

**ICANN
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group
Tuesday, 14 October 2014**

Part III

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: Okay so we'll get started here in about 30 seconds and prepare the recording and all of the interface. Thanks. Okay, are we good for the recording? Great. Thank you very much.

Cherie Stubbs: Quick housekeeping details just to remind everyone to please announce your name when speaking for purposes of the recording and for those who are participating remotely. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks (Sherry). Thanks. Welcome back everybody to the afternoon session of the registry stakeholder group meeting in Los Angeles. So we have with us today at this point Maguy and her compliance team and Allen Grogan. So I just wanted to welcome the compliance crowd and thank you very much for spending the time with us. We always look forward to these sessions and value your participation and so I think we can just get right into it.

Maguy maybe I could hand it over to you for some introductions of the team and then we can go from there. Thank you.

Maguy Serad: Good afternoon everyone. Thank you for this opportunity and I hope your meeting with the board was successful. It started while we were there listening.

I'm proud now to introduce you to Allen Grogan my new boss. Less than four years at ICANN and on my third global leader so I'm not sure what that means but mostly I would like to ask my team to stand up. We have the LA-based compliance team in the room with us today and I have not only the honor but the pleasure - I really have fun working with them - to work with such fine group of people but also we have our Istanbul and Singapore team who are participating remotely.

So with that we're going to be providing you a brief update. We've already - we already know your concerns. The questions you submitted were on our slides but as (Keith) said earlier, it is also reciprocated. We value your input too. We're going to share with you our thoughts and reason behind some of the efforts we're leading. If you do not agree, let us know why. We'll talk about them. We'll take it back and think about how can we address them differently. But let's have that open dialogue and collaboration that we've been having for many years now. So with that I'm going to ask Victor...

Keith Drazek: Thank you (Maggie) and this is (Keith). Just so - again a welcome to all of you on the compliance team both here in the room and remotely. Thank you very much for joining us. We know you have a difficult job sometimes, maybe all the time but we do appreciate the collegial interaction that we have I think established over quite some time now so thank you.

Jennifer Scott: Hi, my name's (Jennifer Scott). I'm manager of contractual compliance. Next slide please. Next slide.

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Scott: Thank you. So we're just going to give an update today regarding what we have learned since ICANN 50. The first point is just a point of general clarification and response to the question number two that was submitted by this group to compliance and that was regarding the difference between inquiries and audits and as you can see here on the slide, we've laid out when inquiries are sent. They are generally used when we are in an information gathering stage or if there is no known compliance violation yet or if we're doing proactive compliance monitoring.

And it could be a combination of those things when we send an inquiry but the main point to note is that if you don't respond to inquiries, it will turn into a compliance notice so please do respond to inquiries if you receive those from compliance.

On the other hand audits are things that compliance will give pre-notification of. They focus on past performance and it's similar to what's been going on recently which is the new registry agreement audit. An observation that might come out of an audit is just something that ICANN compliance is noting. It's informational and it's not something that requires a registry to take action on so if you do see observations coming out of the audit report, that's what an observation is.

Compliance has been doing some proactive monitoring of several items, one of which is the publication of abuse contact data on registry sites and the obligation there is to post an email address, a mailing address and the primary contact that is to receive abuse reports. And we would ask that registries identify any repeat offenders of that abuse reporting system to ICANN so if

we need to take action with respect to abuse reporters that are abusing that system, we can do so. Next slide.

Here are just some statistics on the abuse monitoring that we've been doing. The preliminary reports of that proactive monitoring is that over 50% of TLDs were either missing the mailing address or the primary contact name. In that effort compliance - and it should actually say 83, not 87 - inquiries and notices to registry operators which covered 100% of the TLDs that were in general availability up to the first of October 2014 and you can see here that we still got some notices and progress and others that are closed.

And I'll hand it over to Victor Oppenheimer to speak on pick.

