

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
October 14, 2014
1:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: Your recordings have started.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drasek: This is the gTLD Registries Stakeholders Group. This session is the Joint Session with the RySG RrSG. It will run from 11:00 to 12:00 our local time in the Constellation Room.

((Crosstalk))

(Sherry): If everyone would please take their seats so we can start the next session.
Thank you.

Woman: I'm running for Chair.

Keith Drasek: Okay. If everybody could please wrap up your conversations and take your seats or take the conversations out into the hall. Thank you.

(Sherry): Good morning and welcome to the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And to anyone who has joined us online. And just a reminder when speaking please announce your name for purposes of the recording, the transcript and those that are participating remotely. Thank you.

Keith Drasek: Okay. Thanks very much (Sherry). Hi everybody. This is Keith Drasek, Chair of the Registries Group. Welcome to Michele Neylon, Chair of the Registrars Stakeholder Group and all of the registrars here. We welcome you here. How was the tent?

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Mr. Drasek, thank you. Michele for the record. The tent is cozy. Translation. Oh my God, it's hot. And it's depending on which part of the tent you're sitting in. I gather from some of our members are freezing. Others are boiling and I'm not sure there's anything in between.

And so yes. I can understand why the GAC didn't want to be there all week. Well over to you.

Volker Greimann: Just to extrapolate what Michele said and I think he's trying to say thanks for rubbing it in.

Michele Neylon: No. I will actually push that hard. Gee VeriSign, you suck. Sorry.

Keith Drasek: Well thank you. Thanks Volker. Okay. So welcome everybody. This is the Joint Registry Registrar Session. We typically have these meetings as most of you will recall at the very end of the day on Tuesdays.

So we decided together to reschedule and to move things around a little bit so we could have this interaction A, while we're still fresh relatively speaking in the day and two, before we each have our interactions with the ICANN Board. So there's an opportunity for us to compare notes.

Our agenda today we'll do a brief recap on the joint ExCom's meeting that we had with the GDD staff and that was joint registry, registrar and NTAG ExComs that took place on Sunday.

And then we'll get into a discussion of contracted party house concerns, questions, issues including issues and motions upcoming for the GNSO Council meeting and, you know, discussing again, as I said, conversations, topics that we'd like to raise with the Board and then any other business.

So why don't I stop or just pause there for a moment to see if there's any other agenda items we ought to add at this point; anything that the registrars would like to bring to our attention or vice versa.

Michele Neylon: Just Michele for the record. Just I think very briefly Keith I think it wouldn't be a bad idea if we also discussed briefly what's been going on within the Community Leaders Group within ICANN. But before I add that all after, we can address it then. Thanks.

Keith Drasek: Okay. All right. Very good. Anything else? Okay. Let's jump right into it then. I'm sorry Volker. Did you have something?

Volker Greimann: Yes. The grapevine tells us that you are trying to reopen the registry agreement discussions with ICANN. And through the process it has been established and would be nice so to just have an update or heads up on any issues that might impact us as well.

Keith Drasek: Absolutely. Okay. So I've noted that. So let's just jump right in. I'll take the opportunity just to give a brief update. I think we had as the joint ExCom session with the GDD staff, Akram and his team among others; Maguy Serad was there from Compliance; Xavier from Finance. We had, you know, I think a pretty good session on Sunday evening with the joint ExComs.

I don't feel like there were any real hot button issues that sort of stand out or remain. I assume that you all have had your interaction with the GDD staff as well or you will.

So I just want to open it up to any other ExCom members who were there; like to share your views or identify any issues that we ought to, you know, be focusing on together as contracted parties.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Keith. Michele for the record. Just so everybody's aware who isn't aware, the ExComs of both the registries and registrars we tried to coordinate to a greater or lesser degree and we have been having meetings with ICANN senior staff generally speaking on the Sunday evening at the ICANN public meetings to raise issues primarily around like service issues, that kind of thing.

During the meeting we had this past Sunday apart from service issues we also raised the auction issue. In other words, around what's happening with auction funds.

