

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
October 20, 2014
5:30 pm CT**

Marika Konings: All right, so as I've said I've with me over 50 slides, but as in previous meetings it's not my idea to go through all of these but actually leave those behind with you so you can review those at your leisure. But instead actually just, you know, put up the list of issues that are currently being discussed within the GNSO and just ask you which ones you would like to hear more about or if you have any specific questions you would like to ask me.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks, Marika. Michele, for the record. Just in relation to the current work what might not be the worst idea would be just to see who in the room is involved with these various work tracks.

So the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy, is anybody in the room involved with any of those working groups? So Graeme, myself, James, who isn't in the room at the moment.

Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation is probably most of the registrars - well, a bunch of them anyway. Sorry, I'm just getting the evil eye from my predecessor. You are still my predecessor, deal with it.

Data and Metrics for Policy Making, Graeme is involved in that one. Policy and Implementation - which registrars are involved in that one, do you know Marika? Not off the top of your head, okay.

Protection of IGO INGO identifiers. What, sorry?

Marika Konings: So the IGO INGO that PDP is now with the Board but we also have the Curative Rights PDP, that may sound more familiar.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Then Whois - well that's a whole thing there. I think there's quite a few people involved in various aspects of that one. Cross Community Working Group Principles, that's with the GNSO I think isn't it?

Marika Konings: No, there's actually a cross community working group together with the ccNSO that's looking at developing principles for cross community working groups. That's a joint effort.

Michele Neylon: Oh this is the one with the rather interesting title.

Marika Konings: Yeah, CWGs for CWGs or I think CWG square I think it has been referred to as well.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Then there's the GNSO review which is - currently has a survey out for people. And there are another 15 projects underway. So are there any specific items on that list that anybody in the room is interested in learning more about or anybody on the remote?

Marika Konings: I can maybe just pick out a few as you think through the list. But I think especially on Inter Registrar Transfer Policy just to give you a heads up that a final report is being considered by the GNSO Council that has a number of

recommendations in relation to the IRTP and more specifically the transfer dispute resolution policy.

So the expectation is, or at least I think so far we haven't seen any objections or concern about those recommendations so should the Council decide to approve that at this meeting it will go out for public comment before the Board considers it. And then it would be one of those next projects that will eventually come your way for implementation.

Michele Neylon: That's specifically IRTP-D which I believe James is chairing, is that right?

Marika Konings: Correct. I don't know, James, are there any new specific recommendations you would like to call out that that may be of specific interest or as a heads up?

James Bladel: No. No actually it's not - sorry, speaker right behind me. They're thinking about the registrar implications of IRTP-D. But the most part we've left status quo intact. There's a pretty big change coming for the registries in that they are going to no longer be providing tier one disputes for TDRP for those seven incidences a year where that actually - or total I think for dotCom that's actually happened.

There was a very vigorous discussion over whether or not we should abandon FOAs and just focus on auth info codes as the only mechanism by which someone could transfer a domain name. And I think that the determination was that those are still necessary particularly when things go wrong, the FOA is still necessary.

But the one thing that I would draw your attention to is at the end of that entire list of recommendations we noted that the transfers, not, you know, we

spent a lot of time over here talking about governments and intellectual property and law enforcement and all that stuff but transfers are still far and away the number one issue that drives people to file an ICANN complaint.

So what we've asked is that we start collecting some data and that may fall to registrars, that we start collecting some data to determine whether or not these changes have improved the overall landscape for transfers and the overall registrant experience.

And if it hasn't we've gone through all this work and they're still getting, you know, the same level or higher level of complaints about transfers then maybe we ought to look at a top to bottom revamp of the entire transfer process, the security, the mobility, the accessibility and dispute mechanism.

So that's kind of where we left it with IRTP-D. I don't see anything controversial in there or anything that's going to generate a lot of heartburn on the registrar side.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Marika, back to you. Just hold on one second. Tom, are you having difficulty hearing?

Tom Keller: No I'm not. That was most of the questions that I - what is this (unintelligible) about. I kind of understood what you're talking about, James, but I don't really know what the working group is about. And I think a lot of people here in the room are not. Is that any better? Okay.

Again, could you allude to what the working group is about? I mean, I see the recommendations but I'm not sure what the working group in itself is about and all the acronyms really don't tell me what.

James Bladel: So this was the - I'm trying very hard this speaker right behind me - but this is the fourth working group that was established to review the transfer policy. This is IRTP transfer policies. This is IRTP-D and it was mainly focused on transfer disputes, the TDRP.

Now for the most part that is a seldom-used policy. It's something that every registry is required to support and we also have contracted providers to do it as well like NAF and WIPO - or maybe just NAF and the Asian one.

And what we're saying is we don't use this policy enough; there's only been seven TDRPs I believe filed in the dotCom space since, what, in the last 10 years. So it's just - it's not being used so it doesn't make any sense for registries to continue to operate the teams and the procedures to support something that no one is ever using. So we've essentially said let's eliminate that level and let's just focus on the provider level.

Yeah, I think there's also something in there about putting some more resources on the ICANN Website that are easily understood so that people can come and their get questions answered about transfers.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. And just to add one thing as well to James's comment about the changes that have been made to date, bear in mind that while IRTP-D is kind of drawing to a close recommendations for IRTP-C and some of the recommendations from IRTP-B still haven't been fully implemented. So it's still a bit of a lag. Tom, did you have something? No.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. If I can maybe add to it as well because indeed, you know, as James alluded to there are very few disputes filed under the TDRP but at the same time it's one of the areas where ICANN gets the most complaints. So I think the working group partly looked in as well, you know,

where is the disconnect but realized as well that the TDRP as it's currently structured it's not really the appropriate mechanism to open up for registrants necessarily.

So what the group has also done is actually developed a number - or a set of use cases identifying where there are specific issues related to the transfer policy that registrants may have and trying to see that if after IRTP Part C, which is a change of registrant policy if those use cases are still not addressed and there is indeed the view that those should be addressed by a separate kind of mechanism that that would then be further considered.

So I think this indeed a process of continuing conversation and continue on the point that James made on data gathering and I think I also would like to make a pitch for the Data and Metrics Working Group which is actually specifically looking at how to get access to that information, how to be able to work with contracted parties to obtain some of that information where how can we actually, you know, collect that in that makes you as well feel comfortable about sharing that information.

Is there a way to aggregate that somewhere at a third party? Because that information is really important to help inform policy development. And I think I've heard you many times talking about, you know, we need to data to help us decide what to work on, is something really important, is it really an issue?

But for that we need to have data. And some of that we can get from ICANN compliance but a lot of the data is probably held with the different groups here. And I know there's - I think a relatively limited participation and - okay - I have Graeme - but I think beyond that so it would be really good to have

some more contracted parties involved in that to actually think through how we can, you know, make that possible and obtain some more data.

Michele Neylon: Graeme, would you like to add some flavor to this maybe?

Graeme Bunton: Sure. So it's a non-PDP working group so it's not binding. And I think there's only two contracted parties in there. I think it's Pam from the registry side and myself representing the registrars.

In general, the purpose of this group is great. I think injecting data into the policy development process is a really good idea. It will probably serve to benefit registrars quite a bit.

There is - and so it's a - I think the overall goal is to have a cultural shift within ICANN that when, you know, an issue is presented then we need to sort of prove that that issue is real in the first place, and there's data to back that up and then we look at the different sources of data within the ICANN community and how to collect that to sort of look at options how to solve those problems.

There are lots of challenges that I've been raising within that working group and I'm - would love other registrars to hop in there occasionally and help out or share your concerns with me. But there's issues like, you know, anonymity of data so that no one registrar is singled out.

The aggregation of data; we all collect information in different ways and who pays for the aggregation and anonymization of that data. You know, Tucows is a big enough company that we have a brilliant and charming man running the business intelligence department but...

Michele Neylon: Would that person happen to be in this room by any chance?

Graeme Bunton: He might.

Michele Neylon: Oh, Elliot. Elliot is doing - has a double job of CEO and charming man. Okay.

Man: It was Graeme, just to be clear.

Graeme Bunton: That is also me, which is why I'm in this working group. So we're of a size where we have a team that can do these things but not all registrars are big enough to have a team of people that are there, you know, capable and with the time to dig through their data and produce data sets.

And so if we're only putting these obligations on the larger registrars with these resources then the data isn't complete and it's maybe not a full picture. So it's an interesting issue of how do we change this cultural shift but also make it possible for registrars to participate.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks, Graeme. James and then we have a question on remote which isn't specifically related to this but related to Marika's slides. James, over to you.

James Bladel: Just to thank Graeme for participating in this. I mean, I agree we're in a Catch 22. We don't like the fact that policies that are argued by, let's say, very, very vocal and persuasive and well organized minorities of positions are able to impose burdens on millions and millions of otherwise innocent-acting registrants because it serves the agenda of a very organized few.

So we need data to show that these are actually problems that we're chasing and that the cures are not worse than the diseases. However, let's be clear, a

lot of this is going to involve statistics and business-sensitive information perhaps that we don't want sharing either with each other or with the wider world. So that's going to mean some sort of aggregation and sanitation - sanitization system that's going to, you know, cleanse that data so you can't trace it back to any one registrar.

I mean, the last thing we want is, you know, some sort of problem and say here are the top 20 offending registrars, right? That would be, you know, woe to the person who's on that list. But now I just also want to point maybe for the group that that can't be ICANN. This is the group that brought you TAS and RADAR and all of these other systems that have been shown to be very, very sensitive to what I would call, you know, late 90s, early 2000 security breaches.

So, you know, that is not the kind of operational maturity that we're looking for when we're talking about putting business sensitive data into a policy system.

The second point is the consumption of those statistics, they are not as neutral as they sound. They are not going to benefit us. They're not always going to benefit us. Okay? They are going to be used against us and there's nothing worse than seeing your own customer I think used to make a case against you.

