Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
GDD Update
Sunday 12 October 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.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#oct
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much. Good morning and welcome to the second of the weekend session of the GNSO, the working sessions on Sunday, 12 of October here in LA.

Just to remind you all please, if and when you do speak, and anyone in the room is welcome to speak either at the microphones around the horseshoe here or at the microphone at the front of the table, please do announce yourself, your name, before you speak for the transcription purposes.

We've got a pretty busy schedule this morning. We're starting off with a meeting with our colleagues from the Generic Domains Division...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: The Global - oh my goodness - the newly renamed as of - the soon to be further renamed Global Domain Division. Akram, Cyrus, Christine and Karen. I'm sure you may well know some or all of them already.

This is an opportunity to ask questions and discuss things and make - I know they would like it to be as interactive as possible. We've got a couple of topics we can deal with. Akram, I don't know if you'd like to make any opening remarks first and then we can see where we go with picking up on a couple of the topics.

Akram Atallah: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you all for attending the meeting and welcome to LA, our hometown so it's really nice to not be jet lagged for once in an ICANN meeting.

I think that it's very important to talk a little bit about where we are in the Global Domains Division and we've set out to do a - to change our structure and how we engage with our customers and how do we implement all of the policies that come our way. And I think we are well on our way to get to the finish line.

We've made a lot of progress in the last few months. I think the - on the registry side we were able now to move what used to be the team that did everything for the Registries to become more relationship management focused and services focused to the Registries.

We've assigned a account manager to every registry now so you have a point - as a registry you have a point of escalation so any time there is any issue you have a name that you can call, you can talk to, you can work with to resolve your issues.

We've also moved forward on the Registrar side; we have now registrar relationship managers in every time zone. We haven't assigned accounts yet but that's - that will be happening shortly both in Istanbul - in Istanbul and in Singapore. We've also moved all of the work that used to be done by those teams to the operational team.

We're putting in place already a layer of customer support. We're putting the tools together. So I think things are coming around. It's a major transformation of how we do business but I think we're making a very good progress on that front.

We are also - we've added a CTO with David Conrad. He's focusing on the identifiers on the Internet identifiers and making sure that we are on top of things. The - our chief security officer is now more focused on security issues and outreach while our CTO is focused on the technology and the transition and all of these things that need to happen.

So I think overall the Global Domains Division is now more complete, it's more focused on its work and it's making a lot of progress. And I'm hoping to see your feedback on both the tools, the relationship management approach, all of these things that we are putting in place. And of course it's a continuous improvement but it think we've made great stride in the right direction.

So with that I would like to give it back to Jonathan to start on the topics and then we will hopefully have enough time for Q&A. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Akram. So the kind of topics we had talked about was an update on the policy implementation work. Obviously the Council is focused on management of policy within the GNSO so some form of updates on policy implementation work going on within the Global Domains Division.

There was a topic that I had flagged with the team here and which happened to come up in our discussions yesterday and that was the interrelationship between the work of the consultation group on - or sorry the discussion group on new gTLDs and the staff work that's going on in - the related staff work on appraising the new gTLD program. So I think Karen is probably prepared to say a few words about that and discuss that.

We have a separate session later on name collision so I suggest that's scheduled for 12:00 so I suggest we probably don't need to go into that. And I know, Cyrus, you had asked to get some update on the sort of focus and what's coming down the tracks from the GNSO. But so we could go in to the policy implementation work unless Cyrus or Christine or Karen, any of you want to make any other follow on remarks from what Akram said.

Okay great. So let's go onto the current sort of policy and implementation work and an update on that. And just to remind you - everyone here - that anyone is welcome to contribute both in the form of either input or questions at any time. These are the GNSO working sessions. This is the Global Domains Division and any form of interaction is welcome. Thanks.

Kaitlin Tubergen: Hi. This is Kaitlin Tubergen from ICANN staff with an update on GNSO policy implementation. For IRTP Working Group B Recommendation 8, which is the standardization and clarification of Whois status messages, this was incorporated into the Additional Whois Information Policy, or the AWIP, and it was announced after ICANN 50. Is it will be effective for all registries and registrars February 15, 2015.

IRTP Recommendation 9, new provisions for locking and unlocking of domain names, was announced in July and will be as active for all registrars January 31, 2015.