We also were talking to them about the upcoming much wanted GDD portal. Well I think - what other - were there other matters? Keith, I'm trying to remember.

Keith Drasek: Go ahead (Jen).

Jennifer Standiford: There's obviously areas of overlap of interest related to compliance that were discussed. I'm sorry. This is Jennifer Standiford for the record. Areas of compliance - areas that overlap as it relates to compliance matters that were discussed.

The team - we look forward to working with (Alan) much more closely on that and better communication across the contracted parties as it relates to that so we can formulate a project plan and adhere to deadlines that all parties are agreeable to in addition to ICANN staff providing more frequent updates to us was a very - one of the items that were discussed and a key take away from that discussion.

Keith Drasek: Yes. Okay. Any other ExCom members who were there want to jump in on an update for the membership? Any other details? Okay.

Michele Neylon: I did touch on a couple of topics I'll actually go into a bit quick briefly into some of the details. Michele for the record. Like on the auctions item, we got rather circular responses. ICANN does not want to commit to any timelines about addressing this - addressing it until they know how much funds they have even though it might takes months. They - it was kind of a circular kind of roundabout. They wouldn't give us any timelines.

On the GDD portal side of things they seem to have made very good progress with providing the integration with sales force for the registries but the registrars are - we're still stuck with the older system.

Now that's an interesting segue into the compliance side of things because what we're seeing on our side is some interesting issues with respect to

tracking compliance tickets and various issues around communication there where some tickets are kind of disappearing there's other kind of problems I think Jennifer or (Ollie) might speak to a little bit more. And those are the salient points.

The change of staff within compliance with the appointment of Allen Grogan we're looking at that as being a positive change. He met with us on Sunday during that session and he was in with us this morning during the compliance session with registrars.

He has only just started in the job. But he's already kind of being hit over the head with various things. Has made a commitment to come back to us as a group on some matters that we already raised with him. Thanks.

Keith Drasek: Okay. Thanks Michele. Any other questions or comments? I think one of the other topics that I think we raised was the question of privacy, personal data handling issues. Obviously registrars have now a track record of having to deal with, you know, managing personal data with regard to retention and having to seek waivers from ICANN for exceptions to the 2013 RAA.

There are some registries and new TLD registries and applicants who have identified the need for a process to handle not necessarily data retention issues but general personal data display issues, collection issues and things like that based on their national law.

So this was teed up as a joint topic of discussion because the registrars have some experience in this process. Some registries have identified a desire for a process to handle exception requests. (Maxim) feel free to jump in if there's anything that I'm missing on this. But I think this was an issue that you'd raised; something else that we talked about with the GDD.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele for the record again, in case you don't recognize the (dust) of Irish tones. During the who all things Whois session yesterday ICANN staff said that they were putting together - I'm sorry. I've forgotten what the damn acronym was - some kind of implementation study group of some kind to deal with issues around conflicts between Whois policy and national law.

I have absolutely no idea who's involved with that. But this was mentioned during the presentation yesterday.

Keith Drasek: Did we also - and this is Keith for the transcript. Did we also hear that - was it Jamie Hedlund was the staff person involved in drafting a white paper or something like that on the privacy issues?

Michele Neylon: Yes. This...

Keith Drasek: Or Whois related, you know...

Michele Neylon: Yes. There's a couple of - there's a couple of threads there. There is - oh God, sorry. Just the entire Whois thing yesterday was actually quite overwhelming because there's multiple initiatives that are either directly or indirectly related with both policy and operational matters that impact the Whois.

And they're all kind of piled one on top of the other. There's a series of studies that have been done. There's more studies in the pipeline. There's operational things like the move from thin to thick in com and net. That three's the EWG report, which is still kind of floating around the GNSO and they're meant to be doing things.

And then there's the conflicts of national law. So there's - it's actually even for those of us who spend a disproportionate amount of our time interacting with ICANN on all this stuff and bearing in mind that I'm suffering from lack of sleep and possibly slightly hung over.

