

ICANN 51, Los Angeles
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group
Tuesday, 14 October 2014
13:00 to 15:00 UTC

Morning Session, Part I

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Keith Drazek: Good morning, everybody. Good morning. If you could record your conversations and take your seats please so we can get started. Cherie, why do we take this opportunity to start the recording?

Cherie Stubbs: Good morning everybody. Just one housekeeping reminder, if you are speaking would you please remember to announce your name for purposes of the transcript and the MP3 and to use the microphone of course.

And I don't know if we have anybody joining us remotely? We do.

((Crosstalk))

Cherie Stubbs: So if anyone is on remote and wishes to ask a question into Adobe chat or if you're on audio please feel free to step into the queue.

I think we're ready to start, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you Cherie. Good morning everybody. Keith Drazek, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting, ICANN 51 in Los Angeles, Tuesday 14th of October.

We'll go ahead and get started by reviewing the agenda. Actually for a moment before we do that a couple of housekeeping items or notices I guess. First importantly today we have a birthday to celebrate, Mr. Nevett. So happy birthday, Jon.

And I think it's also important to kick off this meeting with an update on our membership numbers. Just to note that we have gone through some quite substantial changes over the last 12 months. Currently the Registry Stakeholder Group has a membership of 113, voting 43, nonvoting seven, and active 42, observers 63.

The NTAG, 100, voting 58, and nonvoting 42. So those are some pretty significant numbers. And I think it demonstrates that we've really come a long way in a fairly short period of time as it relates to our stakeholder group.

There will certainly continue to be growing pains and opportunities for making our own operations as a stakeholder group more efficient and more effective over time. And obviously we have the Evolution Working Group that's I'll put out a plug for that will continually work in the coming months.

But just wanted to note that and welcome everybody. And also finally, before we move on to the agenda review, a congratulations to everybody that's been delegated with the new gTLD program. I think that's really remarkable progress that we as a community and industry are making so congratulations to all the new delegations and those that are in the pipeline.

Okay so let's get to the agenda. We've reordered our agenda for this meeting a bit so it's probably worth running through it. We will have first a session with that GDD staff, the Global Domains Division staff. I know Krista is here already. I think we'll be joined by a few others.

We got a note last night that Akram may have a conflict now so it's not clear how much time he'll be able to spend with us or if he'll be able to join us but we certainly will have plenty of an opportunity to engage with GDD.

And I think that - I think Akram's update - the GDD update yesterday for those that were there I think went very well, actually not a tremendous number of questions. So I think the issues that we may have can certainly be addressed with Krista and Cyrus and anybody else that does join us.

So following that GDD staff session we will have our joint Registry/Registrar meeting. That will take place in this room if I'm not mistaken, Cherie? They're coming to us?

Cherie Stubbs: Correct.

Keith Drazek: Okay very good. So we will need to make some space for our registrar customers at the table here and also in the room. So that's a shift from our normal structure where we typically would meet them at four o'clock in the afternoon while everybody was all worn down and tired from the full-day so this is a, I think, a good opportunity for us to engage with the registrars on questions that matter to us as contracted parties and soon-to-be contracted parties prior to our engagement with the ICANN Board for example. We can compare notes on that.

We will then have a working lunch in this room preparing for the meeting with the Board that takes place at one o'clock. On the agenda you'll see the items or the issues that we plan to raise with the Board.

Then we'll have a meeting with the ICANN Compliance team, Maguy and her team will be coming to us. We'll get GNSO Council update from Jonathan Robinson. Steve will give us an update on the NTAG developments and the meeting that took place yesterday, which I understand was a standing room only which is pretty exciting and encouraging.

Then we will get down to Registry Stakeholder Group business. And Paul has kindly agreed to run that session and any other business at the end of the day. So any questions, comments or suggested changes or additions to the agenda?

I don't see any hands. Is there any input from Adobe? Okay thank you. Okay so great well let's move then right into, but see what time we got - we're still a little bit early. Krista, can you remind me who else is joining us and will they be joining us at 9:15, is that currently the plan?

Krista Papac: Yes. Krista Papac from ICANN staff for the record. Cyrus is supposed to be here. I'm not exactly positive who all is coming. Xavier - actually maybe Valerie can tell us.

(Valerie): Yes, so we have a Cyrus - sorry my name is (Valerie) from ICANN. So we're expecting Cyrus to come in at 9:15, and then we have Francisco, Karen and...

Krista Papac: Xavier.

(Valerie): ...Xavier will come in at the end of the session, around 10:45.

Krista Papac: Okay. And then Akram was going to try and come in as well at some point, depending on his schedule. He got pulled into something else so.

Keith Drazek: Okay. All right very good. Well let's give it a few minutes so Cyrus can join us and anybody else that's planning to come. And maybe what I can do since we don't have a separate topic on our agenda for ICANN accountability and IANA transition maybe I can just take five minutes here to give everybody an update on the recent developments on ICANN accountability and IANA transition.

So on the IANA transition track, the ICG, or the IANA transition coordination group, as a meeting, a face-to-face meeting scheduled for Friday. So Jon and I will be both participating in that session along with our other colleagues from the GNSO and all the other various community groups.

There has also been a cross community working group that's being called a community working group on the IANA stewardship transition. The drafting team has completed its work. There was an initial kickoff meeting, face-to-face kickoff meeting that took place yesterday I believe. Chuck, is that right?

Chuck Gomes: We actually had a kickoff meeting last week via teleconference. Yesterday was the first in-person meeting.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck. And I think the plan for the IANA transition community working group, as I understand it, is to have, you know, pretty regular meetings, a couple hours each week. So I think that there's an acknowledgment that work needs to begin and that it's going to be a very intense project because there are fairly aggressive timelines that have been laid out by the ICG.

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and I - later on hopefully we can make sure there's no objections to the official rep and alternate rep that our little small group has selected. But I wanted to tell people that one of the things that that group is going to have to do is feed information to all of you on a pretty regular basis because when we get towards the time where we have to see whether there are support for any recommendations it's going to be probably a fairly short turnaround.

So I appreciate it - all of us on that team will appreciate it if everybody kind of tries to stay up to speed of what's going on. And we will try to do our best to keep you informed on a regular basis.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck. And if I'm not mistaken from the email list that Donna will be our primary rep and that Stephanie will be our alternate rep, is that correct? So, I mean, we can talk about that now if we want. I don't know if there's a particular time on our agenda but I think those are both great selections personally.

And I think if, you know, we can talk about it now, we can talk about it on the list, but I think your proposed approach about, you know, having a couple of people be the point people and then, you know, making sure that there is regular updates and engagement on this topic will be very helpful.

Chuck Gomes: And for those that may - this is Chuck again. For those that may not have seen the email our small group has unanimously supported the two of them as our, Donna is the official rep and Stephanie is the alternate, that we wanted to make sure today that there are no objections to that from the fuller group.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks Chuck. So, you know, people can consider that today but I think we will be well served by those two, Donna and Stephanie. Okay so that's the IANA transition track. And just to be clear the IANA transition track is focused on I think really the services that ICANN/IANA provides to its customers I mean primarily.

There are accountability components to that but what we're really talking about in that track is establishing accountability mechanisms for ICANN's delivery of service to the IANA functions customers. And in this case registries are direct customers of IANA, particularly all of you who have been recently delegated have had more interaction with IANA than some of us who have been around a little bit longer, recently.

So as direct customers of the IANA functions or the IANA services, we need to make sure that once NTIA disengages, and that contract is dissolved, is that we have the ability as customers to hold the service delivery accountable, to make sure that its operating at the level that it is today in the future. So I think that, just to be clear, that's really I think what we're talking about as it relates to the IANA stewardship functions transition and the group that Chuck has just described.

Second track is the ICANN - the overall ICANN accountability track. And they are very much into related, interdependent. And NTIA, Secretary Strickling has said that the ICANN accountability track, that piece, must be resolved to the community's satisfaction before any IANA transition can take place, which I think is very positive and very constructive.

So we have, over the last several weeks, several months, been engaged with ICANN. We asked the community, community leaders, have been engaged with ICANN staff and others in the community to ensure that the process that

we have in place for the accountability discussions, and coming up with the accountability recommendation, is a process that we can trust and it is rooted in the community to make sure that the community, at the end of the day, is the one determining what recommendation we will forward to the Board.

We had some back-and-forth combat over the last several months. ICANN had proposed a process that, in many views, appeared to be a little bit problematic in that it gave a little bit too much influence, or maybe a lot too much influence, too ICANN staff and maybe the Board in terms of the inputs and the outputs of that process.

So we were, as a community, able to I think pushback and hold a unified position calling for a cross community working group making sure that any expert advisors that were appointed work advisory only and not part of any voter consensus call.

And that really basically making sure that the community was in charge and that the community now has the responsibility to take on the work, to form the cross community working group that we've been calling for and get to work on the actual substantive recommendations on accountability reform and enhancements.

So I think, just to take a step back, or at a fairly high level, I think that the movement that we've seen just in the last week with the announcement that took place on Friday that ICANN was going to pull back its originally proposed plan, allow the community to form a cross committee working group, is all very positive and we should feel much better, I certainly do feel much better now than I did a week ago about where we were as it relates to the accountability process.

So I'm happy - why don't I stop there, see if there are any questions or comments or other discussion points on this before we then move to our discussions with Krista and Cyrus and the GDD. Any questions, comments, thoughts? Okay Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: I would just make one. I mean, I think even people who are pretty deeply involved - sorry, it's Jonathan Robinson for the record. Even those who have been deeply involved and had their sleeves rolled up on all of this have had some confusion over some of the details, haven't always necessarily seeing eye to eye.

But it's a combination of two things, one is we may not all agree on all the fine details; but regardless of whether we agree or not there are a lot of fine details and it's acronym soup, you know, it's ICG, CWG, CCWG, transition, accountability, accountability track one, accountability track two.

So I'd encourage people to talk about it, ask questions, try and find out, make sure you have an understanding, test the understanding of others because, as Keith said, we need to be well informed and responsive to all of this. And part of that is talking about it, understanding what work is going on and positions. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much Jonathan. This is Keith. Any other questions or comments or thoughts on accountability for transition. Okay Donna, yes, go ahead. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin. So I guess I'm just not clear, now that the accountability track has been, the is staff one is off the table and as a community proposition that will go forward, I'm just not sure what's that process for the community one?

Has that started? Jonathan, I was in the session that you and Byron did yesterday but I'm just not sure whether that's kicked off or not.