Victor Oppenheimer: Thank you (Jen). For the record Victor Oppenheimer Senior Manager Account Compliance. And before I go into the I guess more formal update, allow me to just provide some context on the pick monitoring - pick proactive monitoring we are conducting.

You heard (Sally) yesterday state that I can - it's rooted on the public interest and that public interest is at the core of ICANN's mission. He also stated that this is a good industry - one that operates in the public interest so when we have a few contractor parties in noncompliance, those few make the headlines and make all of the rest look bad. So by doing this proactive monitoring ICANN is raising the level of effective caution by anchoring it on facts and numbers and away from mere assumptions and perceptions.

So this is why we're asking for your collaboration and we have gotten - for the most part - collaboration. I know many of the registries that received the inquiries were more concerned about how - how can we (unintelligible) operators get a level of comfort that we are in compliance if there is no

framework yet. ICANN on the other hand is concerned with the what - what are registries doing to detect security threats to maintain statistical reports for specification eleven? And I can thus recognize that there are different registry operators doing it differently.

So lastly before I enter into the presentation itself, we have received plenty of feedback from you guys through our ticket system and I want to insure that compliance is considering all of the feedback and will be making adjustments where appropriate. For example, some of the inquiries could be streamlined or less burdensome. If we have that data in ICANN system, we get that and we're making adjustments in terms of registries - the list of registrars for example or maybe the inquiries can better explain the purpose of the proactive monitoring.

So I appreciate your feedback. I am sure you're going to provide candid feedback to us so the presentation itself - on screen you have the mandatory provisions and I'm pretty sure you're familiar with all of them. We are inquiring about some of them and depending on whether we have the data then we just don't ask questions but we are checking the TLD's coalition - the general registration policies and that there are no restrictive criteria of the sort only allow for the brand among others. Next.

We're also inquiring about the voluntary provisions and we're aware that not all registry operators have voluntary commitments and it is some of the ones that we are asking processes on our inquiries. Next. As (Jen) stated, the mandatory and voluntary picks are contractual obligations and that is the focus of our inquiry - specifically the statistical reports on security threats and the actions taken as a result of the security checks.

At the end I want to note that as you all may know, the big standing panel is in place and we encourage you to look at the link provided for more information.

So preliminary statistics because if you recall, two or three slides before this ICANN is verifying that the TLDs only using 2013 IAA and that the registration - the registration policies are public and so on. There are various levels of data received and analyzed at this point but the takeaway is that the target was to cover ten inquiries to 100% of all of the TLDs that by 1, October were on the general availability space. Next.

And we continue with the monitoring of right protection mechanisms including among others, timely delivery of the (unintelligible) file and abiding by the provision of improper allocation under the trademark clearinghouse RPM document.

And of course since August IT compliance is also monitoring that TLDs are complying with the end position current assessment. Next. I'm going to go now over some of the questions - (Jen) covered one or two already - that were submitted to compliance. One other question was please clarify what's (Jones) day role in regard to item compliance activity and the answer is that (Jones) day really supports GDV under review of sunrise policies received from registries as part of the TLD startup information.

There was also a question - apparently some conflicting information on the slide deck that we had posted for registry road show versus another one in a prior date and so we thank you for bringing that to our attention. This apparent concept which was really we have a - on our website when you visit our website - compliance's webpage - you will see that the informal and formal approach are depicted and the slide deck did not have all the information that

was posted on the website but now they are aligned so we consider that action item completed.

There was a question on one slide that shows how many registries per region and how many domain names and complaints per region for registries and registrar and the question was how is ICANN designating what are registries region eight and it's based on the same information that actually the TLDs are providing through GDD during onboarding in terms of the primary business location.

The next question was whether we could provide a number of complaints meaning compliance file by third parties versus the number of complaints generated by ICANN or ICANN's contractors. ICANN does not track complaints like in that fashion so we - ICANN does not distinguish between types of reporters.