IRTP Working Group C Recommendation 1, the change of registrant policy, draft policy language has been distributed and reviewed by the implementation review team. The draft is expected to go through public comment before ICANN 52.

Recommendation 2, which is the time limiting of FOAs, the draft text has been reviewed by the implementation review team and that updated text will be included in the updated IRTP when it goes out for public comment with Recommendation 1.

UDRP Locking Working Group, the updated UDRP rules went out for public comment. The comments have been incorporated and the updated UDRP language has been approved by the implementation review team.

Announcement will go out within the coming weeks and all ICANN accredited registrars will be required to comply with the updated UDRP rules by July 31, 2015.

For thick Whois, the conclusions of the legal review from Recommendation 3 are expected to be available in November. The current implementation plan will be revised in order to provide for more input by relevant experts, the working group recommendation to convene a team of experts from affected parties, as well as provide an opportunity for delivering on outcomes sequentially and potentially sooner.

This will be done by proposing the de-coupling recommended by the working group of two parts of the main recommendation, transitioned from thin to thick Whois, and the display of output. There will be a thick Whois implementation working session on Thursday at 8:30 in Constellation.

For IGO INGO, the final draft for the use cases for TMCH claims has been completed and is pending internal review. Reconciliation of the Spec 5 reserved names pertaining to IGO INGO names is ongoing. The team is looking at the swim lane diagrams for the TMCH claims which will be carried out in the next two weeks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So that great to get that summary. I have a question immediately, does that information come out in that sort of form anywhere else? I mean, is that digest like - do you guys give or do you guys do some sort of reporting about current implementation activity or is that - James, go ahead.

James Bladel: I was going to ask a similar question. It would be really great - I was typing as furiously as I could but it would be really great if there were - and I know we've talked about this and I know there's been a lot of progress on this but if there were a calendar somewhere that you could go to and you could see when these dates are occurring.

For example, I noted that the first two items you discussed, one is going to take effect February 15 and one is going to take effect January 31. Operationally it would be great if we had been getting as close as possible to the same date. So, you know, it's easier to explain to our team that by, you know, February 20 - 28 - the end of February we have to have these eight things done instead of something happening every week between now and then.

So, you know, I think if we can get these all centralized someplace where we can just take a look what's coming next, what do we have to sprint towards and then getting those dates consolidated to as few deadlines as possible, those two things would be great.

Jonathan Robinson: Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, James. And in fact this morning when I was reviewing my notes for my day and my session here I did write down that James is going to ask for that policy implementation calendar which I promised to him back in London.

So I apologize for us being delinquent; we are working on that. And I commit to you to actually have that in one form and a calendar form which will help you and help us actually in terms of planning. So point well taken, we'll take that as an action item.

James Bladel: I apologize for being so predictable.

Jonathan Robinson: Doing something unpredictable now. Karen.

Karen Lentz: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Karen Lentz. I also wanted to add to what Cyrus said about the work that is ongoing in terms of kind of a comprehensive view of all of the implementation work that's going on.

We've been seeking to document a lot of the work and our practices around the stages we go through when we inherit a policy to be implemented and all of the progress we make and how we report on it.

We've actually discuss that - some of that documentation with the Policy and Implementation Working Group, excuse me, which I think have been really positive discussions. But part of our effort is, you know, to create more transparency around what the status of the work is that's ongoing.

So our - one of the things that we envision is something like exist in the policy space where there's a diagram and you can tell exactly what phase something is in, all of the policy activities that are underway. So that is an outcome that we envision.

And then something that we have also been folding into that is discussion of a calendar, how you can synchronize things together to minimize the stream of changes which has gone through a few iterations so as Cyrus said that is in progress as well. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Any other comments or questions relating to that? I mean, absent that calendar it may even be helpful just to get a written summary of that so that we can have that and come to the Council, then we can send it out to our groups.

Any other questions or comments? So I think then that makes sense to move on to the topic that we talked about on the relationship between the work of

the discussion group and the staff worked on the - reviewing the outcomes of the new gTLD program.

I should say for you guys' information, this came up as a discussion item yesterday and it was also input on the fact that there's the work going on in the Policy and Implementation Working Group as well. And so the discussion really centered around effective coordination and making sure that those - there was a sort of joined up thinking and the way in which those different areas work.