Jonathan Robinson: So here's my expectation of what will happen next. The chairs of the SOs and ACs are likely to put out some form of comment indicating a form of consensus as to how this will work. And essentially the expectation is that it will work either identically to or very similar to the way in which we've dealt with the stewardship transition, that is to say a drafting team formed with a couple of members from each of the chartering or prospective chartering organizations.

They come together, form the drafting team, produce the charter, send that back to the chartering organizations for approval and then that - from there on that commences the work of the working group which will have participation from, likely in the same way as we've done with the IANA stewardship transition, variable numbers to suit the requirements of the different groups so somewhere between two and five members. So although that isn't carved in stone, that's the sort of consensus that's emerging of the process.

And all of this links to the fact that cross community working groups aren't set in stone in terms of their processes and procedures and care to make sure that others are brought into through the most appropriate mechanism. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Jonathan. Any other questions on accountability? Okay let's move into our regularly scheduled programming of our discussion with the GDD. And Krista, thank you. I see we've got Cyrus and I think Christine came in and a few others in the room so if you all would like to join us up front you're welcome.

Okay so the first item on our agenda for the discussions with the GDD staff is the Registry Agreement negotiation process. And we've got Jon listed to lead this discussion on the agenda, the Registry Agreement negotiation process.

Jon Nevett: Great. Thanks Keith. As you all know from the list we had triggered the Registry Agreement amendment process and we sent over a list of proposed amendments to ICANN. ICANN replied with comments to our list and some suggested changes/clarifications of their own which also was circulated to the list so everyone should have that.

And then we met over the weekend, I guess it was Sunday, we met internally first Saturday, the folks who volunteer for the committee, and then we met on Sunday with ICANN and had a very productive meeting, very - good faith negotiations.

We better understand their list, they better understand our list. And some of the issues, the ball is in their court and some of the issues the ball is in our court. And we're going to get back together as a group when we get back and then probably schedule a conference call with ICANN in the next couple weeks. So I think it's in a good place.

Keith Drazek: Great thanks, Jon. Any comments or any discussion on that or are we inserted a good spot?

Cyrus Namazi: Actually I just wanted to say good morning and happy birthday, Jon. So yes I'd like to echo what Jon was saying. I think the tone and approach was very professional, done in good faith. I personally don't see a lot of huge gaps for us to fill.

There's a couple of issues that probably warrant, you know, further discussions and negotiation but the ball, as Jon said, is in our court actually to consolidate the two sheets that we put together that we sent you, organized the list of asks by you and by us under, you know, the same topic to organize the discussion a little more. And hopefully once we're back from Los Angeles and we've recovered from all the pain and misery then we will be able to get back to you. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much Cyrus, and welcome. Okay any other questions or comments on the Registry Agreement negotiations? All right next item on the agenda is the RSEP process and specifically focused on two character release requests and just general overall expectations of the RSEP.

So just wondering if anybody from the Registries group would like to take the lead on this one? Mr. Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I guess it's pretty simple, it's just a question back. I mean, we heard, and hopefully this works out the governments - the GAC met on - I'm getting my days mixed up I think it was Sunday, and seems to not express any opinion to come out with consensus advice either for or against. It was pretty much just, you know, this doesn't seem like an issue for us for consensus advice.

And it should be up to individual governments if they want to object. It seemed like that was the trend. Now I don't know what's going to happen with the ccNSO discussion with the GAC and whether that will or won't change anything.

But I guess my question is, we're all waiting for this meeting so I'm sure you've done some thinking of what's the next step, assuming there is no GAC advice, what's the next step in improving the long queue that you have of the

two letter requests, like so where do we take it from here because we are outside kind of the norm process, right, this really was never - this is kind of the first time I think that the GAC - if there's been kind of a willingness to kind of say okay GAC, you can consider at the next meeting but we are way outside the timelines for a lot of the people.

And so what kind of thinking have you done about that? And moving that forward after this meeting either with or without GAC advice.

Krista Papac: Thanks Jeff. Krista Papac, ICANN staff. So if I can maybe catch on process for a minute first because there's been a lot of confusion about the process and you mentioned timelines and so I wanted to add some clarity.

It's also something we've been covering in the road show and had some extensive discussions with folks that have participated in the road show about the process and sort of what the different lanes are that you travel down when you submit an RSEP request.

So the RSEP itself as specific timelines that are in the policy. And as we all know when we discussed about six months ago we were, as we were ramping up we were struggling with those timelines but we've now got that under control.

And with the two character requests they've been, except for the initial, you know, issues that we had, they've been going through and meeting the timelines that the policy called for.

If you - so you go through the RSEP, it's a security and stability, you know, competition that stuff. Once you go through that process you come out the

other side and then a determination is made whether an amendment needs to be made to that Registry Agreement.

So if you draw a box around the RSEP and now you go into - if you need an amendment what is that process? If it's a material change to the Registry Agreement that something that would require Board review. And for the two character requests we consider those to be material changes. And in order for the Board review to occur we first need to get public comment. And that's what everybody has been going through is that public comment process.

And through that the GAC came forward, as we all know, and said hey, we want to talk about this. We're discussing it, we want to further discuss it in Los Angeles, you know, please hold off, you know, Steve Crocker, until we have the opportunity to do that.

They did meet on Sunday. And from what I've heard, I wasn't in the session, but my team was, they did say that - the synopsis I got is they're not too concerned about the two characters. To your point I heard what you just said also from people, Jeff, which is if individual governments want to, you know, come in and say something about their specific two character code great, but we are not that concerned. We do want to talk to the GNSO - excuse me, the ccNSO about this. That's two characters.

I want to point out that there's one request, you might be familiar with it, Jeff, for country and territory names. And what I've heard is they want to further discuss that. And then I've also sort of heard off-line that they think that that might be a more involved discussion amongst the GAC members with the country and territory names. So I think that now these things get a little bit decoupled and they're going to travel down separate paths.

So we will wait to see what the outcome of the ccNSO is and what the GAC actually tells the Board about this topic, right, because that's sort of where we get our marching orders; they talk to the Board and then the Board, you know, tells us what to do.

We have thought about what the possible outcomes are. The problem is is no matter how many times we think about the possible outcomes there's always some other things that you didn't think of that somebody introduces.

But, you know, our goal is to move these things through with the correct a blessing as quickly as we can. We've been posting the summary and analysis of the public comments, we've been, you know, we've been continuing to process these on the path that we would.

And we are waiting for direction from the Board. Following the boards direction we will implement what their direction is, it's kind of hard to say what that is right now. That we have thought through what those things could be and potential ways to address it.

So it's not - I'd love to be able to tell you yes, this exact thing is going to happen, but it's hard to know what's going to come next. So hopefully there's some good direction that comes from, you know, hopefully the conversation with the ccNSO and the GAC goes well. And I'm hoping, you know, we get some - a solid path forward at least for the two character ones.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so this is Jeff Neuman again. Yes, we recognize that they're probably going to go down two different paths and so we submitted two different RSEP requests because we didn't want one to hang up the other. So I understand it can go down a couple different paths and I'm not trying to ask you to be kind

of reading the future but how do we make sure that this is not something that just drags on, you know, that there is something in place?

Because I think we all want to discuss the RSEP process in general and we all want some predictability. And I understand, you know, in fact probably the people in this room that understand the RSEP process, Chuck, myself, and Bruce Tonkin who sat there, first time ever learning Microsoft Visio, by the way because I actually do that obnoxious document and I asked for help with - from Chuck and Bruce Tonkin because I had no clue...

Krista Papac: That's your fault?

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Yes.

Krista Papac: I want you guys to talk to him.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: I said how do you use the Microsoft Visio thing? And I probably to this day got the triangles wrong but either way. So, yes, so we understand that. But again the goal is to get to predictability. And, you know, we don't want every - first of all I think there may be a difference of opinion as to whether something is a material change or not.

And I'm actually not sure that ICANN's determination of what's material or not is necessarily binding on the other parties. So I do want to at some point have a discussion of what if a registry doesn't agree with ICANN the changes material and requires Board approval because technically there's two parties to

a contract and if we don't both agree it's material then it has to go through some cooperative engagement process to try to resolve that difference.

But I think there's an assumption that if ICANN staff thinks it's material or the Board does then that automatically goes through some kind of review. So that's number one is we need to like make sure there's two parties to this contract and both parties should agree that something is material before it goes through this other process that's more involved, which didn't happen here.

But putting that aside, we really want more predictability and don't want the GAC to just be able to hold things up in our contract for new services. And so this is just the first example, it's probably going to happen a lot. And so it's just something for us all to think about is that every time we request a new service, here is two characters but what if it's something innovative that may be the GAC doesn't understand.

We don't want every time the GAC doesn't understand something or wants time to discuss it that all of a sudden now there is a delay until the next physical meeting of the GAC and then yet another delay if, at that physical meeting, they don't get to it.

Like in this case they didn't get to the country names but notice was provided to them with several weeks, three or four weeks before they met, but right now with the country names again Neustar did this as kind of - we knew the first time would take a while. So I'm not so concerned if this has to wait until Marrakesh, right.

But for other people that have really innovative services that they want to get out to the market, waiting two meetings, which in this case could be, you know, four months between meetings and a month before that, that's five

months. That's a lot of time. And so we just need to do some thinking, both of us together, as to how we can avoid that when there's really something - a registry service that's innovative, that people want to get out to the market that this doesn't delay it.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff. I've got a few folks in the queue. Krista if you want to jump in at this point and then I'll get to the queue or - Akram, welcome. Thank you.

Akram Atallah: Yes. Thank you for having us. Jeff, this is a big issue. I mean, you don't get into major problems when you implement something that's not innovative right? It's when you implement something new that nobody has seen before that you have potentially issues.

And this is why I think the RSEP is considered that anything that only a registry provider could do is considered for RSEP. Now this is I view this is a much bigger envelope that maybe we can, you know, size down to something that's more manageable. But we need to put our minds together and work on this and try to identify a better process to classify requests between what goes into the RSEP and what doesn't.

Staff errs always on the safest approach right? So that's part of it. But, you know, we are willing to work with you. We want to make sure that the process is easy.

One thought that I kept thinking is if somebody applies for a service why do we have to let everybody apply for the same service again? But then also as you said maybe some services are innovative. We don't want to say to one, you know, once somebody applies for one that everybody else is, you know, here it is, it's available for everybody else to do.