And then question number seven - thank you for bringing that to our attention. There was also a typo if you will in one of the slides that were used for the registry roadshow in Tokyo and it should have been labeled registrations - I'm sorry - obligations that arise upon finding out the agreement and other open delegation but they both were labeled open signing so that has been fixed and reposted very shortly on our webpage.

Yan Adrania: For the record (Yan Adrania) Product Manager. So this is the new registry agreement audit update. This is a new project that we started in the summer. At this point we selected 14 new registry agreements or 14 new GTLDs and proceeded with the audit. The RFI or request for information was sent to the TLDs themselves and to the data co-agents.

Subsequently we received responses either directly from TLD or from their backend service providers. The number of documents was received - you can see some statistics on the screen. The audit phase was completed and we issued what's called the preliminary audit report. Next slide please, yes.

These numbers show you the - what's called initial deficiency and the key word here is initial. It means these are not necessarily where the real errors or problems we found - even the inability or when we had a situation when the documentation was not given to us, we didn't know that it has deficiency. That's why you can see percentages on the right there may look surprisingly high because some of the TLDs did not really understand what we were asking for but during the communication we were able to obtain mostly what we needed.

The articles under audit summarized here what's been - what's been included in the audit. On this slide you see the deficiencies as of October 3rd which is quite some time ago. So the numbers are already lower. If we're looking at the situation today, the progress is considerably better. 5 out of 14 GLDs already have received clean reports meaning there are no deficiencies in them or there might be an observation which does not require any action on their part.

And the other nine will receive updated reports at the end of this week. Out of those nine there are four that have - still have deficiency that needs to be addressed. Five will receive clean reports.

Feel free to send more questions. I just want to bring your attention to something that I've been asked several times by now. What are the main true deficiencies that have been noted? There are two major - I guess the most important deficiencies we noted is the data of the quality of the data extra file.

Some of the fields do not agree with who he is. So there is something - some kind of problem going on with the backend provider and they're looking at it.

And the second major deficiency was the number of the means registered reported through ICANN in the monthly report does not agree with what's in the data escrow file. Sometimes it's over reported. Sometimes it's underreported. One of the major backend providers explained it to us as their system was contained an error. Basically they were not counting the means that were registered outside of their TLD zone.

So for example if you have a TLD that is let's say dot A, B, C but the main server - but the main server for that domain is located in dot com, their system didn't count domain at all. That was just one of the reasons. And feel free to ask more questions.

Maguy Serad: Thank you team. This is (Maggie) for the record. (Keith) with this we'd like to open the floor for questions if you'd facilitate it.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Thank you (Maggie). I was looking over there for you and you were hiding. Thank you very much. I do have a question.

Maguy Serad: I'm testing your afternoon.

Keith Drazek: Or my hearing. Yes so I do have a question in queue. We have Brett Fausett would like to speak up and so (Fred) I assume you're joining over the phone.

((Crosstalk))

Brett Fausett: I didn't know how best to get your attention so I put it in the Adobe chat.
Thank you all for the presentation.

We take our compliance obligations very seriously, in fact so seriously that when we get a ticket from you or we get an audit as we did over the summer, it becomes our highest priority which is one of my frustrations with what happened last week with getting the proactive monitoring is that that looks like another audit to me and we just did our audit. So if you can be proactive and send us stuff whenever you want to be proactive, that puts a lot of work on us at random times that aren't in our control.

And one of the nice things that I'd like to go back to is the idea that every three years we open our books. We show you, you know, whatever you want to do and you can come in and look at everything and then deal with all of that and then when we're done, we're done and then we'll see you again in three years. I would really like to unless there's a problem, right.

And then if there's a compliance problem, you know, obviously we'll deal with that when it comes up. But when there's no problem, I just want to have a quiet period of three years to run my business.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Brett). I've got (Jonathon) in queue and then (Pam).

Jonathon Frost: At the expense of sounding like a broken record, I'm going to want to echo a little bit of what (Brett) said. If you look at the contract, there are a couple of different categories of inquiries that I mean I can't commit because they specifically contemplate what they can do.