So let's just be very, very wary. I think Graeme, you know, you probably have a unenviable task, and if there's anything we can do to help you in that regard, you know, let us know. We need to support Graeme on this.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, James. The support would just be another voice in that working group probably be I need to have two registrars because it is me in there basically being negative all the time and that's not always a party.

James Bladel: Can I ask one other question?

Graeme Bunton: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay this is getting...

James Bladel: Too many pumpkin spice lattes at this table because it's getting (unintelligible) over here.

Michele Neylon: It's all your fault, James.

James Bladel: I know.

Michele Neylon: You started us on that.

James Bladel: I got the Europeans hooked on the pumpkin spice.

Michele Neylon: I wouldn't say that Volker and I are hooked on it but we've definitely taken a liking to it.

James Bladel: Okay. Something that I want to put on the table because I'm feeling a little punchy today, is that some of the people participating in this Data and Metrics group have business models based on selling analytical products of our industry. So let's just keep that in mind that the folks asking for the data are the folks that want it to, you know, better their products and services. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thank you, James. Kelly Salter from the data group had a question on remote which is rather hard to read into transcript because it refers to a URL. But

essentially she's looking for a recap of imminent policy changes. So I asked Kaitlin to join us at the table to possibly assist with this.

Kelly has also put on the chat that a nice easy to follow list would be fabulous from Kaitlin, or any other ICANN staffer, headlines, dates, links so I can start assessing what changes we need to make. So I'll hand over to Kaitlin. Thank you.

Kaitlin Tubergen: Thank you for the question, Kelly. And thank you for the suggestion, I'll work on that for everyone. I believe the compliance team presented the two most imminent changes, the first of which is a change to the inter registrar transfer policy dealing with the locking and unlocking of domain names. That's I believe in Section 5 of the policy. That takes effect January 31, 2015.

The additional Whois information policy, which also came out of some recommendations from the GNSO regarding the IRTP goes into effect February 15, 2015. And all registrars will shortly receive an announcement probably in the coming weeks about upcoming changes to the UDRP rules. The modified UDRP rules will take effect for all ICANN-accredited registrars July 31, 2015.

And I did want to note that the Registrar Services Team did conduct two webinars. Both webinars go over all of these changes in detail. And I will provide links to both of those webinars in the chat. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: It would also be helpful if you could email them to me and I'll distribute to people who aren't in the room. Thanks. Anything else specifically here or shall I give it back to Marika and her 50 slides? Marika, back over to you and your 50 slides.

Marika Konings: No, the 50 slides will stay with you, I'm just highlighting here. So maybe just very briefly, you know, Privacy Proxy Service Accreditation, I think, you know, quite a few of you are involved in that, you know, the working group I think is getting closer and closer to an initial report. So I see Graeme smiling as one of the co chairs, you know, vice chairs for that group. So really keep a close eye on that and, you know, provide input as you see appropriate.

Policy and Implementation it's more of a process-focused working group but I think it would be key as well and I'm trying to think of - I think we have a couple of registrars on the list, I'm not really sure if there are many that are really actively participating in the effort.

And I think it would be really good if, you know, you could actually start paying a bit more attention to that effort because what it's looking at is, you know, first of all maybe coming up with some additional processes that the GNSO Council may use or had at its availability to provide input to the Board and it's the kind of mechanism whereby it would also trigger - if the process is followed it would also trigger Board consideration in a similar way as currently works for the PDP.

It also looks at a possible fast track PDP for limited circumstances. For example, in cases where a policy has been implemented but as part of the implementation there's a realization that, you know, the policy actually didn't get it right and there's a need to, you know, redo some of that work.

And similarly if there is an issue that already was scoped through previous efforts there may not be a need to actually have an issue report and have those various stages. So please, you know, keep a look at that - a lookout for that. I think the group is hoping to have an initial report in time for the Marrakesh meeting so they'll be asking for public input as well.

And it's also specifically looking at, you know, how to create more transparency and predictability around implementation related processes. So it's working as well with our colleagues in the GDD team on a framework for implementation of consensus policies particularly looking at, you know, at what stages should there be community involvement, what happens if an issue is identified that need further consideration that wasn't anticipated, what mechanisms should be in place for the implementation review team to actually go back to that GNSO Council if they believe there is an issue.

And we're really hoping that, you know, at the end of this process we won't be in similar situations where we have been in relation to implementation concerns or questions and there's a real clear path forward and it's really clear both from a staff side as well as the community side who's responsible for what and what happens at the different steps of the process.

And the purpose of gTLD registration data, or also known as - I think that EWG PDP, I think as you know as well that some conversations that will start at this meeting, together with the Board - between the Board and that GNSO Council to see what should be the next steps in the process.

And I believe James, I think, are you the volunteer for that one?

James Bladel: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay so I think that's one as well where probably at some stage you'll get, you know, further suggestions or proposals that are being made or coming out of that group on how to move forward on that. So again it's really trying to work out what is the next step in the policy process - policy development process that was started by the Board and how the EWG report fits into that effort.

And I see James dying to say something.

James Bladel: What I would like to say about EWG is probably not suitable for this audience.

Michele Neylon: Is that why you're glaring at me, James?

James Bladel: One of the things that I think - just initially that I would like to understand is that the EWG report specifically says that these are a package of recommendations and they must not and cannot be separated. And I think I would like some clarity on that because if that is indeed an ironclad recommendation of the EWG then in my opinion it is dead.

Because I think there are some things that are perhaps salvageable, some things that are may be suitable for further policy and some things that I don't think should go forward. And so if it is true that it's an all or nothing proposition then I think we should pursue nothing.

But, I would like to hear some guidance from that from the EWG and from the Board and from the other folks that are going to be working on this on how much discretion do we have in separating those different elements and recommendations.

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record speaking as a member of the EWG which is now more or less defunct, though not quite because nobody wants to let it die. James, I mean that entire thing around the all or nothing aspect of it, I understand where it came from, because I was in the room, but I also understand the challenge that faces because even if you were to accept that further work

needs to be done on every single element in the recommendations it would be physically impossible to do them all at once; you just couldn't.

So you'd have to do a certain degree of prioritization no matter what. And throughout the entire EWG's work over a period of 18 months we made it very very clear to ICANN execs and Board that any output from the group would have to be fed back into that GNSO.

Now speaking personally, I was a bit disappointed with how our report was handled after the fact. It was - that it was given back over to the GNSO with very very little guidance whereas previously we'd been led to believe that the Board was going to take it, study it and then give the GNSO Council clearer guidance. And that basically does not seem to have happened. It seems to have been thrown at the GNSO and asked to be sorted out.

Now maybe Marika can speak to that.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. And I think that's partly what the goal of this informal group between the Board and the GNSO is to work that out indeed what kind of guidance the Board has for the GNSO, what the next steps should or could be.

And, you know, my personal view is indeed this is input that is intended to inform the working group deliberations. So as such I don't think at least, you know, from a PDP perspective I don't think there's anything that could, you know, require the working group at this stage to say it's all or nothing.

It is something that at the end of the day I think, and that's something that the PDP working group, or the PDP Manual also foresees if the working group at the end of their process as indeed a package available and clearly states to the

Council, you cannot separate this; there is the expectation on the Council that they will need to take it as is or send it back to the group.

But at least my - and as I said that is my personal understanding at this stage is that the EWG could or would form input to the working group which would then decide indeed how that's all of lines together, you know, are there parts that need, you know, can be done better or in a different way. But of course at the end of the day what needs to come out of it needs to be a full package or something that all ties together.

James Bladel: So I would just point out for this group, we just left the Board and we were discussing, you know, maybe I should just be very careful and say think about the discussion we just had with the Board and the disruptions to our industry regarding, you know, some validation and cross field verification, things of that nature.

Now imagine if that EWG system that's proposed by the EWG, the registration data directory services, were to be required to be phased in by let's say January 1. Whatever burden or expectation of benefit that we are asking of the Board and law enforcement and all that stuff we just had a conversation, just multiply that by, you know, several orders of magnitude and whatever the disruption, you know, the same.

So just - I'm very skeptical and I think it's got a very high bar to be cleared to go through. And I think the first question is can we look at this and find there are some elements in there I think that are worthwhile, worth exploring. But I don't want to go down that path that you are seeing and then get to the end and say no, we told you at the beginning it was all or nothing. You teased this apart, you've broken it into segments and so the answer is you can't have it

unless you go back and put the rest of the stuff in. I don't even want to, you know, take that first step unless we have some clarity on that point.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. And I think that's, you know, exactly probably the conversation you need to have with the Board because of course, you know, after the GNSO Council considers it it goes up to the Board. So if indeed if their view would be, and again I have no information that tells me that is the case, that they would say, you know, you need to accept it as is then indeed I think it's the past as you describe.

And so again I think the conversations that will start this week will hopefully bring some more clarity. And then, you know, depending what the outcome of that is, you know, it's anticipated that the PDP will start, you know, moving onto the next steps in the process. And hopefully then of course many of you will be involved and I expect you will.

Maybe briefly touching translation and transliteration, I know that was on your agenda. I think there has been some discussion here as well this week. So again if it's a topic that you're interested in the working group is still open for anyone interested in.

And I think the working group is aiming to have an initial report out for public comment I think hopefully by Marrakesh. So again it's another opportunity to provide your views on that specific item.

And I think at this stage there's nothing really further I have for my side. I don't know if you have any questions. And of course if after your review of the slides if you have any further questions feel free to reach out to me or anyone else on my team and will do our best to help you out.

And if I can maybe make one last plug for monthly newcomer webinars that we are organizing for working group newcomers, and we actually have several other hosts here. I see Thomas here and James is one of our hosts as well for those meetings.

If you are interested in joining working groups but first would like a bit more information on how they work, you know, what it's all about feel free to join those. There really intended as a kind of open house, you know, you just come in. Any questions you have, you know, just throw them out. So if you know anyone or if you yourself interested, you know, please feel free to join the call.