So it's not as simple. You know, I think that the whole team you'll see is very open to sit down and figure out a better way to move things forward.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you, Akram. And let's everybody remember to say your name for the transcripts. I saw hand over here, go right ahead.

Andrew Merriam: Good morning. Andrew Merriam for the transcript. Krista, my understanding from the road show is that there was going to be some staff recommendations to the Board and I didn't necessarily hear that in your breakdown right now, so has that happened? Is that still coming? Staff recommendations to the Board regarding each individual RSEP.

Krista Papac: Yes. Thanks, Andrew. So, right. So the next step - Krista for the transcript. The next step in the RSEP process, summary and analysis of public comments and then we provide that to the Board. So yes, we have for that first batch - first two batch - no, to the Board, for the first batch, yes, we have - the first batch was ready to go so we have provided that. And, you know, we'll be submitting that to the Board.

Andrew Merriam: And it's just the document that we all saw, the public summary and analysis? Or is there some recommendation therein? There's not a recommendation necessarily in that document I don't think.

Krista Papac: I'm sorry, no so that's just - sorry, I got a little button happy here. Right the thing that we published - it's just a summary and analysis of the public comments. Then once the Board meets and discusses it they'll be - I'm not as familiar with the Board process - but the minutes from the meeting and what, you know, what they talked about and all of that kind of stuff gets published following the Board review.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Andrew. So I think Andrew's question specifically, if I got it right, was so there was the summary and analysis and the question was was there a staff recommendation to the Board in addition to that summary and analysis? Or will there be? Thanks.

Krista Papac: Yes.

Andrew Merriam: Okay.

Krista Papac: Not in the public - so that goes to the Board separately. So the summary analysis is the report that gets published of what the comments were. There is a separate thing that goes to the Board that explains everything that's, you know, details everything that's happened, gives them the background and then there's a recommendation on, you know, what they should discuss and how that should go forward based on the feedback that we've gotten.

And, you know, for instance like the, you know, the GAC wants to talk about this so we have to kind of - part of that is we need to hear from the GAC.

Andrew Merriam: So is the recommendation at this point to wait for the GAC to say something?

Krista Papac: Yes.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Krista. Thanks, Andrew. So I've got a queue here, Jonathan, Ray, Reubens and Chuck, Bret, anyone else want to get in the queue?

Jonathan go right ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. It's Jonathan. I want to go back to Jeff's point. Jeff, just a quick clarification before dealing with this. You said you went down - you

submitted on two paths, how did you distinguish between the two? What was the distinction there just...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, sorry about that. Just to clarify, sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. We submitted one RSEP request for two letters and one separate RSEP request for country names.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Thanks. That's helpful. Now I really liked Jeff's point about materiality. I think it goes to the heart of how we work with you guys. You know, I mean, I think you get it, right? It's pretty self evident. But it's just that little conversation we should have before - I think he's right, it's the kind of weight normal business might be done. And we need to work with you in that normal businesslike way. So I'm just speaking in support of that point. I think it's a great point.

In terms of the GAC, I mean, they've repeatedly say we only can deal with matters at ICANN meetings. We may have to live with that reality, we may have to try and work around that. But as you know, through the work that the GNSO has been doing with the GAC, there are real opportunities to create innovative and new ways of working with it.

So I think - I'm not going to offer a practical solution yet but I certainly think, for example, getting something on the GAC agenda we could really help with that. Straight to the Secretariat. One of the mechanisms we talk about working with the GAC's is a joint GNSO and GAC chairs' forum. So I think that we're building these kind of mechanisms.

And if people want to take advantage of those or use those mechanisms, talk to me. Some of them are work in progress, but this is precisely the point. You know, like I say, I'm not sure we'll be able to move the mountain of getting

them to meet intercessionally or do - because they seem to think that this is a - and immovable principle. But there may be still ways in which we can move things along more effectively. So I'd welcome turning that kind of theoretical interaction into some, you know, pragmatic, beneficial outcomes. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Jonathan. Next in the queue is Ray. Go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Thank you. Ray Fassett. Again I will support all of the conversations regarding materiality. It is a key issue here with the RSEPs. There has to be transparency to that decision. The materiality issues, what triggers other event in the RSEP, whether it's a yes or no decision on that. So again I want to support that.

Now when it comes to the RSEPs too, and GAC input, you know, we really do need staff here to stand up for what this consensus policy represents which is certainty and predictability. And we need staff to do their best understanding the different interests that are involved to communicate, you know, first of all, no significant security or stability or competition issue has been identified. So where is the standing here for the GAC on RSEPs? That's a question.

Now anything can fall under the public interest. So if there is a public interest concern, which is different than I suppose then a significant security and stability or competition issue, then I think there should at least be some level of burden communicated back to the GAC. There needs to be a significant public interest concern to delay or hold up an RSEP as what's happening here with the two character ones.

So we would - we are counting on staff to help represent what this consensus policy was created for, not just accepted the notion that well, the GAC can

opinion on anything they want so we have to hold on moving forward because, you know, GAC can do that.

I think, you know, we need staff to take a stronger position for us that yes, the GAC can have an opinion on literally anything but understand there isn't a significant security or stability issue here, there isn't - we have not identified a significant competition issue here; what is your issue exactly? Is it a public interest issue? And is a significant one?

We need to know those things and there needs to be a bit of a burden on the other side. And I'll just throw one other thing that a little bit troubles me, I've heard a couple of people mentioned that we're waiting for the ccNSO and the GAC to have their discussion. Clearly it seems to me that the ccNSO has some kind of special interest here involved and perhaps not allowing two character names.

And we have - this is exactly what the consensus policy is for is to prevent special interests from coming in who may have a vested interest in the outcome and delaying the RSEP, that's what the whole certainty and predictability is for.

So when I hear we're waiting for the ccNSO to talk to the GAC, and I know one of those two parties has perhaps a vested interest in the outcome of the decision that kind of troubles me. And we need staff to be bringing this point up not just, you know, having us have to fight that battle because the consensus policy has already been won. So that's my input and I hope that helps.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Ray. I've got a queue. Krista, did you want to respond or do you want to get in the queue? Yes go ahead.

Krista Papac: I was trying to be patient but I just want to address - I've heard kind of the same thing a couple of times. I was trying to be patient and wait for the queue but I feel like I should jump in right now so I apologize to those in the queue.

So first of all we are representing your interests. And you guys know just as well as we know when the GAC comes and tells the Board they want to talk about something we have to let them talk about it. There's not a lot that can be done about that.

As far as the ccNSO discussion goes, that's what was heard in the GAC discussion the other day so the current status is still the GAC has said to the Board, we want to talk about this, please hold off. There has been no further direction from the GAC, just to be clear.

So they, you know, they in their meeting said we want to go talk to the ccNSO so we all know that from having these public meetings etcetera. I just want to make sure - make sure that point was clear.

And then I'll go ahead and go back to the - thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Krista. So I've got a queue right now of Rubens, Chuck, Bret and, Jon, that I see your hand as well? And Jon. Okay, so Rubens, go right ahead.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you, Keith and good morning all. For the record Rubens Kuhl (unintelligible). I wonder what are the next steps for (unintelligible) that didn't (unintelligible) for RSEP yet. Let's say that one or two or three of those RSEPs or those three nature of RSEPs for two character approved, we other registries need to file RSEP as well or could I consider some blanket provision

so everybody life is easier by not having to file RSEPs and process RSEPs?

Thank you.

Krista Papac: Thanks, Rubens. This is Krista. So that's a great question. Just so you guys know too, this RSEP stuff is not fun for us either, which I realize is not your concern but, you know, we want a better way to handle these probably as much if not more than you do.

That being said, so the way that it works - and I was going to wait until everybody spoke but you asked the specific question. Not all RSEP requests - and some of you already know this - have to go through this, you know, Board review, public comment thing.

Once there's a precedent set for that service, and it's just the same thing, you know, more - additional registries are requesting the same thing over and over again that other registries are doing, those still get amendments but they just go through a normal, you know, contract amendment signing process.

So the way that would work, just like IDNs is one - a great example, many of you have added second level IDN registrations or added additional languages to your contracts. You submit the RSEP it goes through that period, it's got a timeline that's defined in the policy. Draw a box around it. Yes, it requires a material change to the agreement so we do, you know, we do an amendment.

I'm sorry, it requires - excuse me - a change to the agreement. We prepare an amendment. We send it to you, sign it, boom, you get to implement the service once the amendment is signed.

With the two characters they've been added in legacy TLDs but there was never a consistent way that they were added and so we couldn't really draw a

straight line to call it precedent established and that's why they're sort of in the process they're in now.

Where we'd like to get to, and again it really depends on what the boards come back with, but we'd like to get to where this is now a precedent and we process these much more quickly and not have this public comment piece.

So should that occur we are discussing internally - so should that occur the way everything works right this minute you'd still submit a request, it would go through the RSEP review. It'd come out after 15 days, come out the other side, you get an amendment and you would sign it.

We are discussing internally if there are some other mechanisms that we could put into place - we haven't quite figured that out yet but that would maybe, you know, make it not even have to do that. We're not quite there yet but we are definitely considering if there's a quicker or faster way to get these done. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Krista. I've got Chuck, Bret and then Jon and we should probably start to look ahead to move on and then Ching, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Thanks everyone for all the comments. Again several people have brought this up but I'm going to bring it up again. That's the materiality issue especially with regard to the two characters. The guidebook, from consensus policy approved by the Council, and obviously by the whole GNSO in that regard, and later by the Board, provides for the opportunity for two character strings to be offered at the second level.

To the extent that an application from a registry or applicant to use those satisfies that criteria I see no reason why that's a material change. And so what

I'd like to, first of all in my comments, request is that sometime in the very near future you provide us an explanation of why you think that's a material change.

And I'm talking about those that certainly meets the criteria that was provided for in the guidebook because that's already covered so that shouldn't be a material change. Now I understand that there will be variations in the applications where something new may be introduced, I get that.

Okay next, I totally agree with you, Akram on the importance of the RSEP process. I for some reason remember how that all came about years ago; some of you don't. But the whole idea was to get some predictability and we obviously do not have that now. So I totally agree with you on that.

Now, a comment was made that, Krista, you made it, that - and I'm not picking on you particularly, you just happened to make the comment, that the staff present recommendations to the Board with regard to these things.

Why isn't that made public to the rest of us? Why don't we see what is recommended to the Board? Isn't that being transparent? I'd certainly - think it is and would request that those things are made available to us as well.