You know, I'm having difficulty trying to kind of understand exactly which item is being dealt with by whom. But there's a hell of a lot of it going on.

Keith Drasek: Yes. I think that's well said is that there's so much going on right now overlapping or otherwise in the Whois discussions that it's something that we're going to need quite a bit more clarity on I think. Okay. Any other topics for discussion from the joint ExComs' meeting with GDD before we move on? Okay.

Next item on our agenda is actually to talk about the GNSO issues and motions, anything that's coming up from the GNSO Council that we as contracted parties ought to discuss or coordinate or brief each other on in terms of positions. So (Jonathan), can I look to you to maybe take the lead on this one?

(Jonathan): Yes. I'm aware there's two motions. I'm just going to pull out the agenda.

Keith Drasek: Just before you do that - sorry (Jonathan). I assume you're all aware that (Jonathan) was - has been awarded a very large award. And just for those of you who happen to have the opportunity to congratulate him on this - sorry (Jonathan). I just - I take perverse pleasure in embarrassing you or anybody else when I get every opportunity. Please continue.

(Jonathan): You've achieved the perverse pleasure. Thank you very much.

Keith Drasek: Oh, and it's Jon Nevett's birthday today as well I hear. Happy birthday Jon. So (Jonathan) - while (Jonathan) is pulling that up...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): ...I'll just pick up on the agenda. So (Jonathan) for the transcript. And we've got the two motions. I mean I'm just - the first is the IRTTP Part D. This is the final and I know Michele and others have pointed out that these acronyms drive us a little crazy.

But essentially this is about domain name transfers with registrars and this has been a significant piece of work that's been broken down into four components. This is the fourth component and James Bladel of the registrars has been significantly involved in driving this forward and in particular this last one. And it's come to the point where it's a motion ready for completion.

Normally I guess - we normally meet you guys at the end of the day and we would have discussed as registries our position on this. I don't think this is controversial or difficult. But typically that's the sequence. So we haven't actually discussed whether or not we're going to herd forward. But I don't anticipate we won't. Any questions or comments for anyone on this? (James).

(James): Not really a question of how registries intend to vote but does anyone - are you hearing any indications of a deferral? I mean is it likely that this will be voted on tomorrow or are we going to table it?

(Jonathan): My expectation is it'll be voted on and I don't anticipate any problems.

(James): Okay. Thanks.

(Jonathan): The second motion deals with charter for the Cross Community Working Group to discuss Internet governance. And if one or more of you said to me what is that, I wouldn't be surprised. Let me orient you just in case you've now got saturated on one too many Cross Community Working Groups.

A couple of ICANN meetings ago Fadi made reference to the community and said, you know, how about you guys do something on Internet governance. A couple of the groups stood up and said all right, we'll take a lead and pulled together I think it was - someone can remind me - it was Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group and ALAC I think stood up and said okay, we'll take a lead on this.

And they actually proceeded to get on with working on it. And then I think subsequently realized that it was - the work wasn't sufficiently well guided and needed a charter; produced a charter. And actually it - that came out around just prior to London I think and then wasn't really dealt with or put forward in the form of a motion properly.

It's now before the Council as a motion. And essentially what this does it says here's a place for the ICANN community to come together and talk about Internet governance issues such that we have our own community based forum for doing so. And this is - this gives - here's an opportunity for the GNSO to get behind that.

It's already been adopted by ALAC, ccNSO and SSAC. So any comments or questions on that?

Keith Drasek: So thanks (Jonathan). This is Keith. I'll just note that, you know, I think this particular Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance was identified as a need by many in the community following last year's

Montevideo statement where ICANN CEO was pretty far out in front I think of the community and engaging with the other ISTAR organizations to come up with the statement about, you know, some Internet principles and then moving to the NETmundial meeting and preparations for the NETmundial meeting, the establishment of this one net discussion list that came about at the IGF back in Bali over a year ago now or just about a year ago.