The call is for participation (go) regularly out and I presume they also go out to the registrar lists.

Michele Neylon: The monthly email reminders we get - I get at least three emails about it but I'm not sure - yeah, we definitely get it and we do share it with the members. You know, that's definitely happening.

Marika Konings: Great.

Michele Neylon: Does anyone have any specific questions for Marika? (Unintelligible). Okay then. Thank you Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks for having me.

Michele Neylon: And at this juncture we'll invite Mr. Ashtiani to come and join us up here and talk to us about a wonderfully exciting subject which is the GNSO review. Matt. Oh, go ahead, Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Just while we're waiting for that transition to happen I thought it would be - and we're finishing up the policy bit, I just wanted to say that Privacy and Proxy Issues Accreditation Working Group has a bunch of registrars in it, it's pretty contentious but it's been really positive to see a lot of us working together in a way that we might not normally as we are all competitors.

And I think we're making good progress there so that's just a sort of general thank you for everyone who's participating in that.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Graeme. Yeah, I mean, just personally noting that that working group, the diplomatic way of describing it, is to say it is contentious. There are many other adjectives I would use.

And also as a side note, on the part of the pilot project within ICANN's policy team the PPSAI held a full-day a face-to-face meeting here in Los Angeles last Friday and several of us came into Los Angeles early in order to be able to attend that since we've been talking about the budgets and everything else, just for pure disclosure reasons.

Those of us who did come in early were given travel support in terms of being put up in a hotel for the night or for two nights by ICANN in order to attend that. Not much else to say. Oh they did feed us as well. We did get lunch and coffee. James, over to you.

James Bladel: Yeah and just wanted to mention they did give us a meal too. No, and I wanted to point out that that worked fairly well. I mean, Graeme, the group has been contentious. I think maybe I'm naïve or being optimistic. But that one day session I think we probably made more progress towards bridging some differences, on some meaningful questions than we have in the last

month or two of these really nasty calls. Not nasty, you know, just kind of intractable sort of telephone conversations.

And, you know, not only do we want to thank ICANN for letting us be the guinea pigs on that and Graeme for his help - Thomas is in the room and Thomas was kind of our neutral - what was the word - facilitator, moderator of the conversation. I thought he did a good job as well. So, you know, it was worth a lunch I think to get that thing - keep that thing moving a little bit in a more positive direction. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Paul is - or has emailed the slides for this presentation to the members' list as we've had a couple of problems loading slides into the remote. But anyway. We're going to hand over to Matt I believe.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi. This is Matt Ashtiani for the record. So we're coming here today to provide you with a brief update on the GNSO review process. I'm a member of ICANN staff. I work in the Strategic Initiatives department. And this is Colin, he works with Westlake Governance, the independent examiner for the GNSO review so I'm going to hand it over to Colin now and we'll be happy to answer any questions you have.

Colin Jackson: Hello, good afternoon everyone. This is Colin Jackson for the transcript. I am with Westlake Governance. We are doing the GNSO review. And many people read out the contents of their slides; I don't propose to do that. But what I am going to do is draw your attention to the link there. That is the link to the 360 assessment, the survey that we are doing.

I would like you to write that down or preferably type into your browser address bar right now. Whilst you're doing that I just want to talk a bit more about the review. The review is being done with a variety of data sets one of

which is what we can glean from the Website or ask for existing documents from the staff.

Another is from interviews that we've been conducting, and we've spoken to one or two of the people in this room so far. And the other, the final one, is this 360 assessment, this survey.

This has been promoted quite heavily by ICANN. It's been open for a couple of months now. We have got so far - as of 15 minutes ago we had 223 started, 138 had finished of the 223. From this group there were 10. That's actually pretty woeful in terms of uptake.

This is your review. I know (unintelligible) you may feel like you've been reviewed over and over but they have been stretched over a good few years. We need to hear what you want, what you think and the survey contains plenty of space for you to write that.

The first couple of pages of the survey are quantitative, you know, you're asked how well you agree or disagree with certain propositions that we've put up to you. Then there are a number pages about the specific constituencies in ICANN - in GNSO, I should say - all of which you can skip but I would hope that you would fill in the one about the registries.

And the final page has three big text boxes that you can enter as much as you like into within reason. So we very much want you to use those to tell us what you think, please, what we might not have found out, what your views are, what we should have asked in the survey, what you would tell us if you met us face to face.

It's really important that you do this. Now the survey is available in all six UN languages. To date we have had nothing in a non-English language but we live in hope. As I say we've had 138 in English and that's fine.

The survey is going to close off at 2359 UTC on Friday. So that's five in the afternoon here in Pacific time zone. It's 1:00 on Saturday afternoon in New Zealand where I live. And we'll be cutting it off then. So I would really strongly encourage you to start filling in that survey now, if you haven't already. You can always save - once you press next off a page it saves where you've got to so you can go back to it.

You can do it in 10 minutes but I'd actually prefer you took 45 and told us everything we should know. But even if all you can devote to it is 10 minutes then please do it. We do need to hear - we do need the numbers and we do want to hear your ideas.

I can go - could someone advance the slide please? Keep going. I want to get to the time zone - to that's right. This is the timeline of the review in general. Again, I don't propose to read it out but if you look at that you'll see that there is a point where the GNSO review working party, which is approximately 10-15 people taken from the GNSO, will get an early draft for providing us with comments on factual matters to ensure that we haven't made errors of fact.

And then a draft report will become available in February which will be put out for public comment. And the final report becomes available in April. I would imagine there will then be an implementation cycle, if we recommend anything that requires implementation. But I'm not going to prejudge that at this stage.

I'm happy to take questions. But the longer you keep me here the more times I'm going to encourage you to fire up the survey and start entering it. Yes?

Volker Greimann: Maybe not a question but rather a call to action for all members here. This review is really important because it could determine how the GNSO will change or not change over the next couple of years. The review doesn't take the - questionnaire doesn't take that much of time but you could assume that other interest, which might not align to our interests, will be very active in filling out that review and will express their views there which may not be compatible with our reviews - with our opinions on this.

So have a look at the review. The link is in the chat. The link will be sent around by email later on. And you have until Friday - it doesn't take more than 15 minutes, take the time. That would be helpful.

Colin Jackson: Yes. And if I can just follow on from that, this constituency has - it's the absolute last in terms of numbers of people who have contributed. I want to keep stressing that. And whilst that's not just something we can all use adjectives about it's also - means that there's a real possibility that your ideas and voice won't be heard in the noise of all the others.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Just out of curiosity how many registrars have completed the survey?

Colin Jackson: Well there were 10 people - 10 individuals have completed it. Maybe we could just put up the link again? Can we go to the very last slide in the deck? There's one after that. There we are. I put that up not just for the rather flattering picture of me but also because it has my business partner, Richard Westlake, on it where you can waylay us anytime in the next 24 hours whilst we here at Los Angeles, you can email us.

And please do feel free to email us. If you would like us to make contact with you for say a Skype chat definitely email us. And there is the link for the assessment again. I'll just leave that on the screen for a couple of minutes just to make sure everybody has really got it. Yeah, that's the link. That's all I have to say, Mr. Chair, except to encourage people yet again to fill in the survey.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Anybody have any questions on this or any comments? Okay thanks. We're actually ahead of schedule now by about 10 minutes which is kind of cool.

Colin Jackson: Make start on the survey.

Volker Greimann: Maybe fill out the survey - yes.

Michele Neylon: Off with you, Volker.

Volker Greimann: I already did. I did it actually in the time it took to give the presentation during the GNSO Council session. And I actually took the time to also fill in the boxes, so it's really easy work.

Colin Jackson: Thank you, Volker. And Volker was there, we basically shamed the GNSO Council into getting on with it a couple of days ago. And that's a good thing. And I hope that you will be doing the same thing here even if the address isn't understood.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks everyone. We've got about 10 minutes so if you want to take a bio break feel free and will start up again at 1630 local, 4:30 pm for those who are challenged by military time. And the next item we'll be having a visit from the NomComm. Thanks.

Volker Greimann: Maybe just to reinforce the point that was made earlier, what's at stake here is possibly even the two house structure of the GNSO because there is significant pressure from the other house, because of their disorganized - their disorganized nature and the inequalities in that house - to change the system.

So as the two house structure has benefited and served us quite well in the past protecting that should be one of our priorities. And anything that we can do to make our voices heard. Because the other side is very strong in this survey it will be helpful. Don't take this lightly, that's - I think that's a summary of what I'm trying to say.

Michele Neylon: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, boys and girls, we are now getting an update from the 2014 Nominating Committee, but since that's two words and it's far too long we'll call them the NomComm. And we've been joined by Mr. Stéphane Van Gelder who is the chair elect. I'm not going to - how do you pronounce that?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Why don't you let me take it from here Michele?

Michele Neylon: Sorry I'm just looking - I'm looking at his name tag thing I'm just - there's too many vowels in the wrong places.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Michele Neylon: Okay, Yrjö, Ron, Ron Andruff and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And as of our course our current NomComm appointee is Dr. John Berryhill. So I'll hand over to whoever of you is going to do this.

Stéphane Van Gelder: What type of medicine do...

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: Hi, everyone. Stéphane Van Gelder speaking. We're actually bridging both 2014 and 2015 Nominating Committees so this is why you have a spread of people here. I'm to 2015 NomComm Chair. And to my far left Cheryl Langdon-Orr is the 2014 NomComm Chair. She's the Associate Chair for 2015. To her right, I think because I can't see, yeah, is Ron Andruff who is the 2015 Chair Elect. The chair and the chair elect are both elected positions. The associate chair is elected by the sitting chair. And next to Ron is Yrjö Länsipuro who was the 2013 Chair, 2014 Associate Chair.

So that in itself shows you the leadership succession planning that is in effect at NomComm level where there is an attempt to make sure that the leadership is both well trained, so the chair elect has one year to learn then becomes chair or is expected to become chair, and then at chairs discretion may become associate chair to provide the chair with the experience of the previous years.