Next, I think most of us here understand the complications in dealing with the GAC. And so we don't envy you in your position or the Board's position in that regard. But one question I have with regard to that, as the GAC been educated in terms of the consensus policy that we're dealing with here and that you have contractual obligations that you have to fulfill to registries and registrars?

Now I'm not saying they will buy that, but an effort should be made for them to understand that you have contractual obligations that you're not able to meet because of their concerns. So I think at a minimum, there should be an effort to communicate with the GAC and let them know that, you know, you're interested in their input and so forth but you also have contractual obligations that you have to meet.

So, I'll leave it at that several points. And I'm not asking for a response right now on the materiality. This is probably not the right session to do it. But I would like to see that in the next week or two so that we understand why you think things that are already complying with the guidebook introduce a material change.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Chuck. Krista wanted to respond. Go right ahead.

Krista Papac: Yes, just real quick. So I want to just again stress that the RSEP process and the RSEP policy, these requests have traveled down that path and we draw a box around about.

The thing that the GAC is looking at has to do with - well they're looking at the whole thing, I don't think they distinguish between our process - one process and the other. But we've done our part with respect to the RSEP. It is - and I realize that not all of you agree that it's a material change to the Registry Agreement but it is a material change to the Registry Agreement. And the public comment - that's the thing for these are right now.

The other thing I just wanted to point out, this is a material change to the Registry Agreement, not the Applicant Guidebook. And the Registry Agreement says you will reserve these characters, you know, following some other - unless you get approval some other way.

And so that's - I think it's just really important to make sure you're distinguishing between - this isn't the contract that says it, it's not about what the guidebook - what's in the guidebook. And I'm off the top of my head not familiar with what the guidebook says on this specific topic.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Krista. Sorry, Akram, did you want to jump in? I've got a queue but - okay go ahead.

Akram Atallah: To Chuck's point on GAC communication, I like the idea, I think that's right. I don't think that we - so they sent a public comment that said well we want to look into this, don't move. We have not inserted ourselves to really educate them about what's going on. And we need to figure out how we can do that.

But I think that's right, we need to put that position in front and not let them go off on their view of the world and without some inputs from what we're dealing with, so we need to do that. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much Akram. Thanks for that response. Next in the queue is Bret, then Jon, Ching and Jordyn and then will probably need to move on.

Bret Fausett: Yes, I hope this is brief. I had the same question as Rubens and I'm going to ask it again only because I think I've heard two different things from the responses. Akram, I instinctively reacted negatively to what you said which is that just because it's approved for one doesn't mean it's approved for everybody else.

And, Krista, I liked your answer much better which was that, you know, once it's gone through the analysis - so with Donuts gets two characters via - defy

then submit the same RSEP that they did I think it's presumptive that I get it, and you don't do that analysis again.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Bret. Jon, you're up next.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: All right. Thanks, Jon. Ching then Jordyn.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Keith. Ching Chiao from dotAsia. So we actually grew from, you know, seven months of preparing to reserve and the country names with the GAC in 2007 and eight months periods for the RSEP. So I'm hoping that this is going to be shortened to four months, maybe three months, maybe one month periods of dealing with RSEP.

Nothing went wrong in the past and I hope the, I mean, the discussion. So, I mean, just to bring out the worries that I'm hearing is that okay this is going to be an educational process for GAC to understand the two character, the country names.

I think we should focus on the discussion in terms of the process, make sure that the community is working together to do that better process instead of, you know, pushing us back to educating GAC or even ccNSO to talk about things in terms of the two letter codes and the country names. So I think we should make a very significant, I mean, differences here. My two cents. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Ching. Jordyn, you're up next. And I should note that we do have a standing mike in the room so if anybody who's not sitting at the table

here would like to speak up feel free just to walk up and you'll be acknowledged. Thanks. Jordyn, go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: Hi. Jordyn Buchanan from Google. So I don't want to talk about this in the context of materiality; I want to talk about this in the context of why do guys think this is a change to the contract at all. Krista, as you pointed out the contract says that we shall reserve the names unless ICANN approves the release of those names.

The contract has all sorts of things where it says you can't do X unless Y. for example you can't like put stuff in the root zone unless it's the following types of records, sorry, in the TLD zone unless it's the following type of records.

I don't imagine if we said oh, we're going to put that type of record in the zone that's a change to the contract just because now we're putting stuff in because the contract already contemplates the circumstance in which we are allowed to do that action. There's all sorts of don't do this unless there's.

And so the contract seems to envision that ICANN has some procedure by which you would allow us to make these two character names available. And at the moment it seems like you guys are using the RSEP in order to do that. And that seems a little bit like you've got this handy hammer at it doesn't matter that, you know, this is a screw or maybe just like a ball or something like that, you're just going to sort of whack it with a hammer because that's the tool that's available.

And I think as an initial starting point of getting the process going maybe that's not unreasonable but it does seem like once you've gone through the process even once and sort of determined that, you know, there's not issues here that you're figuring out how to onboard there should be a very

streamlined process that's explicitly just the process in order to allow the release of two character names as contemplated by the contract as opposed to using this RSEP process which is designed for new registry services.

Which this is clearly not a new registry service when it's already explicitly contemplated as just a release of reserve strings in the agreement. Like certainly if we started to release names that were not - that we had registry reserved no one would do that as a registry service either.

So it's just I feel like - I understand where we've gotten to where we are, but I think it's time to stop using the hammer that we've got and try to figure out the right tool for the job which seems like a slightly different lighter weight process.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much, Jordyn. So that brings us to the end of the queue. I don't know if anybody would like to - oh Donna, sorry. Got to raise that hand higher, sorry.

Donna Austin: So I guess just to comment on the GAC advice so - or hopefully not GAC advice. This meeting was not the first time that they've discussed this. They had language in the Singapore communiqué I think, and potentially another one.

So, you know, part of the concern here is they have discussed this before and then six months down the track they send you a letter to say don't make a decision because we need to talk about this. So at what point - because we use the communiqué like you do, too get a sense of where the GAC is sitting on something.

So the first advice sort of come out around the same time that these first RSEPs went in. So I guess it's a, you know, Akram, take the point, yes, educate the GAC. But this isn't the first time they've discussed it. So at what point in a process or a discussion as the GAC said enough and, you know, what do you take into account?

So I think it's a, you know, it's a general frustration with the GAC in the way that they discuss things and continue to discuss things and never stopped discussing things that, you know, means that we can't move on because they haven't actually issued advice.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Donna. Would - yes, Cyrus, go right ahead. Thank you.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you all very much. Really good comments. A couple of things I just wanted to highlight, it's not a specific response to anything but just wanted to reiterate the fact that on this particular topic the staff is actually with you; we're not trying to create impediments to progress.

I personally, and I know Akram and others in GDD, are very sensitive to the impact that this particular piece has to a lot of business plans that you have for your TLDs. So we're trying to move it forward. You know, obviously without violating the process around which we are bound.

And the other thing I would like to suggest is if you actually sort of had the patience, another two three weeks, I think you will see a great deal of progress. We are working with the Board. You've seen the discussions from the GAC and I think there is going to be advice - this is just my personal opinion - to allow us to move forward and essentially negate the effect of the letter that they sent us.

When the GAC sends us a letter and says stop doing this until I discuss it and let you know what my advice is going to be, well we have to stop. And that's where we're at. But I'm very optimistic that, you know, with a bit of patience, you'll see a lot more progress at least within the context of the RSEPs that are in the pipeline to move things forward.

In regards to actually using a different hammer, as Jordyn said, in processing these requests, we're very open actually to have that discussion with you. This has been the interpretation by us in terms of what the process should be to, to echo what Akram was saying, we err on the side of being ultraconservative in processing these requests just by design and I think by virtue of the fact that there are just too many variables involved in each and everything that we do.

So give us a bit more time and give us a bit of the benefit of the doubt that we really are sensitive to how important this is to all of you. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much, Cyrus. There's one comment that's been typed into Adobe chat that I will read and then we probably need to move on. Question, "What do we do about applicants who want to use two-letter codes and have not signed the contract already? The RSEP process is inappropriate in that case but we need to, as Jordyn says, envision what an applicant may do?"

And then a follow up question, "And will applicants who haven't already signed their contract be allowed to automatically assume that they are allowed to use two letter codes if others have already run an RSEP process?"

I don't know if anybody wants to respond to that or - okay.

Akram Atallah: So I wanted to use this opportunity to answer this and to provide an answer to Bret - Bret's comment. We are - we work under the assumption that if we get an RSEP request and we go through the process and it passes it creates a precedent and therefore another one that comes our way that's in the same fashion would go along much faster because we lean on the previous one.

What my comments were about is once we approve a service if we were able to say you don't need to apply for an RSEP because this service has already been approved and therefore you can assume that you can do it as well. And therefore save you time from having to just go through the motion for going through the motion.

And the hold back on that is now we're starting to announce what certain registries are doing as a service and what holds us back from that is the appropriate nature of that service might be specific to that registry and if we advertise it we might be actually causing different kind of problem. But that's what my statement was about. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Akram. And thanks to everybody for the discussion on this. I think obviously a very important topic, one that's raised a lot of questions and concerns ongoing process issues and timeline questions so I think this has been very constructive so thank you.

Time to move on, we've got a long list and just an hour left in this section of our meeting. The next item on the agenda is monitoring for security threats in new gTLDs. We had Rubens listed for this one. I understand that there's been some dialogue already this week that the Registries and ICANN I think have a work team that is in place or available for people's participation.

I just want to open this up to see if there's any comment on it. I think it was told that we could probably move this one along pretty quickly. But let me just open it up to see if there's any discussions. Okay? No. Very good, we'll move on then.

Next item on the agenda is the GDD road show feedback and documentation. This was a topic that we raised with ICANN staff in the joint ExCom meeting with GDD. The Registries, NTAG and Registrars ExComs got together with the GDD staff, Akram and his team, on Sunday evening. And this was a topic that we discussed.

We noted, I think, that the road shows that have taken place recently were very constructive and well received, very informative and that there was a call for the documentation and the transcripts or the recordings of those sessions to be made available.

I think the feedback that we got was that certainly I think willing to look ahead towards making the recordings and documentation available, that there may be some challenges in terms of getting permissions and things like that looking backwards to the past - to the ones that have already happened.

But anyway so let's just open this up if anybody would like to comment on their experience to provide feedback to Krista, Akram, Cyrus in terms of the road shows and now is the time. So Donna then Chuck.