You've got - you've got the audit. Every - over a period of time you can - you can look at everything like (Brett) just talked about and then they have the

malware reports which you can ask us any time. If this proactive reporting had then give us our report - give us those reports - everyone would have been like look at the provision. We owe you this. When you ask, we give it to you. And then there are the class of things when it looks like you've received information that we may not be living up to our obligations and then you send a compliance inquiry.

But this - what we received a couple of weeks ago - I mean this is a whole new animal because I mean it didn't look like it was tied to a provision. You were asking us for documents that we weren't obligated to give you and there was no lead to breach of anything. You guys weren't looking for a breach of contract. You were just - this is just a general research project and I mean I just don't think that's contemplated in the contract at all.

It's - I mean it's - and what you said earlier where if we don't respond to this inquiry, it will turn into a compliance notice. I mean that leads me to believe that if we hadn't produced this information, this would turn into an accusation of breach. You know what? I'm looking at the actual inquiry and if all I did was send the report which obviously we do owe you guys, like I cannot figure out for the life of me what I would be breaching if I didn't respond to it anymore. That's it.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Jonathon). I've got (Pam) and then (Reuben)'s in queue and then (Maggie).

Maguy Serad: (Keith) may I ask any more on this topic so we can answer it one time?

Keith Drazek: So I think - yes - so (Reuben) - so (Pam) then (Reuben). Thanks.

Pam Little: Yes, thank you. (Maggie) can we go back to slide seven? Oh just on this one I think the timing is incorrect. The registry stakeholder session should be the later one on Thursday. Is that right?

Maguy Serad: Was this slide seven? I don't know...

Pam Little: Don't worry.

Maguy Serad: The one you were going to advertise for Thursday's session?

Pam Little: It should be the - yes - it should be the later session. That's the registrar session at 8:30.

Maguy Serad: Okay.

Pam Little: Okay can we go back to seven? This is about the pick commitment. And I think until slide seven Victor said this is because of the result of GAC or community concern. So my question is what did they actually say. Did they have data to show the new GTLD domain names have been used more than the legacy domain names for this purpose or opposed as more as a security threat? Do you have data from those who express concerns or do they just feel it's less safe?

Victor Oppenheimer: Victor Oppenheimer for the record. So what they - GAC has said is essentially is in the GAC communities and of course that was the driver for specification eleven. And since Beijing the GAC has been asking or expressing its concern with whether the public interest commitments are achievable, enforceable that has been part of the community concern as well and as I state before and based on preliminary results I think you thanks to your collaboration have been getting. ICANN can state that at least on the data

received, over 80% of the TLDs are implementing processes with regard to a security threat.

And so I think it's important that we have the data now to go back to the community and go back to the GAC when requested and show the state of the industry based on facts rather than -- as before - assumptions or perceptions.

Pam Little: Okay, can I have a follow-up question? So that's why that one of the questions we asked you just a couple of days ago was about how you actually track complaints that are filed by third parties versus those generated internally by ICANN because in this instant label is very important because - as you know - PTRP actually contemplates these third party complaints, not ICANN complaints.

And now on ICANN website you actually publish or you track PTRP complaints which are actually self-generated - ICANN self-generated complaints. And later on the track you will have the consumer trust and the AOC review. How are you going to categorize those tickets because you gave a perception that actually you are receiving 253 complaints - peak related complaints - which I don't think is a good story to tell in terms of new GTLD success.

So they are internally generated. I really think you should make a distinction whether it is a third part complaint or an ICANN generated complaint and that's especially so in relation to pick related commitments or obligations.

Victor Oppenheimer: Thank you for your comment. ICANN is making clarifications on the newsletters. I'm not sure - I don't think the latest one is already posted but that's the vehicle that we're using to clarify to the community what this proactive monitoring entails and that it's been really generated by us.

Pam Little: But this third party complaint has to follow the PTRP which is a contract mandated process. If it's ICANN generated complaint or inquiry then it doesn't apply. But what the outside world cannot tell the difference if you don't distinguish the two types. Thank you.