And in my capacity as chair in 2015 I can tell you that I'm very happy to have Cheryl's experience from last year. Cheryl will go into last year's achievements in a minute but it was a very collegial, very well-run committee. So I'm hoping, and the pressure is on me is to make sure that we do that this year in 2015; and Cheryl will be of great help in that regard.

So that leadership succession planning I think works well. The committee itself, as you know, is charged with finding good quality candidates to fill certain key leadership positions at ICANN. Let me just tell you which positions we're looking for in 2015. The slide here.

We're looking for three members of the Board, three members of At Large from the Africa, Asia Pac and Latin America regions, two members of the GNSO Council and one member of the ccNSO Council. So those are the positions we are recruiting for.

And as usual the NomComm will go through a work cycle with different work phases. And there will be, we expect in December, from December to April, an application window for people to submit their statements of interest.

This is where our interactions with the community, yourselves, are extremely important because we are obviously dependent on your networks, the people that you might know or yourselves that might want to fill the positions that I've just described. There is ample opportunity to either apply or suggest people that might apply.

So the idea is to come out also and talk to you, make sure you know the leadership, make sure you can approach us if you need to in the corridors after these meetings, if you have people you want to suggest or information you need about the application process, Please do not hesitate to come and see us.

And with that I'll stop and handed over to Cheryl maybe to speak to the 2014. The aim of this is also obviously to answer any questions you may have so I'm mindful of the time. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much Stéphane. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And if we can just progress the slides? I can't remember if it's forward or back at this end of the day. No, there, to the activities, a little bit - that's it perfect. Thank you very much.

Just to bring you up to speed on what we have managed to do this year. We did continue to build on the excellent work that was undertaken by the NomComm in 2013 under Yrjö's stewardship. We've bolted out of the black box in the cupboard and we've made everything as transparent and we're working on a countable as possible.

The only thing that's sacrosanct is the actual details of candidates. All our processes are open, and if they're not open enough we'll make them more open. We have regular meetings at ICANN meetings that are open (unintelligible) meeting but if anyone wants to know the mystery that goes behind the previous closed doors come on down, our doors are no longer closed.

And of course the only time that we do have closed doors is when we're discussing and deliberating candidates' information. We also have been sending out regular report cards, another initiative that started in 2013. And this allows the sending organizations, organizations like yours, to have an idea of what's going on and what John, in your cases doing, bringing on your behalf etcetera, etcetera.

We implemented a brand new process to the online application and our statements of interest, the SOIs, this year. I'm not suggesting it went without any little hiccups, there were one or two tiny blips which we would expect when we went live with a prototype. But it had to be done. Someone had to do it. We chose to do it this year and we think we did a good job of it.

And the little blips have been ironed out and a proposal now goes to 2015 NomComm which we trust they will take in good faith and probably implement to make sure that none of those minor glitches, which had to do

with, for example, at the closing of our application date, discovering that some candidates had only partially completed the several pages.

But that's simple enough to fix. We don't have several pages, it's now a run sheet so we had - we gave them an extra day or two to complete their application. That shouldn't be a problem in the future.

We had 58 statements of interest; that is not a world record. We know that's not a world record but the quality and standard of those applicants was extraordinary. And it's a compliment back to probably the community, including yours, for finding people of such caliber to put themselves forward or to be put forward. And clearly we'd like to do more of that. We'd like to have more people. And you'll need to use your networks to see if you can hustle some good quality people along to us in 2015.

I don't know that there's a live link on that. It doesn't look like a live link. But please do take that opportunity - oh it is a live link. Very nice. There we go. Just so you know who we appointed, you got a familiar old face back, that was not meant in any unkind way.

And a brand new face from Asia Pacific with the appointment of Asha, I need to make it clear to you all that under the bylaw limitation where we can only have on the ICANN Board five from any one geographic region, that region is now capped; it is full. Okay, so we cannot appoint, at least this coming year and probably for another year...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you for finishing my sentence, Ron. Thank you. To the Board, which is the candidates we're looking at, and the bylaw mandate if I wasn't

clear is for the number of people who can serve on the Board from any one region.

You've got a continuing face in the ALAC, Alan Greenberg has been reappointed by the NomComm. And has been done the honor of being given the role - or appointed to the role of chair of that organization, which I think is a kudos to him. Jimmy is a new face and he's hit the ground running and is already actively engaged. And if you click on any of these links it'll take you to your bio - to their bios.

A couple of familiar faces; we've put Ching into ccNSO and we've put Carlos into the GNSO. And I'll stop there and go back to you, Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Cheryl. Well perhaps to just open it up for questions. Before we do I see a lot of hands already. But I was just going to say before we do that perhaps just give Ron an opportunity to speak specifically to the work that we've done to try and be accountable perhaps to the sending organizations.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much, Stéphane. Good afternoon, everyone. One of the things that the leadership team in the 2014 NomComm instituted, which was a first, was actually a peer review so that everyone who's on the NomComm would be reviewed by their peers to get a sense of how well or how poorly they're performing in the eyes of their contemporaries.

And it was a very interesting exercise. We had, as Stéphane and Cheryl have mentioned, a very collegial group, worked very, very hard. And the - you can take great pride in your Dr. John Berryhill because he was a very key component with his terrible sense of humor that you all know so well.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Acerbic with, exactly. He did a fine job and he served you excellently and he served the NomComm as well as the institution of ICANN very well. And we're looking forward to having John come back I think this year.

So the idea of the peer review however is not just for us, in fact it's to go back to the sending organizations so that you all can see exactly how your representatives are performing in this very important role. And the purpose of that is so that you can understand if someone is or is not performing but more importantly so you can realize - you can send us your best and brightest to fulfill the important task of finding the individuals that will become our Board and other representatives.

So thank you very much, Stéphane. And thank you, John.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Ron. So can I open it up for questions? Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Stéphane. The - you were talking about - Cheryl, about the geographic rotation...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...limitation, rotation, call it what you will. And I was looking at your - looking through your slides, that have been sent to all members as well that are on the mailing list. Which regions for which positions are, in the 2015 cycle, as the 2014 is finished isn't it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you for the question. Cheryl for the record. For 2015 the people who hold the current seats, which end at the AGM next year, so there's the seats we have to fill, George Gonzales and Olga.

Michele Neylon: Which regions are those though?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Europe, Latin America, America, thank you. Had a blank there. America. As I if can't remember George is American, but there you are. North America, Latin America and Caribbean and Europe.

Michele Neylon: And the - so the other regions have - they're capped...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The only region that is capped is Asia Pacific. That is the only region. There is room for more Africa.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, that's what I was trying to understand because with the GNSO councilor seats for the registrars we have three seats which have - each one has to be from a different region. And I was just trying to understand whether or not...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's an arcane and dark art as all I can suggest. But what it is is you've got five regions and you have a Board that doesn't divide by five evenly and you've got a rule that says thou shall have no more than five from one region.

Ra: And there's a wildcard there because other organizations may appoint their directors directly and that would then maybe fill up the cap - that quota if you can use that word, the quota as well. So it does become a little bit tricky but at this stage of the game we do know that Asia Pacific is at the top.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Michele, I'm happy to draw you a diagram.

Michele Neylon: I need little cartoons with little pictures and not too many words.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I suggest that if I draw you a diagram that's acceptable you can pass it on to your team here so they understand?

Michele Neylon: That would be nice. No, I'm not trying to be...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...literally trying to get my...

Stéphane Van Gelder: Of course you're trying to be awkward.

Michele Neylon: Stéphane, stop being French. It's just trying to understand exactly which regions were affected, which ones weren't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And to be honest we can't give any final answer on that until the appointments from the SOs come in next year because that could change it as well. NomComm is limited by the bylaws that says no more than five and what has been appointed throughout that same year by the supporting organizations.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Thanks to you both. Volker is next.

Volker Greimann: Okay let me borrow the microphone from you. Sorry, I'm sure you hate that but nonetheless. I think the NomComm in the past year and the - a bit more

have done a great job in breaking up the - a bit more arcane perceptions by providing more regular reports.

And there has been criticism in the past and I think the NomComm (unintelligible) tries to react to that and that's it was a big surprise to me personally when there was this Board working group coming out with suggestions of realigning the NomComm and further actions.

And when we called the Board, the Board members on the working group, after GNSO level, about that they were referring to horse trading and further things like that that made, in their view, a reform of the NomComm absolutely necessary. So I would just like to give you the opportunity to comment on that. And as like to hear your own views...

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: ...on these proposals and these opinions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yrjö will take that but, from my personal point of view we were probably as astonished as you are.

Yrjö Länsipuro: Yeah, I'm sure that the NomComm people here we all have our opinions about that report but it's not the place and time to comment on that. So I would like to make a plug for an event tomorrow, which is 11:00 in the Santa Monica room when there's a public session discussion on this Board working group the report. And I really hope that there is big participation and that there will be a sort of robust discussion about that report.

And the other event I would like to point out is our NomComm public meeting at 10:00 on Thursday in Westwood, a public meeting of the

NomComm have taken place since 2013 at every ICANN meeting. This is one of the things that we have done to make the black box of NomComm more open.

Volker Greimann: Just before I let you talk about that, Ron, I would just like to ask that you give us a small preview of that session because there is a lot of conflicting sessions, working group sessions that many of us here want to attend. And therefore your important message may be lost if it's limited to that one session.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Volker, I'll take that after Ron, okay?

Ron Andruff: Yes, thank you. Volker, just as a follow on, as was mentioned earlier, we were all shocked. And one of the things that's important to know, if you haven't heard already from the BWG NomComm is that their view is that was a strawman. It would have been good if they said that in the title when they put it out and we wouldn't have all been so shocked. But it is a strawman.