There is some risk that we're sort of operating in three different silos if you like. And so that's really - I guess with my thinking in advance of this meeting. And it certainly seemed to come out yesterday in the discussion. I think this is a step down that route. So, Karen, if you've got some input or thoughts on that that would be great to hear. And then we can take it from there.

Karen Lentz: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Karen Lentz speaking. So we've also been thinking about the, you know, potential interaction between the work that's going on within that GNSO to discuss work going forward and how we might best collaborate on that.

So I guess, you know, we really intended to have a discussion. I found a discussion yesterday very interesting. But I wanted to I guess pose a couple of questions that we have.

One is - and this was touched on some yesterday - what the output of the, you know, discussion group will be. And there was some description of bucketing things in terms of policy issues or implementation questions or issues, maybe things where there is no policy but there should be.

You know, how do you categorize that? So, you know, understanding what the output will look like in terms of those things I think would help us to plan at a more concrete level in terms of timing and activities.

Secondly, one of the questions we had we, you know, have been following the work of the discussion group and there's the mind map of 75 or 80 things that have been brought up. So one of the questions that we had was whether you wanted our input on, you know, things that - from the staff side might be considered to be a topic of possible policy work.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Yes.

Karen Lentz: Okay. And then, you know, one other thought that we had is in terms of the output it would actually also be helpful to know what shouldn't change, what should we not work on, you know, what worked well or what, you know, was in line with was expected.

So I think that's a few initial questions to start with. I'll turn it back to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or input, Bret, I mean, for the - you might as well get that on the record that...

Bret Fausett: Yeah, I think we - I think we do. I've - and it's probably very appropriate timing right now. I think what we're trying to do with the discussion group here in Los Angeles is sort of pivot from issue collection to now thinking about how we're going to manage this thing.

We've spent the last two months trying to gather all the issues that people had and now we want to start the harder work I think of identifying what's policy and what's implementation. So this is the right time and we really would welcome your input.

Jonathan Robinson: I know we discussed this a little bit yesterday. And so which is what stimulated the point. So, I mean, to some extent we've covered this ground. But are there any - is there anyone in the hall or the meeting at the moment who would like to make any comment and make sure that any issues are - I

mean, my understanding is the group has been, as you say, Bret, collecting all of the issues at this point.

I think having that dialogue with staff, I mean, I have to - I'm a bit sick of the use of the word "dialogue" it seems to appear too much. But having that sort of conversation and ongoing conversation with staff is probably very, very useful in terms of understanding and keeping it open rather than operating in two parallel tracks.

Has anyone got any other comments or input they'd like to make into this area at this stage? I mean, certainly, Karen, I wouldn't mind if you would, again, just so we capture it properly if you would send us those questions are those - any thoughts you've got and we can distribute that to the Council and staff to feed it into the work of Bret's group and so on.

Karen Lentz: Certainly we can do that. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Akram.

Akram Atallah: This is Akram. So basically right now I think it's important for us to participate in the session that Karen will be leading on the next round and so that you can see all the planning that's going on. There is a big operational review within the staff that we're going to be doing also on every piece. And from that hopefully there will be some also recommendations. I don't know if they will rise to policy level but there will be some recommendations from that as well.

And there are a lot of other streams that might come back with recommendations. And these recommendations might actually touch on a policy. So I don't know that we can right now say that if you deliver some questions or some concerns that we can say now you have everything you need to look at the policy framework because it's the reviews come back in a

year from now or more with some input or some recommendations - these recommendations could impact the policy.

So we need to be a little bit flexible on how we move forward but we should try to figure out how to keep moving forward in lock-step. I know that basically the Board on collisions, for example, made the request from GNSO to look into the possibility of policy development in the area. And we followed up with a statement that was sent to the GNSO on that.

That might be also another way that the Board will approach these issues or they might approach it in a list also from them on the - especially the NGPC if they review what they worked on and stuff that could be another avenue for input to policy work as well.

Jonathan Robinson: That name collision - I think it's - in terms of a request is new to us, it's very recent. And so that's now on the Council agenda - on the formal Council agenda for Wednesday although it's - at this point it's an initial discussion. I'm not even sure that Council has had enough time to sort of digest that and read through what's being proposed.

Any other comments or questions on this work? I mean, it does feel to me like there's a number of parallel areas and coordinating that it makes sense almost to have not necessarily this but a more functional smaller meeting to understand the relationship between what's going on in consultation group, what the Board might be doing, what the staff is doing on this, the reviews, just somehow making sure these are, as you say, in lock-step or at least coordinated.

