the update on next round of new gTLD is today.

Donna Austin: (Unintelligible).

Krista Papac: You're talking about the other session. Okay just wanted to make sure there because I was even confused. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Yes. So this discussion group is within the GNSO and it's a separate session on next round. Yes.

Steve Machin: Any comments or questions regarding that item? So the last item on the agenda before we give some time over to Krista is another update from Maxim regarding the Cross Community Working Group.

Maxim Alzoba: It's short update on the Cross Community Working Group on country and territory names as TLDs.

                  Basically there were a few meetings after the one meeting. Mostly there were discussions about the that the old document produced by ccNSO on country and territory name use in TLD is still good, that the landscape hasn't changed a lot in terms of what we think is a territory name and a country name. That methodology is still okay, that the classes of the items are still relevant.

                  And basically we expect yes I think it's tomorrow or in today's there will be a meeting that might lead to the idea that everything is still okay.

                  And we need another meeting in Marrakesh to yes, make the final deliverable saying that you can use the old document. Basically that's it.

Steve Machin: All right thanks Maxim. Go ahead Donna.

Donna Austin: So Maxim can I just ask a question? So this is about the use of country and territory names at the top level?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes on the top level there was a short discussion a few minutes if it's applicable to the second or third level or whatever. And it was decided that it's not in the scope of the group to talk about lower levels.

Donna Austin: And the outcome of the group facing to what?

Maxim Alzoba: The idea was to make something which will be used in the next round in situations when you need to understand what to do with the territory name or country name in applications for example.

And I - basically I personally think that the old document of 2013 of ccNSO group will be used again because we the standard ISO standard hasn't changed since then. And yes new countries appear each year now.

But still the methodology's still the same and basically nothing changed. But it is the process to ensure that it is still a valid document.

Susan Payne: Hi, Susan Payne. I've got a question as well Maxim if that's okay. Could you just confirm this is just about country and territory names it's not about other geographical terms which might be at a more sort of, you know, cities and the like and so anything sort of smaller in area than a country?

And secondly do you know whether the GAC representative who's been looking at geographical names generally is still planning to present at your meeting on Thursday?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim, first about the GAC member there is going to be face to face meeting with the subgroup of GAC which is interested in the same things and one of GAC members using this cross working group.

And I think we need to wait till the final document because until then we won't be able to predict if something changed the last minute because GAC usually want some interesting and (unintelligible) things.

So we might expect something but I think we should wait till the final document published. Basically my prediction that nothing will change but it's my personal opinion.

Steve Machin: Thanks Maxim. So that concludes the formal agenda points. We'll now pass the floor to Krista who's requested five minutes.

Krista Papac: Thinks everybody. Krista Papac with ICANN staff, sorry for the last minute request but I appreciate you accommodating me.

I just wanted to quickly touch on something that many of you will hopefully be familiar with. The - we just rolled out a basically an account management of what we're calling an engagement management model late last week.

And what that means is my department's a registry services department and we're, you know, responsible many of you have heard us talk about this over the coming months, responsible for the services that registries use as well as the relationships with registries and with applicants.

And so we rolled out the initial phase of this account management or engage and management plan so the members of the Registry Services Team all of the active applicants and registry operators.

But for the purpose of this discussion active applicants all received emails late last week from their engagement manager sort of introducing themselves and encouraging those of you whose engagement managers are at this meeting to try and find some time to chat with them.

And so I want to a make sure everybody is aware of that if you haven't seen the email please, you know, go find it. And if you still can't find it find one of us and will help you figure out who your engagement manager is.

I also wanted to just make sure everybody understands so that we have a lot of systems and processes in place for the different activities applicants go through.

And you should continue to follow, you know, to use those things and to use the normal channels that you would use like the applicant portal and the various processes for submitting things you need to submit and the established, you know, path for moving different - through different phases of the program.

Our focus is really on relationship. And we're also here to be an escalation point for you guys if there are times that you might find yourself stuck or not, you know, not sure how to figure something out or how to figure ICANN out.

The - I've gotten lots of questions on well when do I escalated and when don't I? And that's the piece that we're still working through.

And the work we are doing in conjunction with your group, the Registry NTAG Group on the scorecard one of the things that we're all actively engaged in right now is working on the service level targets.

And so that will output some more clarity and structure around when you may or may not want to escalate things.

I wanted to just - there is a number we didn't we don't have the whole Registry Team here but we have quite a few of them here. I was just going to maybe ask some of them to stand up. They're in the back of the room. Maybe they left.