So I think that there was a recognition in the community that we as a community need the opportunity to discuss and to provide recommendations on Internet governance matters perhaps unrelated to ICANN's core mission but where ICANN the organization is engaging on the global stage with others.

So I - personally speaking I see tremendous value in having this community mechanism in place where we can have a coordinated effort I guess to make sure that ICANN senior management is advised of the community's common views. So that's just a general statement from me.

(Jonathan): So my assumption would be based on the sort of motivation, if you like, that Keith has made and the description that I gave that we would vote to back this charter and let the group get on and do the work as necessary according to the charter. I assume a lack of dissention is agreement.

Michele Neylon: Are they always this excitable?

(Jonathan): We're just not used to seeing you this early in the morning Michele.

Michele Neylon: You're getting better Jonathan. You're getting better.

(Jonathan): All right. So the next item is Item 6 we've got to deal with, which is a - which is really - I think it's worth just saying a very brief couple of sentences on this. We've got the GNSO liaison to the GAC, as you know, many of you this is the GNSO liaison to the GAC is Mason Cole. And Mason, this is the first meeting where Mason's been in post as it were.

We flagged in our - or I flagged I guess in our meeting earlier that this is - this represents an opportunity for - I mean many of us have been frustrated in the past by the nature of the GAC's operation and involvement in the process.

And this is an opportunity to ensure that the GAC is adequately well informed and perhaps is less likely to intervene in policy process late in the day. That's the whole objective of a collection of piece of work being done of which the GNSO liaison to the GAC is one.

But any of you who are interested in the way in which the GNSO interacts with the GAC, the liaison is really in many ways just a transmission and a clarification of policy work so the GAC is adequately informed by virtue of having a person talking to them that they can query and discuss with.

But in addition there's other work about how the GAC might interact with GNSO policy development. And so if you are interested to know and understand this is work of a consultation group going on that deals with this more.

Let me just pause in case anyone wants to know something more about that or understand it better. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Jonathan. Michele for the record. Is the - this GAC liaison position - I remember reading the description of the role a couple of months ago but it's

not that fresh in my mind. Will that person be providing some kind of regular update back to the GNSO on the GAC's activities or is it more the other way around?

(Jonathan): I mean I'll be frank with you being very, very careful and really pushed hard to be careful about this. The primary point is for the GAC to have other than the - some myriad email bulletins and other piece of information they get, which they tell us are problematic and difficult to process.

The issue is to have a person who can illustrate - who can present to them particular points and policy work who can be available to answer their questions. So it is primarily and significantly a GNSO liaison to the GAC.

The reason I'm so cautious about it being the other way is because that's not how it was conceive but more importantly than just simply how it was conceived is.

The danger is if it is seen as a GAC liaison on to the GNSO, Mason will find himself as some form of, you know, lever to try and influence policy and that's not the mechanism through which we expect that to happen.

So he can relay back information and may well do that but we've got to be very careful that we don't set the wrong expectations of what can be achieved for that role. Stephane

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. I also think (James) wants to be in the queue just in case.

Stephane Van Gelder speaking representing (OP3ST) on the Registry Stakeholder Group. Yes, I know it's a surprise to you Michele. But still.

Michele Neylon: It's literally a question of what the hell.

Stephane Van Gelder: I'll explain that later. On the Mason GNSO GAC liaison, when you were setting this up and congrats for getting this far, what was the GAC's take on them sending someone to the GNSO because that's been a recurring theme for so long and they never really have?

And just segueing from what you just said, if Mason is acting as a one way portal towards the GAC, what feedback are we getting from them into what they're doing which might impact the GNSO?

(Jonathan): This is all about the GAC engagement with GNSO policy work, which is why it's at the Council level because the Council's the policy manager within the GNSO.

Mason's role - the liaison role is the product of this GAC GNSO consultation group. And that GAC GNSO consultation group is looking at a variety of mechanisms by which the GAC might interact with the GNSO including for example frequent meetings - more frequent and semi-formal meetings between say the Chairs of the GNSO Council and the Chairs of the GAC - the GAC leadership.