Go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, Steve Metalitz, Intellectual Property Constituency. Jonathan, is this the right time to ask questions about the new gTLD review draft work plan that the GDD published?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah I think so. I think that's more or less what we're talking about, Steve. It's any review work that's going on, any prospective planning work for subsequent rounds and so on.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. Then I'd like to ask - first of all thank you for publishing that draft work plan because I think it lays out a lot of different streams that will be ongoing and helped to define our work plan for the next year or two.

But I didn't see any mention in there of the public interest commitments in the new gTLD registry agreements. I'm wondering why that was omitted. Is there a plan to review those and to feed in that review into the overall review?

Akram Atallah: Thank you, Steve. So if you look at the review streams they are not necessarily dedicated to areas of the program unless if they were planned ahead of time or requested ahead of time which means we have a review stream that talks about all of the TMCH and all of the RPM mechanisms, that was already requested to be reviewed in the program ahead of time. And so it has its own stream.

But if you look at the GNSO stream, for example, the GNSO could look at anything they see and they say - you know, this one we're going to review and look if there is policy involved in it or not. I think the review team could look at those as well.

So then it's not particularly in any one place. We continuously review these things and from the staff perspective we would look at better ways to implement things as well all the time. And if there is anything that we come up with we will actually bring it back to the community to look at and see if there is a way to - a better way to move forward on that.

But I mean, we could do that if this is a request, we could put it as a stream to look at the picks as well. It's not an issue.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, I wasn't sure it was an intentional omission or you're just waiting to here where we would want to see that review. It sounds like the latter. Let me ask another question related to that. Another word I didn't see in that document was compliance. At what point will the review process look at the compliance effort with the new gTLD program?

Akram Atallah: Again I don't think that that was one of the streams we were looking at but we will take that into consideration and we'll get back to you on that. I think that the compliance is probably more something outside of the Global Domains Division purview to look at. Maybe if there is suggestion on who should be, I mean, it's work that the community could take on any time they want to see if they - and we will support it. So...

Steve Metalitz: So are you taking comments on this draft work plan? It's not up for public comment so I just - wondered how...

((Crosstalk))

Akram Atallah: So there is a session on that and we're going to gather the comments from the session and come back with, you know, the new or adjustments to the work plan.

Steve Metalitz: But there's no public comment period on the work plan. Thank you.

Akram Atallah: There is.

Karen Lentz: There wasn't a public comment - formal public comment period on it. It was published for discussion and feedback but there hasn't been a formal public comment period.

Steve Metalitz: So presumably if we have other thoughts on it that may not occur to us when we're standing at a microphone in a 60-minute session tomorrow we can send them to you and you will consider those?

((Crosstalk))

Cyrus Namazi: Hi, Steve. This is Cyrus Namazi. So just wanted to echo I guess what we were trying to say, and that's the fact that what's been published is really a proposed template, a blueprint for how to go forward. By no means are we suggesting that it's complete. In fact, we are looking forward to getting input and feedback from not only the Council but, you know, the entire community on how to make it better.

In regards to your specific comments on the picks and the compliance related issues I'd be very interested to understand what specifically is your concern. We can take that offline or whatever. But you should always feel free to let us know how we can make things better. What we put out there as a proposal is really just a draft proposal and we're hoping to make it 10 times better by - from your inputs.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Can I just try and clarify something just to make sure - maybe you were going to say this - respond in a similar way, Karen, because what I understand is there were certain review mechanisms baked into the gTLD program. That is what the staff plan has responded to, in a sense mandatory reviews.

That - the picks came along - came to the party later. The fact that they may need reviewing, it's an interesting point, Steve, I get it. But they weren't sort of baked in at the outset which I think what you guys are saying. So the question is, for all of us actually, what - when and how does the satisfactory

performance or otherwise of the picks get reviewed since the reviewing of that wasn't baked into the program?

Was that where you were coming from, Karen, more or less?

Karen Lentz: Yes, a little bit. Thank you. This is Karen Lentz. I just wanted to add one point too. The - you know, on the specific topic, the picks and compliance related issues are, you know, in some way part of the Registry Agreement, which, you know, was a topic of policy advice which could be, you know, part of the program implementation review that staff does that there's recommendations coming out of that.