And we've been informed that the public comment period will be open now and to the middle of November. So it's a good time for the community to come back and pushback. But in reality, based upon the report and what's actually happening on the ground, we're flabbergasted.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just to the public meeting, Public meeting this time, because it is at the close of the 2014 NomComm term, is our report to the community. And I'm not sure whether it is published in yet but I can assure you the moment the link exists will pass it on to you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks to you all. Any other questions?

Michele Neylon: Very mind we are now running behind schedule again.

Stéphane Van Gelder: In that case let me just say thanks for having us and if you have any more questions you know who to ask. Feel free to come up to us. John can help you as well. Thank you very much.

Michele Neylon: No problem. Thank you, Stéphane. And we look forward to engaging with you all again in the future.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: And Cheryl is going to draw a diagram.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just for you.

Michele Neylon: Just for me. At this juncture I'd like to invite Monsieur Bertrand de la Chapelle to join us up here. Bertrand, as you may recall, spoke to us I think it was at the last meeting wasn't it? Yes the last time. Bertrand runs the Internet Jurisdiction Project, which for most of us I would suggest is something that you should have an interest in.

If you don't have an interest in that then maybe you don't understand what he's dealing with as it's mainly - as we are what are considered to be intermediaries and this is one of the areas that is becoming more and more contentious and difficult.

Just as - also by way of introduction at the IGF in Istanbul in September Bertrand and his team ran a couple of very very interesting sessions. I think the videos for those are online. So I'll hand over to you Bertrand. Thanks.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Thank you very much Michele. It's a pleasure to be here. I very much appreciate the opportunity to have a two-hour slot to talk to you...

Michele Neylon: This will be held in the bar later, that we would ask that Bertrand pick up the tab.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: That being said, jokes aside, I'm there for the whole week. What I want to give you is a snapshot, maybe a few comments. And I'm open to further discussions, as you will see. Thanks very much, jokes aside, for the opportunity.

Fundamentally the reason why I'm happy to talk to you is because you, as registrars, are a critical element of the capacity of having a cross-border Internet and the fact that people can buy domain names from wherever they are through whatever registrar you may want, even if they are in a different country. That's a very important element. It's important for your business model. It's important for the accessibility and particularly for the accessibility for a certain number of actors who are in countries where there may be no registrars.

The problem is that because you are fundamentally cross-border actors, like the Internet is, you are confronted with a patchwork of jurisdiction like all the other intermediaries, they can be large platforms like Facebook, Google and so on.

But it is any activity that basically is using the cross-border Internet. And the tension between this cross-border nature of and the patchwork of national jurisdiction which is the way the international system functions, is raising a lot of issues that you probably are experimenting on a firsthand basis.

The problem is at the moment, to take your particular case, you are at that nexus of pressures between the different actors and particularly governments who want to exercise the jurisdiction and the application of their national laws.

And there are tensions at the moment regarding, in particular, two trends. One is the extra-territorial expansion of sovereignty, i.e. for those of you who may be based in the US, there is the pressure that the US government may want - and it works for other countries - may want to take action on certain content via requesting the registrar to basically take down the domain because the content is infringing according to the law of whatever country.

The other tension that is not necessarily directly impacting your self that is the requirement for data localization. And there is a pressure for keeping the data related to citizens of a particular region in the region in question. That goes to the privacy laws in Europe and you are very familiar with that on the registrar accreditation agreement and so on and the Whois.

So the problem is that those two trends of extra-territorial expansion of sovereignty, I don't have to remind you of the cases of (Bodog) or (unintelligible) a couple of years ago, and there are many others, the fact that you are located in a country says that the seizure of domains can happen even if it is bought by somebody with in another country, which is the problem.

So to make a long story short this is part of a larger issue of jurisdiction. You have - you are directly concerned by requests for seizure of domain names and also access to user data through the Whois and so on.

There is a third element that concerns you less but that I want to mention which is that large platforms such as Facebook, Google, all the hosting platforms, are confronted with similar problems regarding content takedown requests.

To handle this issue I have launched at the beginning of 2012 an ongoing process to develop what is now emerging as a framework for transporter requests regarding domain seizures, content takedown and access to user data.

The problem that we have to solve is that fundamentally today there is no international framework that manages the tensions between jurisdictions. There are MLAT, mutual legal assistance treaties, that's function for (unintelligible) investigation. But for all the things that are related to speech in particular there is no framework that handles when and how domains should be seized, not information about users transmitted or not.

So the process that I've facilitated with somebody called (Paul Sellinger) that you may meet in other meetings, is a fundamentally on the basis (unintelligible) that produces a newsletter every month that you are invited to subscribe to that collects cases of jurisdictional tensions.

But domain interests - the main thing that you might be interested in is that the process that has been going on for two years as basically involved about 70 entities, that include governments from Brazil, India, the US, Germany, France, Netherlands, Sweden; law enforcement, Interpol, Europol, FBI, CDI, procedures in various countries; the major platforms, Google, Facebook, Yahoo, Microsoft; civil society group like Electronic Frontier Foundation, Privacy International, etcetera; and some DNS operators like VeriSign, PIR and many ccTLDs including CERA, (ODA), Afnic and others.

And I've been in contact on an informal basis regularly with Michele to keep track of the progress. What the outcome of this process of meetings that basically we've organized 13 meetings in more than 10 countries participating in outreach sessions in more than 20 countries to try to drive really a multistakeholder discussion.

The outcome is now a framework that has basically two pillars. One pillar is how requests, transborder requests are being made through a common request format and a set of databases to ensure traceability and transparency reporting and the collection of the reference of the legal frameworks in the different countries, which is something that is difficult to maintain because there is a lot of countries and their legal frameworks is changing on a regular basis.

That's the first pillar, how the transborder requests should be made and how to ensure that in those requests when you receive them it is in a format that is receivable and understandable and it contains enough information regarding the legal basis and the justification for the request.

The second pillar is how the requests are being handled inside the platforms or the DNS operators. This includes, without getting into details now, sets of criteria and procedural norms that are agreed among the participants in the process; mechanisms for potential appeal for the users but also for the operators; and mechanisms for dispute management.

I have a brochure in electronic format that I distributed during the IGF that I will share with you so that you can circulate it. I don't get into more details. The important point for this discussion that I wanted to highlight is the following.

Among the criteria that are emerging you are confronted with an element that is that a lot of actors, including law enforcement and governments, somehow are behaving in many cases as they've opened a big room and they've seen a lot of switches that solve all the content problems. It's wonderful. You have a problem with content? Take the domain out.

One of the norms in criteria and principles that emerge in the process and that will be documented that I think should be of interest for you is to make sure that there is a global understanding that the domain name layer is not a content control panel, that domain seizures are intended to respond to problems that are related to malware, phishing, harm to infrastructure and so on and not fundamentally content.

And that when it deals exceptionally with content it is when the entire activity of the domain is around a specific thing that is sufficiently deemed illegal in a large number of countries to justify to attach the request at that level.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Bertrand, I know that you can speak very eloquently on the subject for, well, hours.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: No, no.

Michele Neylon: But I'm just conscious of time. Maybe if this juncture you could tell us very very briefly if you could what you would like us to do or what you were advising us to do or.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah. I mean, you're actually going exactly around - that was exactly the next comment. This framework, the only reason why I was highlighting this principle is because among all those that are emerging they are the ones that are the most important for you potentially. And so the other

element is regarding the conditions under which access to user data is being given. It's different in your case because of that Whois but still there are criteria that are being developed.

So to answer exactly your question, the next point I wanted to highlight is, so far apart from the discussions that we've had together with you and a few others on a personal basis that I see around this room, I want to make sure that the registrar community and constituency is fully aware of the process that is going on, that those of you who are direct interest in following that more closely can contact me and discuss it in detail and even participate in some of the meetings that we're organizing in the months to come.

The idea is that there will be a regime that will be operational between 2015 and 2016 with a technical path for the requests decision and another part more on the dispute management.

The point I wanted to highlight beyond the involvement of your community in this thing is that it is something that it clearly serves the community of registrars in terms of establishing high-level principles that can be opposed or taking into account when you receive requests across borders, that you don't know necessarily how to handle or to refuse or to counter.

The last point - Last but not least, and it's not the nicest thing, is that this initiative is something that we have run for the last two years. The funding of this initiative is basically supported by major platforms, including Facebook, Google, ccTLDs, a foundation and one government.

We need next year to raise more resources to fulfill the requirements of the project. And I want to end with a direct and very straightforward call for those of you who would be willing to approach me and can discuss how your own

company you would be willing to contribute to the funding pool. This is something that is really needed to be able to go forward.

But I want to clarify that there is no connection between participation in the process and the funding; one is not a condition of the other nor vice versa. So we are really in need of financial support for this but we more than anything need your involvement and your feedback on where the regime is going.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Bertrand. I have a Volker. Anybody else want to be in the queue? And Elliott.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I'm a bit confused is the wrong word but puzzled maybe about the legal basis of this framework. Is this going to be a voluntary framework that we can adopt or is this something that has to be transposed into law? Because giving personal and private information to a law enforcement agency in a different country may even be illegal for some of us.

And on a voluntary basis we cannot share that. So that must be transformed into local law and only then will it become relevant. But then it would become relevant as a matter of fact.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: This is an absolutely important question. This is a voluntary regime. In a certain number of cases if I take the example of the US for instance, there is a really important element which is not related to the content takedown but to the communication of user data. And this involves the interpretation of ex pat in the United States.

It involves, in a certain number of other countries, the conditions under which this information is being given. The way the system is being developed is that it is a voluntary regime that will be adopted and used both from the receiving

end and on the requesting end which means that the countries that will participate and will have contributed to the elaboration of the regime will agree to a certain number of criteria regarding the operation.

The criteria may be more or less detailed regarding the content takedown itself or the domain seizures. And the user data is the most sensitive issue; I absolutely agree. And being able to map exactly in which conditions this data can be shared voluntarily or not and when it is in contradiction with some laws or not is exactly the kind of input that is needed in the regime.