So there's been - this is perhaps period interaction over and above the formal interaction of the ICANN meetings. Actually it may or may not be news - I'm sure it isn't news to you Stephane but it may or may not be news to others that the Council has effectively opened seats for liaisons from other SOs and ACs.

And the ALAC takes advantage of that. The ccNSO does. But the GAC does not. And the argument is as I understand it that the GAC doesn't have and doesn't see fit to or doesn't feel able to produce a single representative liaison, which is why from the GAC's point of view they call this a reverse liaison.

From our point of view it's a GNSO liaison to the GAC. But the GAC sees it as a reverse liaison to assist them in being better informed. So I don't think we will - we should then expect the GAC to put a liaison into the GNSO but we should expect that they will - we will build mechanisms by which they can become engaged earlier in GNSO process and (unintelligible).

Clearly in once sense we are opening a can of worms here because currently the GAC has an opportunity to put input at the Board level when the policy finally comes up for approval. But that causes problems. And we all know that causes problems.

So the objective here is to try and bring it earlier in the process but clearly we're opening the door a little and there's a danger of managing expectations and that the GAC expects to have some different influences.

So it's kind of damned if you do, damned if you don't. The old way has issues and the new way might have but that's why the rigor with which one sets expectations at every point in this is essential. I'm not saying it's foolproof.

(Jonathan): (Elliott).

(Elliott): (Jonathan), on that point I think there's something very important in the implication of the way the GAC is viewing it. And I would describe that as follows.

You know, I think with multi stakeholder in opposition to let's say, you know, in contrast to, you know, governance in nation states. You know, what we're doing if we acquiesce to this kind of one-way direction is we're reinforcing a traditional nation state way of making change and making policy, which is,

you know, we're going to feed information into this black box and then they still will have their major recourse be part of the Board.

So I want to be clear and I want to tease out two things. One, I think this is a great move forward and I, you know - but I also think that if we really importantly and with explanation need to keep pushing for that being bi-directional.

And, you know, it should be that in order to keep a strong GNSO and in order to really properly shape and form multi stakeholders, which we're all making up as we go along, that we - with anything we do like this structurally that we're conveying that the GAC are a stakeholder, an important stakeholder and that they need to participate in this new approach to policymaking.

And so I'm very skeptical or not skeptical - I'm, you know, I'm concerned if we just leave that as it lays without continually pushing for that to be bi-directional.

Keith Drasek: So this is Keith. Let me just in. Just to know we've got 15 minutes left in our schedule and a couple of other topics to get to. So did somebody else want to get in?

Man: (James).

Keith Drasek: (James), go ahead. Thanks.

(James): Thanks. And like the previous speakers, I share the concern about the unidirectional version of this liaison. However, if that is what we're stuck with at least for the time being, my recommendation from this group and although Mason is slated to represent all aspects of the GNSO, I think this group in

particular needs to encourage him to present some basic industry education, you know, commercial sector 101 for the GAC.

I see a lot of advice and opinions expressed by individual GAC members and in the communicate that I think reflect that fundamental I'll say the word ignorance about how things work in the marketplace. The terminology gets thrown around I think inappropriately, misapplied.

You know, and lack of understanding of what the commercial marketplace looks like including unregulated service providers like resellers and privacy proxy services and the difference between content and DNS.

So all of those things I think need to be bound up into a really nice here's what the industry looks like and here's how it works presentation. If we're going to go one direction, then let's start there and let's - and then let's encourage the other stakeholder groups in the GNSO to do that same.

Keith Drasek: Thanks James. So Jennifer.

Jennifer Standiford: I'd just like to echo - this is Jennifer Standiford for the record. I'd just like to echo (James). And if there is a formation of a support group for Mason or any working group to help him at least provide that information from the Registrar Stakeholder Group in conjunction with the registries, I'd like to help with that. I'm sure I can get others to assist.

But I think it's very important that the education of contracted parties within the GAC is something that we tentatively look to schedule for Morocco if not sooner.