                  So there are a lot of topics that aren't specifically called out in the work plan but that doesn't mean that they're, you know, off the table to be discussed. It just means that there's not a specifically named review on that particular topic. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or questions related to this? Okay so maybe it's - sorry, go ahead, Maria.

Maria Farrell: Hi, it's Maria. Yeah, just I think it might be useful for the rest of the community if you did receive lots of comments and feedback - I don't know what the threshold is but, you know, if they were to be shared in the public domain if that were possible if changes are being made and just to help us track and, you know, understand what's happening. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I think it's perhaps time we switch then to the question from Global Domains is to what's coming down the tracks on - for the GNSO. And I think we've got - I think, Marika, you've got something for us here, it'd be useful. Yeah, thank you. So this really highlights - I actually think this is a very usefully illustrative slide, a sort of Gant chart type set of - it wasn't entirely designed as a slide, it's more of a PDF that Marika has prepared about how - about the various pieces of active work that are going on.

So one of them, which we got into quite a decent discussion about yesterday, was translation and transliteration of contact information. And you can see how it's highlighted there on the timetable where - how that particular piece of work is likely to go and where that's coming. So we can share this with you properly obviously afterwards and give you a sense.

Was this the sort of thing you had in mind, Cyrus? It's kind of saying - yeah, exactly. So let's whip through them and see then first of all. So there's a series like this, and we can give this to you in, you know, in PDF form. So the current pieces of work, which by the way, I mean, that's what we go through all day on a Saturday, I mean, so the format of our Saturday meetings is reports from the working groups.

And it's interesting, I mean, you sometimes come into them thinking that these are going to be purely functional reports and they kick off all sorts of discussion; at other times they go without much at all. And in the case of translation and transliteration that did spurn rather a lot of discussion yesterday.

There's also the work on the curative rights protections for the IGO and INGO names and what - and the potential implementation of the UDRP or URS mechanisms and that's a relatively recently initiated PDP. But again, you can see the likely timescales for that.

And we can move over to the next slide. And IRTP Part D is the final piece of the jigsaw as far as the IRTP work and that's coming up for a Council vote at this meeting so we expect to deliver that to the Board immediately after this and that should close off that work stream.

Go ahead, James.

James Bladel: Just a note that these are ending - and maybe you mentioned this already - these are ending at Board vote but then there's an implementation swim lane following that so I'm wondering when some of these - if, for example, you assume that the Board vote happens as indicated here, then when could be a reasonable expectation for an implementation based on, you know, is it two quarters out or...

Jonathan Robinson: So go ahead.

Akram Atallah: So maybe - look, I don't think we should dictate the implementation. I think we need to talk to the community that's going to implement this and get some feedback on that. And maybe you can help us set some targets for implementation, we can update this with a - with that information so everybody is aware ahead of time on what's coming also on work - the work schedule also so.

James Bladel: And then, sorry Jonathan, if I could make a second comment on the next line or do you want me wait until the privacy proxy?

Jonathan Robinson: Did you have something specifically on this or shall we...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just on, you know, the background to this document - and I actually need to give Steve Chan credit for developing this document, it wasn't me. But the idea behind this is partly - and it's something we have already shared as well with our colleagues and that's maybe why as well you don't see implementation on there now.

But the idea is that we are able to give our colleagues a heads up both in the GDD team but also in the Board support team for when they may see certain items coming their way.

And of course you don't see - well I think the disclaimer is here on the top - you know, this is drawn of course from the working group's work plans and this is not set in stone.

But maybe something we can, you know, discuss with our colleagues as well that based on the estimates that we currently have for implementation that we could even add, you know, anticipating a Board vote, for example, you know, Q1 2015 if that would happen what the standard or normal kind of timeframe may be for implementation noting again that of course not every implementation process will be the same, some will be quicker than others.

But at least that would give a kind of indication on when certain things may hit or work may occur. So just want to give that bit of background on where this document comes from. And the idea would be that we basically update that every like trimester or before an ICANN meeting so, again, we share that with our colleagues so they know as well how, you know, to plan for certain items that will eventually move into their direction.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I must say - a remark from me is that - I mean, immediately I saw this had really struck me that it's crystal clear what's going on. And, I mean, it would be great to think that we were planning the implementation ahead of it rather than a kind of, you know, dropping the baton in the relay race. And I suspect that's part of the purpose for your question so that is - which is great.