In a lot of cases it may not require a modification of the law but in a certain number of cases it requires to make sure that the law in the country clearly specifies under which condition this can be done or not. Does that answer your question?

Volker Greimann: Yes it helps. I think I will need to see the final product at some point.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: But I think this is going in an interesting direction that I will follow.

Michele Neylon: (Elliot), over to you.

(Elliot): Yeah, thanks Michele. You know, one of the things that jumped out to me here when I think about almost any, let me call it, domain name issue, this could be a Whois inaccuracy report, it could be a transfer issue, it could be, you know, a takedown related to content that we all get, the vast majority of them I would put out are transnational.

So if you think of the actors as ICANN, the registry, the registrar, sometimes the reseller, and the registrant, is it rare - it will be the exception that all of those parties are in a single jurisdiction.

And because of that, you know, I think that we greatly benefit from anything that clarifies or puts a little bit of - a little more openness around cross-border issues.

One of the things that, as Bertrand to explain this to me, you know, that immediately jumped out to me and so this is, you know, kind of my idea, not his and because it could be a crappy one so I'm not trying to stick you with it - is that this same framework would probably be fantastic for things like Whois inaccuracy reports.

You know, imagine if we had all of the both specificity of process and transparency around all of these particular elements, you know, what is the wrong being complained of, who is the complaining party, etcetera. And I think that there are probably a number of other processes of ours where this stuff would fit.

So, you know, what I would put out is, you know, something even more, you know, certainly I think all of us or those of us who are interested should follow this and follow the work. But, you know, I'm really going to be pushing Bertrand for, you know, as this starts to actually go live, I think you said, you know, maybe the beginning of '15, first quarter of '15 or so, but maybe the summer of - maybe the fall of - anyway some time in 2015 that it might provide us with an answer to some of our - of our normal process challenges. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, (Elliott). Does anyone else have any questions or comments for Bertrand? No? Okay, then, Bertrand, will probably follow up with us and send us on some information. And if anybody wants to follow up with him directly then they can do so.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, so thank you again for the opportunity. As I said, we have a very simple two-pager brochure that describes basically the process and the stage of the draft framework. I will share it with Michele so that he can circulate it for you.

My address is a very simple one which is bdelalchapelle@gmail and you can find me in the corridors generally. Last point on one (Elliott) was saying, it's probably early to know whether the regime itself would cover the thing that he's talking about or whether it would be an inspiration to develop something that would be similar for the kind of problem that he raises.

But what is clear is that this the type of input that is needed so that the regime can help and the criteria that are being developed can help most of the questions that you have regarding transborder requests and jurisdictional issues.

So thanks a lot for the opportunity and I'll keep in touch.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you, Bertrand. And one comment from the remote participants was that they were shocked and horrified that Bertrand is advertising Gmail instead of using his own domain. There are several people in this room that will be more than happy to facilitate you in registering your own domain name, Bertrand.

At this juncture I'm - I would like to ask Theresa Swinehart to join us very briefly. Theresa, I'm sure many of you know, is in - well I'll let her speak for herself. This is just a very very brief intervention that Theresa asked us for at the last minute. It's brief, it's a more a case of quick statement and if anybody has any questions or whatever so I'll hand over to Theresa.

Theresa Swinehart: Thank you. Given that we posted - whoa - okay, given that we posted on Friday and on such short notice but we felt it was important to get the revised version out to the community. I'd sent a note to all the SO/AC and SG and C leadership just to see whether they wanted me to come by quickly to talk or answer questions so that's why I'm here.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Tell them what you posted.

((Crosstalk))

Theresa Swinehart: I'm sorry I posted - we posted the revised accountability process for the IANA stewardship transition. So my apologies, I wasn't clear on that.

((Crosstalk))

Theresa Swinehart: Sorry, I was trying to do the shortcut so I don't take much of your time.

Michele Neylon: There's a shortcut and then there's leaving us confused.

Theresa Swinehart: Sorry. Let me start again. So I'm Theresa Swinehart. I know I don't come and present here very often. I'm the senior advisor for strategy and oversee the Strategic Initiatives department that covers a wide range of issues. In addition

to the regular day-to-day activities I also cover and oversee the two processes relating to the NTIA announcement on their intention to transition their stewardship role in the context of the IANA function.

And so the IANA functions process is underway. And I think as everybody knows that work is moving forward. And then recently we provided a revised process document or the accountability process which looked specifically at ICANN accountability in the context of the changing relationship with the US administration.

And then a second work stream that provides for ICANN accountability, more broadly other issues that have come up through the community discussions around accountability. And some of those can be addressed in existing processes chance mechanisms and some of them may benefit from other processes and mechanisms.

So the accountability in the context of ICANN and its changing historical relationship with the US is something that does need to be addressed before the transition can be completed. It is something that should accompany what is the proposal that is coming out of the IANA stewardship process.

So in that context we hope that everybody will be able to participate in their respective ways. But I just wanted to come here in case there were any questions about the proposed process or anything on next steps.

I know Michele has been very active and obviously has all the information you may need but I'm more than happy to respond to anything if there's any questions from you or anybody else.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Theresa. To clarify I have wads of text and links to things but I would defer to Theresa and her team when it comes to the finer points of a lot of this because to be perfectly frank, it's a great big growing beastie in the corner which is quite hard to track very closely.

Does anyone have any comments, any questions or anything for Theresa at this time? Just check (unintelligible). Okay. Theresa, thanks for dropping by. And if anybody needs to get in contact with Theresa or her team and you can't find your details just ask me, I have them all. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: We're going to have our next speaker from ICANN staff will be Margie Milam. But before we go to her Bob Connolly wanted to have a minute or two.

Bob Connolly: Thank you, Michele. Some of you don't know me, I was secretary for five years and I haven't been able to attend the recent meetings but I wanted to come while I'm near my hometown and say - see old friends and perhaps say good-bye to some.

This whole process started in the fertile mind of Jon Postel. It was conceived there. Andy meeting followed - he created the international - Internet Ad Hoc Committee. That committee published its final report in March of 1997. And there was an MOU signed on April Fools' Day, 1 April of 1997. That would be the first trimester of ICANN.

The leader of that was David Maher, whom we saw this morning in the Registry meeting. Several other people who are here who were there on that day in Geneva. I also saw Werner over there and Anthony last night, our host.

So I've not only achieved my original objective of seeing a lot of friends but had some unanticipated consequences, very favorable ones. Last night we were in the old Douglas manufacturing plant in Santa Monica. It just happens that my - (Pat)'s mother and my mother to have been Rosies the Riveters in that factory during the Second World War.

In addition to that (Pat) was born in Venice, primary education in Santa Monica, graduated from Venice high school and I was in the Los Angeles high school which I still pronounce correctly and rode my bicycle down and swim in bay here.

And my father in law in the 1930s was a major manufacturer of surfboards, the old long, long ones, laminated, have a picture of a bunch of people holding them. And I have used his surfboard in the Santa Monica Bay. So it's kind of a real experience being here today. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Bob. I mean, you have an institutional memory that has served us very well in the past. Thank you.

Our final speaker, at which point I will release you into the wild, to go forth and sell loads of domain names, is Margie Milam, who was here. You're in my blind spot. Sorry I can't see people if they're sitting almost directly behind me.

So Margie is going to talk about Whois oddly enough; seems to be her favorite subject. So Margie, over to you.

Margie Milam: Hi everyone. I'm also here with Steven Pedlow of NORC, it was involved in publishing the preliminary findings of this pilot study we did. And I'm not

going to go through all the statistics that we went through yesterday. But I want to give you an update on where we are in the process and in particular how it affects registrars.

Next slide please. So as I mentioned, we work on this pilot study. We are essentially building out a system called the Whois Accuracy Reporting System. That was requested by the ICANN Board after examining the recommendations from the Whois review team.

And what it does is it takes a look at systematic approach of looking at Whois records, identifying them as accurate or inaccurate using automated tools. And then the process that's going to affect registrars is that the records that are identified as inaccurate are going to be forwarded to you for follow-up and then it will be reporting on the results of that action.

And so that's the system we're building out that in order to do so we're going to need to get some information and participation from registrars on how to best do that and that's why we're here today is really to get a call for volunteers for a working group to help us identify what that process should be.

Next slide.

Michele Neylon: Sorry Margie, just to stop you there. Have you already put out a call for volunteers or are you going...

Margie Milam: We're going to after this meeting, yeah.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Margie Milam: Yes. So we were concentrating up until this last week on publishing the pilot report on accuracy. And what we did to get to this point we published an RFP and identified vendors that have systems to look at email address validation, postal address validation and telephone address validation.

And the study actually looked at it both from syntactic perspective and operational. In other words if the format correct for the address and telephone numbers and postal addresses but also doesn't work? And that's what we reported on.

And then we've also reported on - we're going to be looking at different perspectives so is there a different accuracy rate for registrars under the old agreement versus the new agreement, looking at new Gs versus prior Gs, and the geographic regions.

Next slide please. So what we did we actually looked at 100,000 records. This is a pretty substantial study. We ran 100,000 email addresses for syntactic and operational validation. And then the other elements we did smaller sample sizes because it was more manual and more expensive to do so.

So we looked at 10,000 records for addresses, telephone numbers for syntactic validation, and then we looked at 1000 records to see whether the telephone numbers worked and whether the addresses were accurate.

Next slide. And so what this slide - and I think you should pay attention to this slide - this slide tells you what kind of reports we'd like to build out. The requirements are based on requests from various parts of the community. And so what you'll see is that community members like the GAC for example, has asked for things like looking at the comparisons that I talked about before but

also a ranking; they want to see a ranking of registrars on accuracy levels and registries on accuracy levels.

And so that's something that we're proposing to build out. There will be a public comment period once we've published the final study report to try to get a sense from the community on what kind of reports we should build.

Michele Neylon: Sorry Margie, we're going to interrupt you a couple of times here rather than...