Donna Austin: I guess not so much feedback, yes it was - I think the road show we had in LA went really well. I guess it's just a question of - and this isn't about, you know, are you going to have three more next year but it's more about what information have you taken out of it and are there any changes in the way that

you'll be doing business or, you know, what kind of analysis have you done of the feedback or information that you've received from the two so far?

Krista Papac: Thanks, Donna. Yes, so we are doing some analysis on the feedback we received. It's - we've - actually Fabien on the team has been doing some great work on that side. I can't figure out how he's doing it because it's pretty impressive.

Not - he's very impressive but the - to take people's comments and find a way to measure those it's not, you know, they're freeform comments, right, they're not in a form. And somehow he's managed to sort of try and normalize the feedback. So we're doing that. We're not through all the data yet. We got through the data from Los Angeles. We haven't gotten through the Tokyo feedback yet.

The feedback has been extremely positive. There's also been some constructive feedback. Some of it is just kind of the same thing we've been talking about, you know, engagement managers and things like that. There are a few things that, you know, we've already implemented even in the road show itself so little changes that, you know, pieces of feedback that we got; people didn't understand one part so we like refined the approach on that.

I'm trying to think. I wasn't really prepared for this so I haven't been looking at the data more recently. But, yes, we definitely are going through the analysis of what we heard and looking at places where we can implement changes.

One of the things we heard is that people wanted to know what happened at the other road shows. So we're trying to put together sessions for the people that have been to the road show to talk to each other and, you know, learn from those experiences.

And we want to do something like that in Marrakesh where we get everybody that went to the different road shows to get together and network and learn from each other. So - but, yes, we're doing quite a bit of analysis on that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Krista. And thanks for all the work - this is Chuck Gomes, by the way. Thanks for all the work that you guys put into the road shows. I'll be very brief because I was at the same one that Donna was at in LA. And the great thing about it was there was - it was designed for two ways communications. And that happened. And so that's excellent. I know that that's what you guys wanted too. And I think you were successful there.

Krista Papac: Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Donna and Chuck and Krista. Any other comments or questions on the road show topic? There is, very good. Thank you. Actually I should take a moment to welcome (Sue). Thank you. Okay so the question in chat is, "When are the next road shows scheduled?"

Krista Papac: Thanks, Keith. This is Krista. Actually that is - somebody set me up deliberately because I wanted to say something once the question was read which is to answer that.

So we have one more road show left in this series. It's in Istanbul next month, November 19, 20 and 21. We - one of the pieces of feedback we heard which we were already thinking but we were waiting to see how the road show went was that people want more of these. We budgeted for this series for the year which is the three - two that have occurred, one that's coming up. And then we're looking at next year, you know, the next budget year budgeting for something similar.

We want to - our goal is to keep finding different ways to engage with you guys and also to - for the road shows to be delivering value. So it will kind of depend what the road show looks like sort of depend on what's going on with you guys and where people are at in launch and implementation of, you know, their TLDs.

This particular road show was really focused on education and engagement. We - it's been so helpful to people and if you haven't been to a road show, you know, you don't have to be in Europe, Middle East or Africa to come to the Istanbul show.

I know it's a little ways to travel for some people but I would strongly encourage you to come because it's - even once we posted the materials the materials are - they're tools, they're not - they're not going to - you're not going to get the education and the engagement from them that you will get when you go to a road show.

It is a workshop so it's very hands on. People are out of their chairs probably 60% of the time, you know, doing exercises, not physical exercises but educational exercises and collaborative exercises. And you just are not going to get that from the PowerPoint deck. So November is the next show and then we'll take a look at what makes sense to do for the next fiscal year.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks very much, Krista. Okay, any other questions before we move on? Okay next item on the agenda is actually a budget question but I don't believe Xavier is with us yet, he's going to join us in a little bit so we'll push that down the list.

Next item after that would be name collisions. And specifically I think questions about the rights protection mechanisms and controlled interruption. Is there anybody in the Registry group that would like to take the lead on this one in terms of discussing, raising questions or comments or concerns?

So, Jordyn, I know that you'd been involved quite a bit in the RPM questions and, you know, regarding name collisions and I don't know if there's anything you want to discuss here or.

Jordyn Buchanan: I don't think there's a lot to add in the conversation with the staff. Staff's been quite engaged in the discussions. Karen Lentz I know has joined all the calls that the joint Registry Stakeholder Group, Business Constituency and IPC meetings that we had to both initially draft the joint letter that was submitted and then following that there was a follow up conversation where Karen had the opportunity to pose some clarifying questions to the group.

And similarly some of the Registry Stakeholder Group concerns about staff interpretation of the previous letter were raised and I think clarified satisfactorily so I think in general staff's been quite engaged and is aware of the letter that we've submitted.

And I know there's been a number of public comments supporting that approach as well. So I guess I'm just hoping - I'm looking forward to the near future when hopefully staff is going to be able to take a close look at that proposal and implement it.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much, Jordyn. And sorry for putting you on the spot like that. Cyrus, you want to respond? I think any, you know, insight or update that you could provide would be helpful.

Cyrus Namazi: Yes, sure. I just wanted to also echo what Jordyn was saying. I think we have had very constructive discussions with the team led by Jordyn. The comment period closed I think on the 7th of October if I'm not mistaken so we've summarized everything.

We actually have a staff recommendation that we're going to share with you I believe in a session tomorrow. And it's very much in line with what you've proposed. And barring any unforeseen incidents this is what we'll be proposing to be adopted.

Jordyn Buchanan: Great. Good news. And I do - you know, I just want to thank both from the Registries, the staff and the other constituencies, I think this was a really good model and I think - I'm hoping that as we look forward to the, you know, as we're seeing with some of the accountabilities and the cross community working groups.

I think this model of working across constituencies with staff, especially on implementation issues, feels a little bit less bureaucratic and a little faster in terms of moving forward. So really like to make sure that those of us in the Registry Stakeholder Group work together and look for opportunities where we can sort of move stuff forward instead of just yelling and complaining which I know all of us, including myself, do sometimes.

Cyrus Namazi: Ditto.

Keith Drazek: Great. Okay, thank you all very much. So on the topic of name collisions I was in the GNSO Council weekend sessions, the working sessions, and I think Francisco gave an update and some questions I think looking ahead about possible policy work related to the name collision issue.

And it's probably worth noting at this point that there was some discussion about the JAS report, and correct me if I misstate anything here, the JAS report drop-catching as it relates to existing gTLDs or second level names in existing TLDs.

And the concern that there may be some relationship between name collisions and existing TLDs and that there's a problem with the drop catching and the re-registration of SLDs. And I was - I don't know if you wanted to discuss that here.

I think it raised some questions among others in the room at the time thinking that that's not really a name collision. James from Go Daddy spoke up, Elaine from Donuts spoke up. And I think there were several people who said, well wait a minute, that's not really what we're talking about in terms of a name collision.

I don't know if that's worth talking about here today but I wanted to at least give you the opportunity to expand on that if you'd like to.

Francisco Arias: Thank you, Keith. This is Francisco Arias, ICANN staff. Yes, that's one of the recommendations in the JAS report. It talks about domain drop catching, that's the exact terminology they use. And it raises one of the potential issues to be considered in the 30 July NGPC resolution there is a direction for staff to address the GNSO with potential policy matters relating to name collision. We included that topic in there.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks. Any questions or comments on name collisions before we move on? Okay so, sorry, Paul go ahead then Edmon.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Yes, for the record it's Paul Diaz. And just to note tomorrow there's a full session on names collision so this might get teased out further for those who are interested. It's 10:00 start in one of the main meeting rooms.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Great. Thanks, Paul. So I've got Edmon, then Maxim, then Jordyn.

Edmon Chung: Okay, Edmon Chung here. So on that topic I'm wondering if - there is an expired domains consensus policy and was long discussions about this specific problem that more specifically issue that you talked about.

Did the JAS team review that process and review all the discussions that were had before - before they, you know, suggested this? Because the first thing - the first reaction is if there was something wrong with the previous discussion or something that was missing from the previous discussion, I don't think there is. You know, what was the, you know, what was the response from JAS?

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco again. I don't know if they look at that. I think they did but it's probably better to ask them directly.

Edmon Chung: It was a very long discussion, that PDP ran on for pretty long time.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Edmon. Maxim then Jordyn.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, (unintelligible). One question, do you have plans to publish the full JAS report, those 2000 pages?

Francisco Arias: Yes. I think I talk about this in the GNSO session. We haven't published that final report because we are waiting on the affected vendor to fix the book that

was found during the study. The last we heard from the vendor and that was just a few days ago because they - I think they do have a patch ready by the end of the year. If that happens then we will - then revise when we can publish the vulnerability - sorry the report.

As we have said the reason why we are not publishing the report is because we think data that is included in that report - the full report - could facilitate bad actors to exploit this vulnerability.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Maxim and Francisco. Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, so maybe this is a better topic for tomorrow. Feel free to tell me that that's when we should discuss it. But we've started to see in the operation of controlled interruption that there's some scenarios in which there are third parties who are affected which I think is an expected result.

And in most cases I think controlled interruption is working very well, those third parties see that there's a problem and then they take steps to remediate. We've seen in at least one case a specific third party had a very specific software problem on one particular SLD.

And there would have been I think a very straightforward path to help them sort of give a quick fix or patch over that problem by returning something other than the controlled interruption record for one particular SLD.

But as the rules stand today our only option is to either just tell them, you know, go pound sand and continue to suffer or to, you know, just turn off controlled interruption for a TLD as a whole which, you know, may be undesirable, may sort of either delay the registry's sort of planned launch and/or provide some, you know, may actually defeat the point of controlled

interruption in that we've notified this one entity. But, you know, there are other people who may not have noticed as quickly.

So I'm wondering if there - is there some opportunity to talk about now that the battle plan has met the battle, you know, there's some bits of - there's some bits that we didn't anticipate and maybe there's some approaches that make sense to use as we actually are seeing problems live in the real world.

How can we engage in ICANN with some discussion as to like what are alternative approaches we can take as we start to see specific problems crop up so that we don't have to cause unnecessary pain to particular software vendors or operators where we might be able to target solutions to their particular problem?

Francisco Arias: So I think if there are specific cases in which we could provide (unintelligible) provide a time, let's say, for the affected party to make changes to the networks we should talk about it. As you probably know the requirements in the assessment, the name collision assessment, said that ICANN will have requests from you formally an action only when there is clear and present danger to human life.