And so that feels like - the other thing that strikes me and is a question for all of us is one of the things we're supposed to be doing is thinking about implementation while we work on the policy so it's rather than as a kind of afterthought. So I think that's - and I know clearly there's the work on the Policy and Implementation Working Group but I think it's incumbent on us to work together effectively and be thinking about that again so we aren't passing a baton and saying, right, here you go, GDD; implement.

It would be great to - and I don't have the idea yet how we do that but, you know, so any thoughts or comments on that. But, James, I know you wanted to say something as well on...

James Bladel: You know, it's probably less relevant now but it's just the idea that the second line there, the privacy proxy accreditation issues is not going to end with a Board vote and an implementation. That's a whole new program and a whole new framework that needs to be stood up with applications for accreditation and evaluations of those applications. So that's going to be a big, big effort right after that orange sunburst there.

So - but you already knew that, I just was commenting on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. Regarding your comment on thinking about implementation as we do policy development I think, you know, many of you may have already seen as well that at many of the working group meetings we actually now have as well GDD colleagues already participating.

And the whole idea around that is that they're able already to either provide input on implementation related issues as we go through the policy conversation but also already to anticipate, you know, what is coming down the tracks, you know, being part of those conversations. So I think we're at least trying to, you know, find as well the system to ensure that's more smooth and we have implementation input early on.

And at the same time, you know, for example we also participate in the implementation activities so we also can provide input from, you know, our recollection or experience of the policy conversation. So...

Jonathan Robinson: Marika I think - and others - I think we should try and capture that and make that sort of known and understood. And obviously it's work in progress

but it's one of those things where for example as the GNSO policy making function we and I have quite often highlighted our intentions to enhance and streamline the policy development process but if we then had a big gap at the end of it and/or, you know, some form of flawed implementation we can do all the work we like at the front.

But it sounds like we're not doing that; it sounds like we actually are working hard to try and ensure that, you know, we're bringing you closer into the front and starting to work that through. So I think we should not only continue to work on that but make it be known that that's what we're doing because I'm not sure that is widely known. So it certainly feels like news to me. So that's encouraging.

Any other comments or questions in relation to this? Is there another sheet to this, Steve or - that's the last part of it, it's just the three are there. So you've got IRTP Part D, RAA on privacy and proxy. Any other comments or questions that anyone would like to make in and around policy implementation work of the GDD? Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Steve Metalitz, member of the Intellectual Property Constituency. I hope this is the appropriate place to ask this, have the PICDRP panelists been chosen? And if so who are they?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Steve. This is Cyrus. Yes we have three panelists that have been chosen. We have signed contracts with them. We are in discussions with two additional ones that the three is the minimum that we need. I don't have their contact information or names and stuff but I can get that to you. Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I have a question that goes back to the beginning of your presentation, Cyrus, where you described the progress you've made in developing a responsive account-representative approach to deal with the contracted parties in the new gTLDs. That be a good way to describe that, sort of account managers with dedicated points of contact for the gTLD applicants.

((Crosstalk))

Akram Atallah: Hi, Marilyn. Yes, actually the account management setup that we've put in place is both for contracted parties as well as applicants.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Akram Atallah: So essentially everyone who is a registry operator or is going to be a registry operator has now been assigned an account manager under the leadership of Krista Papac on my team.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. So let me introduce myself to the ICANN staff as a customer of ICANN's since I am a domain name registrant and potentially a user of services that ICANN provides such as the trademark clearinghouse and the URS.

                  Are you planning on creating a similar friendly approach to support those parties who also use those kinds of services from ICANN? So we too will have an interface like account management team?

Akram Atallah: So typically what you're mentioning, Marilyn, is actually service managers. So there is a difference between the two which means when you have a service that you provide you provide a service manager that you can talk about the service with.

When you have a customer they touch a lot of different services and they have issues and they want to be able to escalate because some of their work is not happening for them or they're having struggles in some of the work that they're doing then you assign account managers.

Now let's be clear, we're not assigning an account manager for every - a different account manager for every registrar - registry applicant or registry contracted party, we are assigning a account manager to a set of these registries. And we are hoping that this will be more escalation path for issues that they have and not to do the work for them, right. So there is a difference between the two we have now. We are anticipating 1300 registries so we can not afford to have one per...