Margie Milam: Sure.

Michele Neylon: We have a question - oh - a question from Chris Pelling on remote. "Define telephone number worked. It rang or something else or did you speak to someone?"

Margie Milam: Yeah, we had (Digiser) actually call the number to see if it worked. So if there was some indication that it worked, you know, like you got a voicemail or something...

Michele Neylon: Do you actually have details on that because what - I think what the - what we're asking is a number could bring but if it never answers or is the voicemail is permanently full or whatever then it's quite different to one for you actually speak to a human being.

Margie Milam: When we published the final results we'll put what the steps what (Digiser) did, so I don't have anyone here to explain exactly what they did but we'll definitely include that in the final report.

Michele Neylon: Okay. And I have a question for you; it's a direct pointed question which you may not like. How much did this cost?

Margie Milam: How much did it cost?

Michele Neylon: Yes, how much did this cost.

Margie Milam: I don't think I can share that information right now.

Michele Neylon: Why not? We are being asked by ICANN to do cross field validation, which has a direct and tangible impact - cost impact on our businesses. You have done a minor - you've chosen a minor sampling of the total gTLD registrations and you have done a partial check on this. So it would be helpful to give us an indication of costs involved because you are asking us to do this.

Margie Milam: Okay, what we can do is we can go back to the finance team and find out what information we can share. I just can't share that off the top of my head but I will go back and check.

Michele Neylon: Right because I would say - I'm going to push you on this and I'm sorry, it's nothing personal, Margie, it's just on something like this the costs are not a second rate matter because we - the registrars, the contracted parties are being called out on this and being - and you are demanding that we do this and yet - and the economic factor of this is not something that can be ignored.

So we need to know how much it cost and based on looking at this - if you're looking at 100,000 records that is potentially the registrations in dotCom in, what, one day? Two days? I don't know. One of the larger guys might know. I'm seeing Tom Keller is nodding. And I tend to believe him. So that's the registrations for one day.

Margie Milam: Yeah, okay so like I said it will check to see what we can share. And so as we build this out we're also going to do trend analysis to see how rates change over time.

Next slide please. And so this is essentially how we - we went to our vendors and ask them to categorize the data into different failure levels. And we determined accuracy rates based upon where they fell in a spectrum. And this is the kind of thing that we're going to want public comment on when we publish the final report.

Next slide please. So I think I'll hand it off to Steven to talk about the statistics just really briefly, Steven. If you can go to the next slide.

Steven Pedlow: Thank you. My name is Steven Pedlow. I'm from NORC at the University of Chicago. I'm a senior statistician there. I was in charge of drawing the samples and analyzing the data.

This slide shows - the leftmost column shows the overall accuracy at each step. And then the other four columns compare registrars under the 2009 RAA and registrars under the 2013 RAA and prior versus new gTLDs.

The first thing to notice is that the syntactical email accuracy is very high, 99.9% across the board. Looking at the rightmost two columns comparing the prior and new gTLDs there's some significant differences which are in bold. But they are small differences, less than 3% but statistically significant nonetheless.

Between the 2009 RAA and the 2013 RAA I've bolded in red the larger significant differences. So you can see here that the syntactical postal

accuracy is higher for 2009 RAA registrars, whereas the operational email accuracy is higher for registrars under the 2013 RAA.

The final two...

Margie Milam: I'm sorry, can - are we opening up for questions by line item or do you want to? It's your preference to go through...

Michele Neylon: We have the slides...

((Crosstalk))

Steven Pedlow: We're here for you.

Michele Neylon: We have the slides.

Jennifer Standiford: Okay. Okay. I just think there was one great point is to note - this is Jennifer for the transcript - that Volker has brought to my attention is the accuracy numbers actually went down under the 2013 RAA?

Steven Pedlow: In some instances yes. I mean...

Jennifer Standiford: We could drill down...

Steven Pedlow: We're comparing registrars under one agreement versus the other agreement so...

Jennifer Standiford: I think what would be helpful if we can drill down on those results and to understand what those instances were, it would be helpful.

Michele Neylon: A simpler question - Michele for the record - where's the raw data? Because it's...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yeah, just being really kind of, you know, looking at this from a kind of a dumb point of view, a new TLD, they've only been around for less than a year, so the likelihood of an email address no longer being valid within the period of 12 months unless you went out almost intentionally to use a throwaway email is obviously going to be statistically lower than a domain that you registered 10, 15 years ago.

So, you know, logically speaking email addresses are probably going to be better. That I don't understand why the physical addresses would be worse because - I don't know, sorry.

Margie Milam: Yeah, I don't have an explanation for it. We do have the data. We can look to see what was causing the higher error rates and report on that. But the good thing is we have the data.

Michele Neylon: Tom, go ahead.

Tom Keller: Yeah, a question. Did you only do automated checks or did you do (unintelligible) checks as well? And if you did only automated checks did you look at the fail rate across all the countries you looked at or was it just (unintelligible)?

Margie Milam: We have a geographic breakdown as well. We can flip to that later if you're interested in those results. I think most - we've tried to focus on automated systems email checks were automated. I believe that syntactic postal addresses

were automated. The telephone is manual. So that's why the sample size is only 1000 given the costs associated with actually, you know, calling someone.

Tom Keller: The most difficult thing in here is the postal code or the postal address, right? So was that manually checked in any way were just automated process.

Margie Milam: We used the UPU databases and then we worked with the UPU. So they have a - if you're familiar with the UPU, they have 190 countries in their databases and the countries send their postal addresses into their database for a central place to search. And that's the data that was used.

That we send it to the UPU and they sent us back the results. So I don't know how they - whether there was any manual part on their side, we didn't have the access to their databases, we just worked with them to get that data.

(Christian): Just one point. Usually these - sorry, (Christian) here. Usually this data is, to a certain degree, a faulty in itself. We had this kind of experience a lot of times. I mentioned earlier during this meeting that (unintelligible) and domain check or address check, catastrophic outcome three years back and they used the partially official data, and the official data had a faulty rate of about 12% or so.

So, you know, we have these kind of customers sending us pictures from the street name signs to prove that they actually lived there while the database said this address is not existent. So, you know, if you are relying on this kind of data these numbers are quite nice actually.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. We have one question from remote from Chris Pelling. "If the email was automated how did you confirm receipt?"

Margie Milam: We didn't confirm receipt. What the (Strike Iron) did is they did a number of searches like is the domain name live? Is there an (ex) record set up? They would interrogate the mail server. So there is a number of steps that they went to but I don't believe they actually sent an email and, you know, they use their - they have a proprietary system that they've developed over time for that. And we'll try to provide those details in the final report.

Michele Neylon: Okay a follow up comment from remote is, "So useless then and flawed?"

(Christian): I wanted to say, so you are only not certain that the email is obviously a fake. So that's actually basically what he's saying, right?

Margie Milam: In a sense, right. It's not 100% because unless you're getting a response back you don't know. But they do, you know, they do have a systematic way of at least checking that there's, you know, that there is a mail server and sometimes they get responses but not all the time.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, okay. It's Michele for the record. That sounds like what you're doing is, how can I put this politely? You are checking - you're doing a technical test at a very high level which would weed out totally bogus email domains but won't actually tell you anything of any value whatsoever.

I mean, this is the kind - like if I - mass mailers do better checks this. And they're the companies that a lot of us would use for sending out newsletters to our clients or transactional emails in large volumes because they are able to detect at a much higher level of accuracy a lot of these things. This doesn't...

Margie Milam: That's what (Strike Iron) does and that's who we contracted with so their service is for exactly that, you know, people that are trying to send mail out.

It's not going to be 100% but the question is are we seeing accuracy rates change over time. If you're using a consistent standard knowing that it's not 100% is the data still meaningful? Right? Knowing that it may not reflect everything but if the rates go up over time then you know you're making progress as long as your standard is consistent. That's, you know, that's the approach.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, well Margie, with all due respect, our contracts don't allow us the ability to have 80% accuracy, it's a completely binary wording. Now if the contracts were reworded in such a way that we had that flexibility then this might be of more value to us.

But the problem we...

Margie Milam: Yeah, no...

Michele Neylon: ...have is it's binary. Now I'd be more than happy to discuss with you further modifying the language of the contract to allow for that greater flexibility but I think we both know that's not going to happen.

Margie Milam: Yeah, and this is not, I mean obviously is a registrar you have a relationship with your registrant; you have the ability to email them and that's part of your process. This is more of a, you know, an outside look at accuracy - it's a different, you know, it's for a different purpose really.

Next slide please. So one of the requests and I wanted to highlight this for you is that the GAC wanted to see rankings of registrars. What we did here we anonymized it so you can't see, you know, who is on this list. It's the registrars that were largely representative of sample by sample size. So they're about

roughly equivalent to the top 10 registrars by size to see what the different rates in accuracy are.

That's a discussion item that we'll be asking for public comment on as what types of reports to publish and one of them being, you know, as I've mentioned, requested a ranking both of registrars and registries.

Next slide please.

Michele Neylon: Sorry just one second. Hold on. Are you saying that you are - you're doing a random sampling of domains and then from that random sampling you are then trying to match that to the largest registrars?

Margie Milam: No, no, no...

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: No, we're sampling all registrars and all registries except for really small ones. So, and then we're going to have a list from 1 to 1000 of, you know, where everyone ranks. The question is how much of that do we publish. We will have that data, we're setting up the sample sizes so that we are searching every registrar and every registry. But except for like a de minimis a number of registrations.

Michele Neylon: Okay the question I'm getting from remote now is, "How do you define small?"

Margie Milam: Do you remember?

Steven Pedlow: So for the pilot we defined a small as having at least 20 domains in the sample but publishable I would support the larger number than that.

Jennifer Standiford: This is Jennifer for the transcript. How do you define accurate? Do you define accurate as in 100% of the fields that were checked based on the number of domains by registrar?