(James): And I don't know if there's a formal mechanism to actually make that request to Mason. How do we do that? I mean we're all nodding our heads around the table. Where do we go from here?

Jennifer Standiford: Right. I know there's a - we could vote on next steps or what's the formal process?

Keith Drasek: Let's hand it back over to (Jonathan).

(Jonathan): Yes. And make no mistake. I'm not surprised if we're all nodding our heads in this room because that's what we would want. We would - and I'm just - just make a slight note of caution because Mason was appointed to do this job on behalf of the GNSO to represent GNSO policy work.

Now I understand that in doing that he should be well informed about the interest of the contracted parties. But I think we have to be very careful to kind of political sensitivity of us - of Mason being seen to be one of us and lobbying for contracted parties house interest when he's a GNSO - just it's - I think if he was presenting it in the context of making sure the GAC was well informed so the GAC could inform policy, great.

But we've just got to be - it's a fine line to tread is all I'm saying. We just need to be able to - and if we wanted the registries and registrars to present that to the GAC, might be better that we find a way of doing that with someone else other than Mason.

So I accept the point and the requirement for the task. I just wonder - just enough said.

Jennifer Standiford: I think we're in - this is Jennifer for the record. I think we're in agreement that the intent is an education exercise. However, how that's delivered to the GAC I think that's open for discussion.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I think we need to move on here because we're running out of time.

Keith Drasek: Yes. Thanks Michele. Okay. So the next item that we wanted to talk about and I think Volker mentioned, which is yes, the registries have initiated Section 7.7 of the registry - the new gTLD or 2000 - or the new gTLD registry agreement basically initiating the process for contract negotiations.

So I'm going to ask - actually ask Jon Nevett if he wouldn't mind as the leader of our working group and the Registry Stakeholder Group to maybe just give, you know, a two or three minute overview of where we are, how we got here and what the next steps are. And then we can see if there's an opportunity for any cooperation or collaboration between us as contracted parties.

Jon Nevett: Yes. Thanks Keith. So in our new TLD registry agreements there's a provision in there that we could trigger an amendment process, which we did as a stakeholder group. So then we entered into a period of negotiations where we sent a chart to ICANN - a proposed amendment that we wanted to see.

They've since sent some amendments that they want to see and some comments on ours. We met in a constructive meeting on Sunday. And so we're in that period of going back and forth and seeing if we could amend the agreement.

And as far as the registrars go, you know, I was approached a little bit ago about trying to coordinate to the extent you all did the same thing. Coordinate

on issues that intersect both of our contracts, which I think makes really good sense.

Volker Greimann: Yes. Would it be possible to see the list that you submitted to ICANN - the list that ICANN submitted back to you so we are also informed about the content of these negotiations? And secondly, are there any points that you would think would also impact our contracts with ICANN even in an indirect form?

Jon Nevett: Yes, absolutely. Happy to show the list. There are people on both, you know, the - so if someone on the registrar list could send it because I'm not privy to it, that would be great.

And secondly, I can't think of anything that would have a direct impact on the registrar or the RAA based on the amendments that we have been discussing. But you might see something that I didn't. So if you want take a look at it and let us know if there are any such issues.

Keith Drasek: Good. Thanks Jon. So - yes. So we'll take the action item to send you the list and the exchange so you have an opportunity to review. And by all means if there's something that you see that raises a concern or a flag, then let's continue those conversations.

But I guess it does raise a question and this is something that we've talked about on some of our joint ExCom calls in the past is, you know, looking for opportunities to potentially work together or collaborate on issues related to contract negotiations with ICANN.

So it's not like - not every issue is going to be applicable but there may be a handful. There may be a subset where your interests and our interests intersect where we can actually work together to move that ball forward.

So and I think we would certainly be open to that. And if that's a matter of setting up, you know, some sort of a work team or a working group or, you know, a sort of joint exchange, then we'd certainly support that I think.

So any other comments or question on that? Jennifer, I'm sorry.