Marilyn Cade: I wasn't expecting there'd be one...

Akram Atallah: Yeah, so we do have service managers that have services - manage different services. And we also have a layer of customer support that you can actually go to when you have an issue whether it's a - it's an issue on the service as a user of the TMCH or other areas. And then you have the subject matter experts also in the operational flow where an issue, if it doesn't get resolved at that level, it can go to subject matter expert.

So we're working on more and more of this points of contact and better ways for you to reach out into the organization and get your stuff done. Just - it just takes some time but we're on that path.

Marilyn Cade: So I ran a franchise business for a global corporation in a particular area so I'm very familiar with service managers, account managers, etcetera. So treating us as customers of ICANN as well that is part of your mindset?

Akram Atallah: Absolutely. And we talked about having a registrant services group also that is separate from the contracted parties. We have some plans there as well. Now we don't know how much work they're going to have but we're going to

start by hiring maybe one person and see how much requests they have, how much work they can - they need to do. But we see that basically today, for example, and I give this example to everybody because it came from the community, the URS has - or the UDRP shows a lot of people how to go and complain about a Website or a Website owner and be able to figure out how to take it away.

But we don't have the same thing for the registrant that says, well, this is how you deal with when you have a UDRP and what you - the steps that you need to do and stuff. So it's service on the other side and we're trying to figure out how to present that to the community as well so.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I welcome hearing more.

Jennifer Wolfe: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, who's - sorry, Jen.

James Bladel: So just a quick question maybe for clarification because I was multitasking. Did you say that ICANN was going to establish some channel for support resources to support registrants directly or did I mishear that?

Akram Atallah: No, so we're not supporting registrants directly but there are things that we do that affect registrants and we want to make sure that they have a place where they can get answers and explanations on what we do and how we do it. And support them to what they come to ask for from ICANN so.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan. IPC. Following up on this point. I note that about five or six weeks ago ICANN posted a job opportunity for a registrant services director

or consumer advocate services director. I assume that without having yet named that position this is the position that you're talking about or that is related in some way to what you're talking about.

I also note that it's posted that this person is supposed to sit in Istanbul and I'm wondering where the - how things are going with filling that position and if - and how that relates to the discussion that you've just been having. Thank you.

Akram Atallah: So we're actually - we have a few resumes. We've been looking at them. And we still haven't made a decision on that. But hopefully in - before the, you know, at the beginning of the new year I think we will have somebody in that position.

Greg Shatan: And a follow up. How did you decide that this person had to pick up and live in Istanbul assuming that the applicants haven't been coming from Istanbul?

Akram Atallah: Well we thought that actually out of the three hubs that we have Istanbul is the one in the middle.

Greg Shatan: In the middle of what?

Akram Atallah: Between the three hubs, it's a decision, if we don't find somebody in Istanbul then we find somebody more appropriate somewhere else, we'll hire the best person. But we have to always start with where we would like to have that position so.

Greg Shatan: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I think we - that feels like we're at the natural end of the session that. Thank you very much. Yeah go ahead, just go ahead.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Cyrus Namazi. I just wanted to make a brief remark about - wanted to commend actually the Council for having sort of solidified a formal relationship with the GAC. I really think this is going to be an immensely useful beneficial step forward.

And in fact in a session that we had before the GAC yesterday - I think Mason was there too - the sentiment that I read from the GAC in regards to the next round of gTLDs was quite negative in terms of the timing of it and such. And just wanted to make sure that you're all aware that, you know, that undercurrent is also taking place.

And want to make sure that the dialogue within the community also takes place at the level of say GNSO with the GAC. I've been saying the same thing to my colleagues in the stakeholder group both the Registry and Registrar. I get the feeling that a lot of times everybody comes to the staff to do, you know, the stuff that we're supposed to do or things that are initiated by the GAC or some other mechanism.

But to have that feedback directly also heard by the GAC and other places where they actually give advice to ICANN Board I think would help us quite a bit in moving things forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, that's a very good point. That's helpful that you remind us of that, Cyrus. I mean, essentially this was a strategic objective of the Council, if you like, was to build bridges to assist in building the bridges between the GNSO and other SO and ACs in the ecosystem - ICANN ecosystem. And that seems to - we're making some progress there, that's for sure. Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. And while I'm an officer of the Business Constituency I'm conveying my individual viewpoints. Cyrus, I really welcome the recognition of the step forward, the evolution, of having representation from the GNSO Policy Council in this position with the GAC.