So in that case we have had zero cases that reached that level so that's why we haven't request any of the (unintelligible) to do anything. But we have shared the cases that we know with the (unintelligible) especially when there is (unintelligible) to a good number of parties. So the registry can talk with the affected party and see if something could be done.

We are certainly open to talk with specific cases with a registry. And if there is an easy solution, as you said, to provide some relief temporarily to the party we can certainly do so.

Jordyn Buchanan: Okay great. Maybe I'll take this offline and we can think about how to advance something that would be sort of generalizable instead of just work for this one particular case at least in terms of an escalation process.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Jordyn. Thanks, Francisco. Any other comments or questions on name collision before we move on? Okay very good. Next item on the agenda is the GDD scorecard. Is Yasmin here? She's not, okay. Reg, go ahead. Thank you.

Reg Levy: Sorry. Thanks. Yasmin asked that I step in for this one. So we've been speaking back and forth with ICANN staff about the GDD scorecard following the letter that we sent to them. And we've made a number of strides. I know that Yasmin sent this out it looks like this morning at 2:00 am so I don't know if you guys have gotten that yet or not.

We've all now hopefully received our account managers. They're calling them I think engagement coordinators - managements - engagement managers which may just be indicative of our differing ways of approaching this. There's been a lot of back and forth about the language used and the language that we want to see and the language that ICANN uses has created a lot of confusion and potentially vitriol.

I think we're both coming from good places but, again, we may continue to call them account managers and we reserve that right. But we're very grateful for the engagement managers.

And the scorecard itself has a lot of input from both sides. There's some issues that have been closed, there's some issues that have gone over to the GDD portal working group. You guys may have seen, if you've signed in since

Monday the changes that we've implemented in the GDD portal. Hopefully it's a little easier to use, a little easier to navigate and to find the cases that are open, closed, in progress, hanging.

There's also the Website working group, there's a lot of different working groups. And so some of the stuff from the GDD portal scorecard - or the GDD scorecard has gone over to that working group which is in progress right now. We met last week and talked about some issues there. So if anybody has any questions based on the scorecard let's open the floor.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much, Reg. So, Krista, would you like to jump in? Go right ahead, thank you. And anybody else who would like to get in the queue please raise your hands.

Krista Papac: Thanks. I just wanted to make a comment which I thought things were going well but I wasn't quite sure if I heard that in what you just gave us an update so maybe there's more to talk about today meaning where the disconnect is and things were moving - well I thought we were making some really good progress.

And that a lot of the things that were in the letter you guys sent in June have been either addressed or in process. There was one big bucket which is service level targets that we were a little more ambitious about how - deadline that was a little more ambitious than we could meet.

And actually we came up with the stuff ourselves on target - service-level targets and then realized we are going about this wrong, we should talk to you guys and find out what type of things are, you know, here's what we're thinking, what are you thinking. So that process is actually underway right now.

It's great if we get these service-level targets but if they're not the ones you look for then - you're looking for then what's the point. So we're going to that effort with the group.

And from my perspective I actually think things are going very well. I want you guys to know my goal and the team's goal from the beginning has been to address what you brought up in the letter.

The scorecard exercise is extremely time-consuming and from what I've heard from a lot of you is, you know, we want to resolve the issues that we don't want to spend so much - we don't want to spend the services team and the rest of the operations team and the other folks inside of ICANN's time managing score cards; you would like us to be actually getting the work done.

And so I'm hoping that we get to a place where we can, you know, be more focused on actually delivering what you guys need and having these regular engagements that we've been having which I think are, at least for us, are helping a lot and just going off and getting the work done for you. And hopefully everybody's in a - we're collaborating and moving things forward together.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Krista. I'll just note that I think from my view, and I've got Reg in the queue, but from my view the scorecard has been a very, very useful tool over the last several months to help us move things forward where they may have been stuck or where maybe communication lines hadn't been open about the issues that were of concern to the registries and the applicants and maybe to a certain extent the registrars as well.

So I think it has been a very useful tool. I think once we get to a point where the issues that we've identified are resolved then maybe we can move to a more efficient process, one that's may be less time-consuming and resource intensive. But I think, you know, I think it has been a very useful tool and we appreciate you spending the time and effort in maintaining it and engaging with us. So, Reg.

Reg Levy: Thanks. I'd like to apologize to Krista if I made it sound like we're not in a good place. I do think that we've made great strides. I just wanted to highlight and sort of underscore the communications issue because everybody received the email from Yasmin earlier this morning that said I'll registry operators and applicants have been assigned an account manager. And each of us have in fact been assigned engagement manager.

And so I know that early on there was just - there were some language issues, which clearly continue. But we seem to be mostly on the same page and are moving forward hopefully in the right direction.

Keith Drazek: Great. Okay thanks. Any other comments or questions on the GDD scorecard before we move on? Okay next item on the agenda is auction process and access applications fees. Jon, I've got your name next to this one if you would like.

Jon Nevett: Yes, thanks. I think the only issue we wanted to raise here was triggering the process for the application fees that are in excess of the cost incurred in the auction fees and not waiting until we know the exact amount because that would just cause another six-month delay. So if we could just trigger the process, get the group together, you know, do a call for the community or however else you guys think we should engage the community.

I think we also see a distinction between auction fees and applications these. And I don't know if we need two separate processes - or - but at least some discussion on that.

Akram Atallah: So the Board would be actually discussing this week and hopefully they will have some outcome of that. But the process has started so - for the auction proceeds. I don't know that they've actually - they might discuss other - the how to predict costs bucket. But I don't know if they will do that to not. And so this week it's on their agenda. Hopefully they will decide on how they want to engage the community on the approach.

This is really - this discussion is really hands off from staff; we're not actually engaged in that at all. It's a Board decision on how to move it forward.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, I understand your comments with respect to the auction process - proceeds. But at some point in time we need a sense of direction on the philosophy that the Board is going to be taking with respect to excess fees paid beyond the cost.

The whole concept behind it was supposed to be a cost recovery. And it - I don't know whether the Board has just elected to defer it or whether they've elected just to ignore it. But I guess I'm trying to figure out what venue do we go to discuss that process?

Cyrus Namazi: Thanks, Ken. This is Cyrus Namazi. I think you actually have time with the Board today and I would highly recommend that you bring this up to them. From time to time we've actually suggested to the Board to take this up but

obviously it hasn't gotten on the agenda. But it's really something you have a direct channel with them today. Use that I would say.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Ken. Thanks, Cyrus. Edmon, go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So I guess building on what Jon and Ken was mentioning, perhaps yes we'll probably, you know, it would be good to get a sense what the Board thinks. But ultimately whatever plan - however we plan to move forward that proposal probably needs to come from the community.

The Board is not going to be - I don't think the Board is going to be able to make a decision and say hey, this is how we're going to spend the money. That process needs to come bottom up from the community I think so we can start it actually.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Edmon. So Ken, go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes.

Keith Drazek: I'm sorry, Akram, did you want to respond? Okay, Ken then Akram.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, I'm going to make my comment short. I'm only referring to the excess proceeds received by ICANN for the applications. The other thing I'd like to get and I'm not really certain how we do this but at some point in time we should have pretty good handle - and let's assume for the hell of it that these application fees were placed in a bucket and there's a budget that works with that bucket. I'd like to see where we stand at this point in time.

We're well down the road, you know, and I think we should have cost centers available for dealing with processing and managing the application process.

And we should be able to match those cost centers up with the revenues - we'll call them revenues, okay, but in effect the - because if in fact - and correct me if I'm wrong, group, please.

I've always been under the understanding that this whole process was designed to be a cost recovery process. And I'd just like to get a better idea of what we're dealing with here.

Akram Atallah: So regarding the proceeds from the application fees, they are in the budget. We've actually did the forecast and what we forecast would be operationally left over from the - from the processing of the applications. There is also a risk analysis that's been done on the risks to the program and we're trying to go to the next level of monetizing that also to see - put some dollars around risks.

And the view on the proceeds is that the risks of the program will be with us for a little bit longer than the program. So there is a timeframe that's a little bit longer for these funds before they can be dealt with in whatever way that the community decides that they need to be dealt with.

Ken Stubbs: Well, I understand that but I also understand that as the program matures the risks start to decrease. And there should be either some philosophies behind that process and if you're using - they actually have legal actuarial firms that kind of put a handle on the exposure legally because that's primarily, I'm guessing what ICANN considers to be the principle risk there.

I don't anticipate any security stability risk beyond norms. So it would be nice if we had a handle on that because it would seem to me that as we're working let's say, one, three, five years out that risk drops. Most of the crap is going to hit the first 18-24 months. Five years out I just, you know, thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Ken. Thanks, Akram. Michael.

Michael Young: Hi I just - Michael Young speaking. I just wanted to support what Ken was saying and the concept that the funds could release some tranches so it doesn't all have to be done as a lump sum. When you hit a certain risk level or point perhaps a tranche of the funds can be determined to be safe to be released and so it'd be progressive.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, everybody. Let's move on now to the next item - we've added an item to the agenda, we're going to take advantage of Francisco being here and talk about universal acceptance. So who would like to take the lead on universal acceptance? Anyone? Edmon, thank you.

Edmon Chung: Happy to take that topic since it's something that - I think it's important. I'm not sure whether we're going to take this up with the Board as well but I guess pretty straightforward in terms of the universal acceptance I think the issue is becoming more urgent as new gTLDs come into play.

I think for me, at least, I think it's a - it's a big issue on consumer trust, you know, people don't trust the DNS anymore if that's not being done. I go back to the JIG report, again, the joint IDN group between ccNSO and GNSO. The report has been there for almost a year now.

I guess the Board hasn't really taken on doing any resolution on it but staff has implement, you know, starting to implement a program on it. The direction looks good. My only main point is that without the Board adopting or - well, rejecting the report some of the things that are recommended is - seems like it's not being included in the current staff efforts or staff plan proposal.

So I think generally the direction is good. I think there is a session on universal acceptance, I forgot, Wednesday or Thursday...

Akram Atallah: Yes, Wednesday 4:30.

Edmon Chung: Right. So in general I guess we will take that further there. But for this community I think, you know, we understand that we as registries, there is much we need to do as well. But I guess the underlying fact is that ICANN should take this on with much higher priority and, you know, this is not - this should be at par with advocacy for IPv6 and DNSSEC and, you know, we haven't quite seen - I know that's part of the plan of the staff. But the higher-level management and the Board doesn't seem to be talking about that.