Jennifer Standiford: This is Jennifer for the record. So I think we're in agreement Keith and we'll be formulating a team and we will make you aware of who that is so we can work in conjunction with one another.

Keith Drasek: Good. Very good. Okay. Before we move on to the item that Michele raised, first, (Jonathan), did I - I'm sorry if I missed anything on the GNSO Council agenda. You're good? Okay. All right.

Okay. Michele then. The item that you raised and then we do need to I think circle back to make sure that if there are any topics that we want each or jointly want to raise with the Board that we circle back to that at the end.

But Michele, you mentioned something about the community...

Michel Neylon: Oh yes.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay. It's Michele for the record. And I'll - I would say I'd speak faster but if I did that, nobody would be able to make any sense of me.

As you may or may not know, there is a type of informal group, which is the community leaders. In other words, the Chairs of the SOs, the ACs, SGs,

constituencies, ACs, lots of - lots and lots and lots of acronyms, which has a - both a discussion mailing list with ICANN staff on it and we have - meet a - about a once a month - we have a monthly call now with ICANN senior staff and generally speaking the ICANN CEO.

One of the issues that we as across the community have raised several times over the last few months was a very pressing issue, which is that right across the board pretty much every single group feels completely overloaded and overwhelmed.

Have a look at the number of comment periods that are open any time, have a look at the number of initiatives that are going on, have a look at all the different cross community working groups and various other things. I mean it's a - it's an interesting reflection on reality when the Chair of the GNSO is having difficulty keeping track of which Cross Community Working Group charter he's meant to be voting on.

You know, it's - there's a lot of stuff going on. So we raised this and they took that onboard and organized - we're meant to be organizing a retreat or a weekend or something for us to talk to them, which then became reduced down to a half day last Friday with a follow up yesterday evening.

So there was a document -- I don't know whether you've circulated it amongst the registries -- which came out of that. I mean essentially what we are trying to do is working with ICANN staff and we categorically and specifically asked Fadi to assign named staff to this rather than that wonderfully nebulous it belongs to Department X issue. In other words, it belongs to nobody. To try and come up - work on three concrete tracks around this.

One would be with respect to the sharing of information and access to information. So for example, taking up from, you know, a conversation we had with Compliance this morning. Compliance would say oh we informed you about this via the newsletter or it's in the slide decks from our presentation, which happened of course, you know, three, four meetings ago.

So if you as a registrar or registry want to know what the hell they said about a particular topic, good luck finding it. So there's a - that's one track. The other one was around prioritization.

You know, which items do we within the community feel ICANN and ICANN the organization and ICANN the community should be putting focus on as opposed to ending up in a situation where you have the CEO running off talking to every government in the world and dragging us all into big Internet governance, things that we may or may not support.

And the third one I think was volunteer - yes, some type of volunteer support. I mean there's several tracks there. Just, you know, the - well the communicate letter type thing that came out from the meeting we had on Friday Keith had circulated to you, I circulated to the registrars.

We are - several of us were involved - will be involved in this initiative going forward. We will be, you know, looking to the rest of you to give us you feedback and input and just, you know, point out practical things that may be that can be done.

I mean ICANN staff are being helpful and collaborative around a lot of this stuff and they have realized that if they don't address some of these issues there's going to be a bit of an implosion. So they're making changes around some of the communication stuff.

I mean one of the things we were talking to them about last night for example was the number of concurrent comment periods open at any time because I think, you know, several groups including ourselves we're finding it rather difficult to keep track of them all.

Keith Drasek: Thanks Michele. Yes. That's a great summary. I think, you know, this really came about because, you know, with the expansion of ICANN staff from 100 to 300 over the last couple of years the consultants and advisors and, you know, the creation of strategic panels and, you know, all of the public comment periods that Michele has referenced - just all of the things that are overlapping and ongoing.

I think there's sense among the community and the community leaders but the community that we are being overwhelmed and that much of the work prioritization of the community and of ICANN the organization is not appropriately or is inappropriately being determined by staff and not by the community.