But part of what you said concerns me a little bit. I'm quite aware of the concerns that many of the governments have about the new gTLD program and the concerns that they have about spending time on talking about a next round.

But I don't want to overlook the importance - I'm not speaking for the Council; I am not speaking for the constituency as a whole - but I don't want to overlook the fact that there's strong concern broadly not the business community about the need to complete the round, do the evaluations that were committed, assess the problems and make sure that registrants are not stranded or gTLD registry failures or missteps are not dealt with before there's any active consideration or resources devoted to a new round.

That will not necessarily be a popular viewpoint among many of the - of my colleagues. But I don't think it's just the governments who have concerns.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, Akram would like to respond and then James wants to make a point.

Akram Atallah: I just want to make sure we set the record straight; we don't believe that there are any missteps in the new gTLD program. But there are always rooms for improvement and we agree that we need to do all the reviews that we can and improve on everything that we've done so far. And believe me, the staff is not in any rush to start the next round. So the pressure will come from the community if any to do the second round or the next round. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Akram. James.

James Bladel: So I think that the staff should be in a rush to do the second round because the community I think is saying that that was baked into the first round. Now I understand to your point and to Marilyn's point, there are items that need to be reviewed. I think that what's at issue is whether that's an end to end project management where you cannot proceed with one step until this step

is totally complete versus looking for opportunities to parallelize some of those things.

For example, a new round of applications, not delegations, just applications, could be occurring. And I think that's, you know, I'm throwing this out as one possible example - as something that - and some things that you would want to wait for, for example registry failures, I don't want to assume that there are going to be registry failures.

So waiting until a certain amount of time that there are no registry failures I don't think is a reasonable prerequisite for proceeding into the next round. So hopefully you're looking for opportunities to expedite that work plan.

Jonathan Robinson: I've go Avri next and then I think we should try and bring this session to a close. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I'm going to take a point slightly contrary to the one just made and support the point that Marilyn made but perhaps go a little bit stronger. I don't think it's for the staff to decide that there were no missteps in this program. I think we're at a point now where we need to start doing the reviews, the reviews that happen in the GNSO, the reviews that happen in At Large, the reviews that happen in GAC, the reviews that are mandated by the AOC.

And only when we've gotten to the point that we understand that there were no failures or what the failures are and how they should be fixed, at that point and only at that point should we move forward with another round.

The notion that we should jump into another round just now because the mechanics are ready to do another round, is truly not appropriate. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Tony.

Tony Holmes: I'll make it very brief because you're closing this subject. Getting to what was said about government's concerns, first of all I do think we need to sort of take it easy on getting going with another round.

But I have also heard, on the question of the necessity of having another round, from governments, for instance, provincial governments in Latin America that they feel - they sort of didn't make it to this round, they've seen city TLDs come out and provincial TLDs or regional. And they're pretty anxious to have a chance to be able to apply also.

So maybe we should consider that people who didn't hear about this in time or were not too sure what was happening, don't have to wait another 10 or 20 years. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Tony. So it seems like that's a question that needs - I'm not sure where that question belongs but it's clearly a question that there's some strong feeling about in both directions as to whether these - the review work and the prospect of additional rounds can be done in sequence or parallel. And so, as I say, I don't know exactly where that question belongs and where we deal with that but it certainly seems like something we need to spend a little more time on.

So I think let me offer you, Akram, the opportunity to make any closing remarks if you'd like to and then we'll wrap up the session.

Akram Atallah: The only thing I would like to say is to thank you all for giving us opportunity to talk to you. And as always we are here to serve you and hopefully we will continue to get your feedback in order for us to improve and do our things, you know, do our job better.

And please understand that from the staff perspective on all of these issues we wait for the leads of the community to let us know especially in the Global Domains Division where we're actually just implementing the policies that

come out from the GNSO. So from our perspective it's all of the stuff that we're putting out there is really for the discussion and then we wait for your lead to decide on how - to tell us how to move forward. Okay? Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thank you, Akram, thank you Cyrus, Christine and Karen. Let's draw a line under that session and take a minute before we welcome Theresa Swinehart to our next session. Thanks.

END