And specifically, you know, as an example when Fadi or Steve Crocker goes and, you know, speaking public they often bring up the issue of IPv6 or DNSSEC but universal acceptance has never been mentioned usually. So that's the kind of thing.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Edmon. I had Cyrus with his hand up. I see Jordyn and Francisco, if you'd like to jump in feel free.

Cyrus Namazi: This is Cyrus Namazi. Thank you, Edmon. I couldn't agree with you more. The topic of universal acceptance I think is paramount actually, the success of it is paramount to the success of the new gTLD program as a whole. We are totally in sync with you on that.

We actually have a staff person full-time dedicated to driving this for us with the community. We actually have published a proposed roadmap for how we think we should handle that. And that was put together as a result of an open public comment period that closed, I believe, back in August. So we're going

to discuss that, present that in more detail tomorrow in a session that Francisco mentioned at 4:30.

But I also want to be clear that the role that we see for ICANN to play here is that study coordinator and advocate. It's a substantial problem. It is not something that even all of us in this room can solve. There are so many layers in the ecosystem that gets affected by this. So we really have to mobilize all of us together to get the message out.

I think the GAC actually could be a good venue for us. And we'll discuss this in more detail, but this is, like I say, it's very close to my own heart. You know, we get the availability and the utility of the new gTLDs in all available scripts in the world for obvious reasons.

And I would even pose a question to the people in this room and ask you how many of you have systems in your processes that can actually take new gTLDs and all the scripts that are available. And I'm actually asking the same question of our own IT people in ICANN because it all starts here.

But the message I want to leave you with here is that look at us as the coordinator, as a place where we can actually have resources available for other people to come to to get educated. But it's not something on our own we can fix as ICANN.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here. Does one short note. Yes, I think the whole community understands that. And - but the key difference there is that I think - at least in my point of view ICANN can take a proactive role on that and so far it has been reactive. But, and hopefully it will change in the future.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, I understand that. You're absolutely right.

Francisco Arias: Keith, this is Francisco.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Francisco Arias: I had a couple slides, if possible, I would like to show them. I have a request to raise this.

Keith Drazek: While we're getting the slides ready, Jordyn, would you like to make your comment to keep things moving?

Jordyn Buchanan: I actually would prefer to comment after I see...

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Okay that's fine. All right so, I mean, I'll just take an opportunity to second what Edmon just said or to reinforce what Edmon just said is that I think there's a need for proactive measures on this issue from ICANN and all of us as a community but from ICANN the organization to mobilize the resources that you do have and the connections and the bully pulpit if you will.

Okay, Francisco over to you.

Francisco Arias: Thank you, Keith. We go to the next slide. Oh thanks. And next one. So universal acceptance, we have been working on this for a few months and the first thing we did was get (unintelligible) with the community worries, the problem we're trying to solve. There were different definitions of what universal acceptance meant for different people.

So we published a few weeks ago what we call a universal acceptance roadmap. We describe what is objective of these efforts. There are three things that the community requests to be - the problem to be tasked here. One is the one that was a starting point which is the lack of support for all TLDs in applications and services, that's number one, you can see in a browser if you type a new TLD you have - you probably are going to have problems.

We have been working with some browsers, for example, Chrome and Mozilla, they are pretty good in how they handle new TLDs these day. We haven't had that much luck with other browser makers that I'm not going to name.

Can we go to the next slide? And the second problem that has been requested by the community to work on is support for IDNs in general at all levels. And the tier problem, if we can scroll to the next slide, is internationalized email. I think in that this could be the clear application that will put IDN TLDs and IDNs in general to the key users that will make these successful.

So what are we asking from - can we scroll to the next one - is to support the universal acceptance call to support all TLDs, all IDNs and internationalized email. Can we go to the next one?

So the first thing and what we are preparing our communications plan to go to the different stakeholders were identified in this definition of the roadmap which have I think seven different stakeholders, the main one of course being the software vendors.

And - but we also think that we need to lead by example and ICANN is the first to say that we need to make changes in our applications to support all of these three things particularly international email is probably the most

challenging one. There is only one big vendor that we know that being Google, the Gmail. They release a service just this summer supporting internationalized email partially.

So now we're working at ICANN to (unintelligible) the template contractor agreement so we are now going to require. This still work in progress but we're going to record that all new systems support universal acceptance. And we're also working on a plan for updating the existing systems so that they all support universal acceptance.

But we think that if we are going to go with this message to the public outside we need the registries and registrars to also support universal acceptance so we can be consistent in the messaging that we are giving to the world. So this is the request to you, registries, to make an effort in your own internal systems to support universal acceptance. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Francisco. So I had Jordyn in the queue and Maxim so, okay Jordyn first and then Maxim.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, thanks Francisco. I think this is an important problem and I think Edmon touches on part of which is that I think it's great to see ICANN as an advocate for this and it would be great to see this get the same level of attention as other issues like IPv6 and DNSSEC.

I think that especially in the IDN space universal acceptance has the opportunity to have profoundly positive effects on the way people interact with the Internet perhaps even more so than some of those initiatives like IPv6 and DNSSEC so it certainly deserves the same level of attention.

But there's a huge amount of work to be done and it's technical work, it's writing code, it's understanding how these systems, you know, not just the handful of like these are the ways that things get used but, you know, thinking through not just making it so that new TLDs work in text entry boxes and work in email systems but things like linkification so, you know, when you see a URL that systems recognize that and make it a link so that they're easy to use just like legacy TLDs.

There's many different use cases that need to be identified and corrected. And I think Francisco is absolutely right that registry operators and others in the community need to lead by example and start doing some of this work ourselves so that we understand and can not just be talking and complain - once again not just complaining about things but actually doing something useful.

And I think the next step is to put together code that can be reused by others, put together best practices that people can read about and understand how to do the implementation. But that requires that implementations get done in the first place to be modeled off of. Right, now there's not working code largely for EAI, right, like we did some work but that's probably not open source because it's on Gmail but there probably are ways to do strong open source work.

And so I think we all are looking forward to the presentation discussion tomorrow. I think getting really clear about what we expect from ICANN and I think as a coordinator, as a repository, as a place to collect all this work that needs to get done. But we in the community need to do it and we shouldn't fool ourselves into thinking that ICANN is going to sort of wave a magic wand and fix these problems. We've got to write the code, we've got to do the

work. We're glad to do a lot of it but we can't just expect that ICANN is going to like come with solutions.

And I, myself, get frustrated like we've been sending people to conferences and talking with folks and it's all just about why doesn't this work? It doesn't work because no one's written the code to make it work. Someone needs to do it. Please start having people on your engineering teams do some of this work, otherwise it's never going to happen.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much, Jordyn. Great comments. So I've got Maxim in the queue. Okay and then...

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Francisco, I haven't seen interaction with hardware vendors in your list because it's quite important because with all (unintelligible) in the world, which are totally unaware of this fancy (unintelligible) and IDNs in particular, it's not much we can do.

Also you mentioned browsers but not email clients. For example, we had conversations with biggest Russian mail providers, they told us we don't want to look stupid in the morning we deploy the services because few million of our customers they have old Outlook systems. They won't be able to use it so we don't want this publicity.

And the last question is when you just tell us to make example out of us it's internal system by definition it's not open to anybody so (unintelligible) it won't be visible because it's requirements of security. So even if we make internal email server which allows me to exchange IDN emails with my colleagues it won't be - we won't be able to use it outside because we need a few million more mail server around. So how do we show example?

Francisco Arias: So, Maxim, this is Francisco. I think there are many ways to see this issue. One is for consistency we're asking someone else to do something you better show that you can do it yourself.

The second thing is this, by having 1300 TLDs to have their internal systems requiring their providers to support these technologies, that will hopefully make aware big providers that are not going to name, that they need - that there is a need for this technology and hopefully they will provide this to you and to everyone else.

Maxim Alzoba: One short note. In all our contracts with our like ISPs, security vendors, security solutions vendors, they are providing the service, almost on monopolistic basis. So we're not in position to dictate something. So we may ask anything but just wish.

And it relates to the previous question of exceeds funds, someone universal acceptance seems to be related to the new gTLD process. It might be a good idea to suggest that some of this money goes to the technology time and money spent to (unintelligible), hardware vendors, with mail clients, yes, providers and, yes of course, browser providers. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay so I've got Tim in the queue then Akram and then we need to wrap this one up, we've got 10 minutes left and three other topics that we need to get to.

Tim McGinnis: Thanks, Keith. Tim McGinnis, dotPharmacy. But speaking in my personal capacity as someone who's been involved with both DNSSEC and IPv6 deployment those deployments required an extensive effort by dozens if not hundreds of organizations in the technical community and beyond.

So if we want to model universal acceptance on that we really need to do major political organization, we can't count on ICANN alone to do this heavy lifting. Got to get ISOC involved or the RARs and (unintelligible), all the acronym folks. We can do it alone.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Tim. Akram and then see Kurt at the microphone and then we're done on this topic.

Kurt Pritz: Want me to go first?

Akram Atallah: Thank you, Keith. I think that it's very important that we do what we can, and like everybody, I think we are all in consensus that this is a big effort. And if we want our voice to be heard it would be a lot more likely that it will be heard if we all go out with one voice.

What Francisco is talking about is if we put in the contract that we do with vendors that we would like them to do these things the first step that will happen is vendors say no. We say why don't you go check if you can do it or not.

They'll go to their technical people, they'll ask for it. What that internal request did it's just give them an awareness that there is demand for it. If this happens often it will create a little bit more voices within that organization that there is demand for it. It might not raise it to the probability that this will get done. But it might raise it a little bit on their priority so that they start looking at it.

We have to put the demand out there, if we don't put the demand out there we're not going to get what we want. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Akram. (Kurt), go ahead.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, so I think Akram is right, demand will force the solution to this problem but what we want to do is accelerate the solution to the problem as much as we can. The business to works on interpersonal relationships. And when - in that Domain Name Association when we receive complaints we seek to find someone with an interpersonal relationship at a high-level in the company.

So one success is within our own community, so when we received complaints about new email addresses not working at Bank of America or Chase, you know, the presidents of those companies didn't respond to me; I don't know why.

But Craig Schwartz help facilitate for us through (BITS) and the Financial Services Roundtable a spot on their agenda where we're going to talk to their member banks, the technical people, and say you don't want to embarrass yourselves, you want to be customer friendly.

And I think the solution is so easy in a lot of these things that they will readily adopt them. And then we're going to attempt to go through, and we should all go through industry verticals like that. So for us, the DNA, you know, Google has pledged to help us with their high level contacts and their peer companies because the president of Apple doesn't respond to my emails either.