So I think the community leaders have come together and made a very clear statement in several instances but I mean basically have taken a position that it really is up to the community to determine the work priorities of ICANN and that it shouldn't be a top down dictate.

That it should be something that the community comes together and particularly where it impacts multiple silos or multiple groups across the community is that we work together to identify what those issues are, to prioritize them, to make sure that there is adequate time available to do the job right and so we're not missing deadlines and, you know, doing halfhearted

efforts just because we simply don't have the bandwidth to deal with what is being forced upon us.

You know, in - I don't remember if it was in London or Singapore but Fadi described the problem as it was raised to him. He described it as a supply chain problem and that we the community were unable to consume as much as they were giving us.

And we sort of as a community said no that you got it backwards. The community is not the consumer of ICANN's product. We are the producers of the work and it's ICANN's job to facilitate and to coordinate.

So I think what Michele has just described in the conversation -- I think a very constructive conversation that we had on Friday with Fadi and the -- is a recognition that the community needs to be much more involved in identifying the issues that we need to focus on, prioritizing the work and making sure that we have the capacity to do it.

And so I think there's a recognition at Fadi's level and maybe at the Board level that this is really important, that the community needs to be more involved earlier in the process of determining how much we can do, what's most important and the steps forward for doing that.

So I think what Michele described I think is the first step in the process of trying to figure out how we move this forward as a community in a bottom up way. So...

Michele Neylon: And just to add to that, I mean the other thing as well is that the - in London we as groups across the entire community did something that generally we don't do. We generally don't agree. We actually agreed on something, which

was a whole new departure and we have continued to agree on several things in the last couple of months.

And when that happens it's interesting how the ICANN senior staff and Board react because it's one thing when you have one, two, maybe three groups saying something but when you have all the Chairs of all the groups across the board and this includes the GAC saying with one single voice this needs to change, this needs to stop, this needs to whatever, they do actually listen. They do take action and they are putting serious resources into addressing these things.

Now of course the IANA transition thing might be helping matters but that's - that just happens to suit us.

Keith Drasek: Yes. So any questions or comments on that? So Michele, (Jonathan) and I were all there. I think that's the group. Any questions? Okay. So then let's talk about issues with the Board.

I can tell you that based on our preliminary agenda the registries will be raising the following three issues with the Board. Two character RSEPs and GAC positioning, Nominating Committee Board Working Group recommendations and ICANN's FY15 budget and financial processes.

Those are the three topics that we've identified at least preliminarily. We're going to talk more about it over lunch. But those are the three topics that we've identified for raising with the Board. I don't know if the registrars have identified you list yet or if you have...

Michele Neylon: Yes. Just so those who aren't aware, the way this normally works is that the staff liaison - staff support to the Board contacts the various Chairs of the

various groups several weeks in advance of the ICANN meeting and invariably we don't get to get back to them in time and it's a last minute rush.

But we do have to inform them of a number of high-level topics. So the ones we have - Jennifer.

Jennifer Standiford: Translation and transliteration, LEA stats, ICANN budget and Internet (government)'s involvement. We've dedicated our working lunch to determine the actual asks, what we're asking ICANN for and what our position on these items are. And we'd be happy to share those with you once we've formulated them.

Keith Drasek: So it sounds like we have one item where we both - you know, there's one item that's on both of our lists and that's ICANN's budgeting or budget, whether that's the FY15 budget that's been approved or the budgeting process in general. So maybe that's worth five minutes of our time right now just to compare notes.

Michele Neylon: We're going to have to leave.

Keith Drasek: You got to go?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Keith Drasek: Okay. All right. Okay. Well then let's circle back and compare notes after the fact.

Jennifer Standiford: Yes. Sure.

Keith Drasek: No problem. Well thank you all very much. Sorry we got a late start. We ran over. I know you all did too a little bit. But thanks very much for coming to join us today. We always value these sessions.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Keith.

Jennifer Standiford: Thank you.

END