They were here. Oh, there's (Ann) and I see where's (Isaac)? Here's Isaac right here. And (Valerie) was in here but she may have had to leave.

But I would encourage you to reach out to your engagement manager especially if they're here this week and just, you know, have a quick five minute hello with them.

The other thing I just wanted to mention is we do have a session on Wednesday. It's called the - it's the Registry Services Update. It's at 11:30 in the Beverly Hills Room which is on the bottom level, the California level.

We'll be talking about engagement management in there and also how we support applicants and registries.

And then finally just a reminder that we have been doing a road show over the past - we did two road show, two locations in September. The final location, the third one will be held in Istanbul in November.

For those of you that haven't been and that can get to Istanbul in November we'd love to have you come join us. And it's a - it's - they've been really well received. They're quite interactive. It's a workshop format so not a

presentation format. And people have found them to be quite useful. So we'd love to have you come join us in Istanbul.

And with that that's all I had. Thank you for the opportunity.

Steve Machin: Great, thanks Krista. Go ahead Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Krista. This is a good development. I actually, you know, a lot of us asked for this years back and I think this is a great development.

Can you just go into a little bit about like, you know, the number of accounts each or I don't want to call them accounts, but the number of TLDs each one manages, how many engaging managers there or kind of a little bit about the rationale of how you decide?

So in other words is every one -- I'll use Donuts, you know, here -- everyone in Donuts TLD is one? Every - like did you use that kind of methodology?

Krista Papac: Thanks for the question Jeff. You're stealing my thunder from Wednesday but no, no, no it's fine. I'll give you guys a preview now but still come to the session.

Yes so there we applied no rationale whatsoever. No, yes there's definitely rationale behind it. It's - I'm glad you brought this up because I've been trying - I've been saying this anywhere I can.

I did the account assignments myself. I'm sure I screwed some things up. So, you know, if some of your accounts are with one person and some are with another person reach out to me and will get it fixed.

The goal is one there assigned by true geography so not ICANN region but true geography. The Registry Services Team members are in the three hubs so Singapore, Istanbul and Los Angeles.

Istanbul covers Europe, Middle East and Africa. Singapore covers Asia and Australia, New Zealand and then Los Angeles covers the Americas and the Caribbean.

We did it by primary contact. So figuring that's the person who you'd mostly be speaking with.

So for instance the entity may be located in Europe but the primary contact is in, you know, China. That would have ended up with people in the Singapore office.

If that doesn't work for you guys we can fix it. Like, you know, this doesn't have to - this is not, you know, set in stone.

We have so we look at them. There's TLDs and then there's accounts for lack of a better word. I'll use Donuts as an example since you started there.

Donuts is one account but 150 TLDs. The engagement managers have anywhere from about 50 to 100 accounts each.

That seems like a lot but we're going to - we'll see how that goes. It also will dwindle down because there's currently, I think there's about approximately 1100, 1150 active applications.

But as we, you know, get to contracting a lot of those will drop off so the account numbers will come back down.

I think and again I would just encourage you if you - if your accounts are not all, if you have multiple accounts and applications or TLDs and they didn't end up with one manager please let me know and we can fix it very easily.

And then the last bit is - and it doesn't apply - it applies to Jeff and maybe one or two others in this room. This is all gTLDs. So it's also gTLDs from previous rounds also have account management.

Steve Machin: Thanks for that detailed update Krista, appreciate that.

Any other questions on that topic before I open the mic to any other business anybody have any other questions for this NTAG session?

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer, just one additional comment to Krista's point about the registry road show just going to put in my own personal plug.

I mean for those of you that have not had a chance and I know that, you know, if you're in the US traveling to Istanbul might not be that easy to do.

But the road show I thought was very good. I mean it was very engaging. It was a chance to drill down on issues. I think everybody there walked away with a very positive view of how it went.

So for those of you that may have missed it and maybe you can't get to the one in Istanbul but when the next round of these comes around they, it was very beneficial, so I just wanted to provide that feedback. Thank you.

Steve Machin: Thanks Tim. Any other - anybody else have anything for this meeting before we wrap it up? Okay that formally closes the NTAG meeting at ICANN 51.

Thanks to everyone on the recording end. Thanks to the people that run the Internet for really providing such great connectivity.

Thanks to ICANN staff, appreciate your input. Thank you very much for that and thanks everybody for attending. Thank you. Bye-bye.

END