Margie Milam: In this case it's just email so if you're looking at email...

Jennifer Standiford: Oh just email, okay.

Margie Milam: Right. So this one's for example email, but we haven't done is due an overall accuracy assessment...

Jennifer Standiford: Right.

Margie Milam: ...of putting them all together and that we are still trying to figure out what the methodology to do for that.

Jennifer Standiford: Could I have been 100% accurate if the emails that you did the sample on have private registration?

Margie Milam: If the private registration is accurate, I mean, it is a real address, real telephone number, it's a proxy service that uses real information that and we're treating that as accurate.

Jennifer Standiford: Well I think that - I think that's flawed. Because if you look at it as private registrations are considered to be deemed accurate and I as a registrar, Network Solutions, you checked 20 of mine and they were all private, then I would come at the 100% rating. But if you checked my other registrar,

Registrar.com and the samples that contained just more end-user accuracy -
Whois accuracy information then it's not - it's not an apples to apples
comparison.

Margie Milam: Well privacy services and proxy services are still subject to the same accuracy ratings. If they just happen to be accurate because that's the business that they're in, you know, it does reflect in the numbers for sure. I mean, and that's something, if you think it should be broken out it'd be useful to say that in the public comments.

Jennifer Standiford: Yeah.

Margie Milam: To see if there's some way we can, you know, identified who the privacy service, proxy service and then reported separately. I mean that's certainly possible.

Jennifer Standiford: Yeah, I think that's something that...

Michele Neylon: I think Luc has a comment or a query. No, he's just looking confused. Okay.

Margie Milam: Okay next slide. Okay.

Jennifer Standiford: Okay, I think - Jennifer for the transcript. I think the same thing would apply if you're looking at one registrar that has a single registrant.

Margie Milam: So how would we know that if we weren't looking at every registration they had?

Jennifer Standiford: Well, you would know based upon doing a sample set and that that Whois output information would be the same for that same registrar. So if it's Jane

Doe is the same Whois information for that sample set for that one single registrar. So in that case they would score higher, the 100% versus looking at a registrar where there is unique end users or registrants for each sample.

Margie Milam: So where we are now, we're going to be, as I mentioned, publishing the report. We really need careful examination of the definitions on how things break out into accurate and inaccurate. We'll publish how we got there and answer some of the questions that you had today.

That I think especially from the registrars who are very familiar with, you know, the data and their customers, to take a look at that and really test it and let us know how to update the methodology because that is part of what will happen in the future is to update it as we build a system out.

Is there anything, Steven, you want to comment on this - this slide?

Steven Pedlow: So we are you talked about the methodology for producing an overall score. What hasn't been attempted during the pilot is the third step of validation - identity validation. Is the telephone number, email address or postal address is valid contact for the registrant?

This is a very complex and costly procedure so we're still in discussions as to how to proceed there.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Sorry just bigger part in just one second. Where in any of our contracts are we obliged to do identity validation? I'm a bit confused by where this is coming from.

Margie Milam: We're not - maybe there's some confusion here, this is not meant to be a compliance report; this is an independent - a look at accuracy and it may be different than what the actual registrar requirements are. And so it's meant to see whether the overall accuracy rates are improving but it's not meant to tie one to one to what the registrar obligations are.

Michele Neylon: Volker, please go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I'm - the obvious flaws that we've discussed before aside I think this is a dangerous report being presented to the GAC, being presented to other parties that don't actually know what we know about flawed procedures and the flawed methodology being promised, exploring validation as a viable option or maybe just something to put up there, they may think in the future that this is an option.

They see these numbers, don't understand them, don't understand what they mean, don't see where there's problems in these numbers. I think presenting this to the community in this form is dangerous and there should have been more in depth analysis what these numbers actually mean before they are shown to the community. I'm appalled.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, thanks, Volker. And just, you know, Michele for the record. I mean, this entire strand around identity validation, I'm, how can I put this genteelly? I'm having difficulty. That really is completely inappropriate. I think it's completely inappropriate to start looking at identity validation within the context of Whois within ICANN. I think it is not the appropriate place to do this.

If you were doing an in-depth study or if the community had asked you to do an in-depth study of identity validation and there would have probably been

pushback from quite a number of people within the community. But for you to have done this without our input I find quite appalling.

And I have no issue with other aspects of this but identity validation - that - with this kind of methodology, with this lack of, I mean, I don't know, there's a certain lack here around aspects of it and the way it's being presented, to echo Volker, that is sending a very bad message.

Margie Milam: And that's certainly but the public comment is for is so if we hear from the community that we shouldn't go there then that's something that gets factored into how the system gets built out.

Michele Neylon: We have another question from remote. You may not have the data at hand so you might not be able to answer this one. Chris Pelling is asking whether you had addresses in countries like Iran, Iraq, Jordan or Israel where it's hard to prove data. This goes to, we had a conversation earlier today - you weren't present - where we were talking about Whois matters and how the UPU staff doesn't exactly fit with reality in some of these countries such as Israel.

So where...

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Can you flip - if you go back to the end of the slides we actually have a geographic one. Keep going. Note the other way sorry. Towards the end of the presentation. Keep going. Keep going. Keep going. Keep going. These are all additional case - keep going. Right there stop. Okay.

So we looked at the study and try to look at different regions. And you can see we had samples - we intentionally chose the samples in the different

geographic regions. I don't know if you want to talk about this, Steven, about how we - about the sample sizes.

Steven Pedlow: Yeah, so out of the 100,000, only 671 were in Africa but those were kept - all kept in the 10,000 sample and they were also over-sampled in the 1000 sample. And that's just to get the best information, best estimates by region. And so does show small sample sizes for the operational telephone and postal operation.

The green indicates - the green indicates regions that were significantly higher in accuracy than other regions and the red indicates regions that were significantly lower in accuracy than all other regions.

Michele Neylon: Thank you. Bob, go ahead.

Bob Connolly: May I have - clarify the data on operational - on email, does that mean that you had had a response from the addressee?

Margie Milam: No, we didn't necessarily have to have a response to be included in the operational accuracy. They did other checks like whether the domain name was accurate, whether there was a mail server set up. It would interrogate and send a - try to communicate with the mail server. So no but they didn't get a response back that didn't necessarily mean it was not operational.

Bob Connolly: I was concerned that the effective filters - spam filters but that would not be sensitive to that. Okay, thank you.

Michele Neylon: And I have another question from Chris Pelling. I think if you give us the raw data it actually - he's asking for...

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: So you'd like the countries that are represented in the sample, is that what you're interested in?

Michele Neylon: Well the thing is - we've been discussing this in the context of our obligations under the 2013 RAA. And, you know - well there's a lot of people in this room that could speak to this quite eloquently.

There are significant issues, I mean, Bob was talking about - can't remember which country off the top of my head, sorry Bob - where a lot of the addresses, you know, they are going to be deliverable, in other words the postman has absolutely zero issue of it, but the UPU formats and things of that aren't often respected.

Yoav, and is really registrar, was talking about the problems there. My latest anecdotal one is that the post office in Carlow, in many cases - the post office in Carlow and several of the courier companies now regularly deliver mail addressed to my home address to my office because they know that it'll get to my office faster than it will get to my home address.

But because that's a practical thing it'll actually - it'll fit in because my front door has a tiny letterbox. I don't know, does anybody else want to say anything further or should we release Margie before her head explodes?

Margie Milam: Yeah, wait. Hold on I do want to go through next steps so let's go back to - go back up these. Okay, go down. Down to like where I had the - right before the questions thing. Keep going. Keep going. Going. Going. Okay so here.

So this is where I need your assistance. We need to set up a working group to work through all of these issues so to look at the error codes, to look at how things are classified so that we make sure we build out the system in a way that everyone understands that the classifications make sense and particularly how, if we do identify records as inaccurate, how they get forwarded to registrars for follow-up action because there's going to be a process that's going to need to be built to do that.

And whether it's the same as the current system we use now through the compliance portal or we do it through something else but that is something that we need to do to get input on from registrars. So that's what - we'll publish an announcement in the next week looking for volunteers for this working group.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anybody have any further comments or questions for Margie? Denise, you look like you want to say something or you're just waiting there just to protect her if you felt that we were bruising her too badly.

Denise Michel: Not at all. Okay so I'm Denise Michel with ICANN. So just - so I'd like to just reinforce the impetus for this and where we are in the process. And I'll probably be repetitive but I think it's worth underscoring that we're following through on an Affirmation of Commitments Whois review recommendation and implementation directive from the Board to do this report.

We're also responding to multiple GAC communiqués reinforcing that request that this work be done. Understand fully the sensitivity of the contractual obligations in this area and the work of the registrars which is why this is issued as a preliminary report and a pilot effort.

We want to make sure that we give you full opportunity to comment, assist, make sure that it is as accurate and useful as it should be before we move forward into a sort of steady-state process. So we encourage you to take advantage of the comment process and volunteer if you can to help us improve this effort. Thanks.

Margie Milam: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thank you. Yeah, okay I think we will probably have quite a bit to say on this particular subject. And I will probably end up reiterating the comments I made yesterday during the all things Whois-related - Whois session wearing basically going to be asking ICANN to put a hold on all Whois activities until such time as we can actually prioritize them properly and get a better view of which activities are duplicating other ones.

Because I think at this stage it's barreling out of control a little. But that's just my personal view, not the view of the Registrar Stakeholder Group until such time as they tell me that that is our formal view. Thank you.

Registrars, those of you who have survived through to 1754 local time Los Angeles. Well done. Thank you for your stamina, thank you for your participation. This meeting - this session and meeting is now closed. Please keep an eye out for various emails from us and others about various topics and sessions that might be of interest to you over the course of the rest of the week.

And we look forward to seeing you all again in Marrakesh. And don't forget that there is a cocktail being ordered - being organized tomorrow evening by the Registrar - whatever they're called this week - Registrar Services Team. You were liaisons now your services. Okay thank you.

END