But, you know, ICANN I know have contacts with many companies too, so, you know, our approach is going to be on a case-by-case basis but trying to attack entire industry verticals to resolve the problem so it's one approach in a problem that will be solved with many pinpricks.

Keith Drazek: That's great thanks, (Kurt). And obviously we need a very coordinated effort here and obviously the DNA has a role to play there as well so that's great. Okay so we're done on that topic. Let's move on. We have three other items we're going to talk about ICANN's FY'15 budget and financial process, we've got Xavier here to do that, and then the next two items are in direct contention sets and CPE timing. We've got 10 minutes.

I sent a note to Michele leading the registrars know that we are running probably 10 minutes late so we may have a little bit of wiggle room but I think we also need a five-minute break so let's get to Xavier.

Xavier Calvez: You're setting yourself up for failure with putting me in the queue now.

Keith Drazek: Sorry, let me just take a note. So Akram and some of the other members of the team have to go. We've got in direct contention sets and CPE timing.

((Crosstalk))

Xavier Calvez: So Christine Willett will be taking care of those for us, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay.

Xavier Calvez: And thanks everybody. Thanks for having us.

Keith Drazek: Hold on. And Krista wanted to say something as well. Thank you, Akram and Cyrus.

Krista Papac: Thank you for the applause. Just kidding. I have to run as well. I wanted to say thanks to everybody. And then I also just want everybody to know there is a registry services session tomorrow 11:30 am in the Beverly Hills room. And

that's really our session where we tell you what we're doing. This is your meeting for you guys to talk to each other. It's for us to tell you guys the different things that we're doing to support you so I would encourage you all to please come. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much Krista. Thanks for being here. Okay, Xavier, thank you.

Xavier Calvez: Sure. Thank you, Keith. And everyone hear me okay with the mic? Thank you. I have a process question first so I have received from Paul a list of questions in writing, and thank you for taking the time and making the effort to do that. I have a written response to those written questions.

Is it okay to publish that list of questions and the responses after your review maybe if you want. Because I think the questions have value for more than just the Registry Stakeholder Group and hopefully the responses as well. So I would actually like to be able to publish the questions and the response on the finance wiki that we use for that if that's okay with you. Okay, thank you.

I also don't know if there is a specific subject of interest among the questions that we are gathered. And if there's one do you think would be more useful to address first I'm happy to do that with the limited amount of time. I know there was a number of questions on the USG transition cost for example so I'm happy to speak about that.

Keith Drazek: So maybe in the interest of time and, you know, apologies for crunching the time that we have. But maybe we could just open this up to questions if there are specific questions for Xavier. And I know that we had a constructive session with the ExCom, the joint ExCom session. So, you know, maybe some

of the questions have been addressed there. But let's just open it up for questions at this point if you don't mind? Okay, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes. And I'm not going to ask questions. Xavier has heard all my questions several times. And also - but what I really wanted to emphasize is I sent around this morning the presentation that Xavier gave yesterday in the finance session.

And in that presentation some of our questions that we submitted our answered, more details provided in several areas and some of the process, although the process for fiscal year '16 is still being developed, that's discussed as well.

So I just want to call that to your attention and let Xavier know that I have distributed it. I'm sure nobody's had time to look at it yet. But I wanted you to be aware of that.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. And I'll do a little bit of advertising as well. I have sent it to an email address which is community-finance, the presentation from yesterday and I will also distribute to that same email address after your validation, the list of questions that I have received and the answers that I have provided to those questions.

And that list - that email address list is basically the compilation of anyone's email address who's interested in the financial and budget processes, anyone is most welcome, send me an email and I'll therefore then have your email address and I can add you to the list and you will have the ongoing updates that we distribute through that email address.

It's just another means of communication to try to keep people up to date. And I will try to use it more in the future. Is there any other questions that you want to address? And while you're thinking about that I will point out to those specific questions that were asked by the Registry Stakeholder Groups, that have been answered in the presentation from yesterday so we provided more details pm the USG related costs.

One of the comment and question was that the response to the public comment processes - sorry, to the comments provided during the public comment period, our response still have been very aggregated level of information notably relative to the breakdown between track one and track two.

So we Have now provided a breakdown of track one and track two. The reason why we didn't do it 10 days ago is because we didn't have it, we worked on it over the past few days and we have no more details.

We have also discussed the timing - the conclusion of the FY'15 budget, that was another question that you guys had asked. And what changed between the draft budget and the final budget, the reduction of revenues of \$10 million, the reduction of expenses by \$10 million to match the reduction of revenues and what type of impact there was as a result of those reduction of expenses.

In the response that I mentioned earlier that I will provide to the question, I am providing the information that was provided yesterday during the finance session which provides an overview of those changes. They are changes by area and we also commented on the impacts which are not specific to any specific organization or specific to any project or activity.

The cost reductions that were reflected in the final budget versus the draft are all spread across the entire organization. They are not specific to a project that is being either reduced or cut, they are not specific to an activity that is eliminated.

And I'll take the example of the travel costs. We basically asked the entire organization to take one trip out of 10 from the budget; find a way to basically spend less and less in travel. So then of course then each manager has taken that instruction and reviewed their own budgets to be able to determine where they were going to do that.

And when for example we intend to send to people to a meeting to support presentations or training maybe we can send only one to that training and group together on that one person two purposes. That's the type of things that have been looked at by the budget owners to come up with budget cuts. So there is no specific cuts relative to the support to the registry or any other stakeholder groups or SOs or ACs.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you very much, Xavier. Very helpful and very informative. Any other questions? Jon, get to you in a sec, then Paul. So I got a note back from Michele, just so everybody knows, they're running a little bit late too so we've got a little bit of wiggle room here but not a lot. So, Jon.

Jon Nevett: Sure, thanks. Xavier, I guess it's more of a comment than a question if that's okay. But I think we have this budget issue on the agenda with the Board so I don't want you to be blindsided in that discussion.

But I think you probably are aware that the Registries in the negotiation sessions to the amendments for the new Registry Agreement have asked for some fee structure changes to bring it in line with the expectations of

registries where you're looking at large registries and small registries looking for different fee structure changes to put it in line again with existing registries, with the number of registries that actually applied versus what was expected.

And so we're in a position where we're going to be asking for that. And if we hear back, which we have already, that we can't afford that kind of the relief, I think the expectation is that we are going to be looking extraordinarily hard at every expense that ICANN has and looking at transparency for that.

Because that's going to be an issue that is going to be something that registries, I suspect, and ICANN will be discussing over the next six months very aggressively. And it's very important to a lot of us. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Jon. Anybody else want to get in the queue? Paul, I think you have something you wanted to add?

Paul Diaz: Nobody else has. Xavier, would you just - since the budget process moving forward is going to be different and particularly now that we're going to start working on (unintelligible) can you just at a high level explain to folks what to expect in the coming weeks with the draft, the public inputs, how the process will move forward? Because some of those timelines for us probably will compress so that we can provide the input, make it meaningful.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. So in the next coming weeks we will as, I think Fadi indicated in the opening session on Monday morning, we will publish for community input the five-year draft operating plan, which in the structure that we have, really corresponds to the complement of the strategic plan that provides the actual action and milestones that deliver the objectives.

So currently the strategic plan does not include the actual milestones over five years and actions that will deliver the objectives it only defines the objectives. So the five-year operating plan is an extremely important document that actually provides the what are we going to do to be able to achieve the objectives.

So it is obvious but this is a document that requires a lot of review and input. So that's the phase that were looking at now. For those of you who were in the finance session yesterday, we discussed among the members present the question that I put out relative to how to structure the interaction with the community knowing that this very important document is up for review and input over the next few weeks.

Which is the first time that it is for review and is not necessarily expected to be up for review in the same fashion every year in the future because we only expect to have a (nub) date on an annual basis, not a full review of this document.

So this I would say one time document and the review is very much impacting the FY'16 process and how to combine the requirement of ensuring we iterate and communicate along the way with the community, the staff and the Board in the development of the budget while concluding with an approval by the end of June 2015, where the Board is the challenge that we are working on right now.

So the next step is the five-year operating plan. We have been working with the Board over the past three days to try to finalize a suggested approach to the FY'16 planning. Chuck and I were having conversations yesterday about it. I will have more conversations with more community members about their

views on what's best to fit a lot of work in the next eight months. And I will come back to you guys with that development on that planning process.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much, Xavier. Chuck, quickly please.

Chuck Gomes: Sure, just a real quick question, Xavier. With regard to that planning process you have said in what's been published publicly so far that that process will be put out for public comment. When do you anticipate that happening?

Xavier Calvez: Sorry, I didn't mean that the process would be put out for public comment, but the operating plan would be put out for public comment...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I'm talking about something different.

Xavier Calvez: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so what was said in your draft fiscal year '16 budget I think - or it may be in the '15, you said staff will draft an annual planning process that includes roles and responsibilities, performance and (unintelligible) and that's submitted to the Board and then the broader community for review and comments. That's different from the five-year operating plan, that's what I'm talking about.

Xavier Calvez: Sorry, thank you. So the draft document has been submitted to the Board that includes a review of the overall five-year cadence of reviews, Wendy Reed review the strategic plan, when do we review the operating plan and the annual process that follows those reviews. The roles and responsibilities - a

description of roles and responsibilities of staff, Board and community stakeholders.

And so that - there is a first draft that's been reviewed - that's been submitted to the Board three days ago. So we now need to collect the Board's comments and come up with the new draft.

What we are hoping to be able to do is to include that element in the five-year operating plan, the document that will be submitted for public comment and released in the next few weeks. Because it actually goes quite well with it because it provides that view on how to work together so that's what we're hoping to be able to do. If we have to do it a bit later because it's not fully finished then we will indicate the date when we will do it. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much, Xavier. And thank you for joining us today. And thanks to all the ICANN staff who came to engage with us this morning so thank you. We've got to now move to our session with the registrars.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you very much for the invitation and the time.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you.

Man: Keith? Real quick, Keith? What happened to the indirect contention set issue?

Keith Drazek: We're 10 minutes over already.

Man: Okay.

Keith Drazek: We've got the registrars in the room, we're going to have to move on I think. Unless there's something - unless there's a very quick...

Man: Yes, we were going to try to have a call. We're hoping that it was rescheduled for the Wednesday time if you could find a room that'd be great as opposed to today during constituency day.

Woman: Yes, we're working on a room.

Man: Great, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks.

END