Victor Oppenheimer: Thank you (Pam).

Keith Drazek: Yes, I completely agree. I think that is an important distinction. So I've got (Reuben)'s in queue and then I see (Maxiam) has his hand up. Anybody else? We've come to the end of our allotted time with the compliance team. I think we can probably go a little bit longer but anyway, (Reuben) then (Maxiam).

Rubens Kuhl: (Reuben Q) for the record. First a comment. You mentioned that you're calling for the development of the framework. The contract doesn't call for development of framework. That comes from the NGPC decision and that's binding on staff, not on (unintelligible).

So we can help ICANN develop that framework but such an abduction of the framework is voluntary to the (unintelligible) unless conscious policy is enacted. So if you think of getting that framework as a compliance tool then it needs to go through a consensus policy, not through a workgroup development process.

So that's all. Just a comment. My questions about information security checks purchase. Much of the information that was asked for calls for a big information security and abuse handling expertise and I usually don't see that as a requirement when I can comply to both positions - open positions on CGR ICANN to be filled. This is not a requirement for a compliance officer. So I was trying to understand whether such information signature

expenditures would come if that's not a requirement for compliance personnel to have. Thank you.

Victor Oppenheimer: I'm Victor Oppenheimer for the record. I'm not sure I (unintelligible) not sure I got the jest of I guess your question. But what I do want to state is that the idea is - as many of you have stated - that there is an obligation at the very least to provide statistical reports and ICANN was asking related questions. True, they are not on the agreement but ICANN was trying to understand the level of readiness that each GTLD had with respect to the security threat. I don't know if I'm answering your question. Maybe if you can restate your question.

Rubens Kuhl: But to understand such revenues that would require information security checks to analyze the process to see if that was good enough to see if that's what fit but usually is not in the skillset of compliance.

Victor Oppenheimer: I see where you're going now. Thank you. So as I stated in my introductory statement, right now at this point ICANN is verifying the what, not the how. ICANN wants to have assurances that TLDs have processes in place to detect security threats. We are not at this very moment assessing or ranking them by from bad to poor to good or great. ICANN wants to make sure that TLDs have processes in place in case we do get actual PTRP complaints.

Keith Drazek: Okay so I have four people in queue and then we have about five minutes left so we have to go fairly quickly here. So I've got (Maxiam). There was - I think there was somebody back here. I'm sorry I don't recognize you. You can come to the microphone. Actually you were next in queue. Yes, thank you. Come on up.

Man: Okay.

Keith Drazek: Sorry. Thank you. So you and if you could identify yourself then (Maxiam) then (Donna) and (Reg).

Idia Nondelia: Good afternoon everyone. I'm (Idia Nondelia) (unintelligible) and we've got an inquiry regarding pick in September which we are applied in a timely manner and yesterday we got their follow-up inquiry asking us to provide a (unintelligible) with two selected registrars and I just would like to understand what's the reason for this request and what are you looking for in this REI's if you could explain.

Victor Oppenheimer: Sure. Thank you. Again this is - I can appreciate the feedback. This is exactly what I was stating in the reunion where perhaps our inquiries can explain a little bit more why we need this data and point taken. That is an adjustment that we look forward to making moving forward but if you recall, there is a mandatory provision for all TLDs - section 3B on specification eleven - and it requires that TLDs put in their RRAs certain provisions warning the registrant that their domain names can be suspended in case of abusive behavior of this sort of detail. So that is the - our only way to check whether that is in compliance or not.

Idia Nondelia: Okay, thank you so much.

Victor Oppenheimer: Okay, thank you and thank you for your question.

Maxiam Alzoba: (Maxiam Alsoba). Hi (Keith). Two small questions. First, these inquiries are actually out of scope of array so if we don't respond, nothing happens because it's not legally binding. The second, disclosure/information doesn't require by our array because we have to insert it into text but we don't have to provide

the text. Actually any disclosure of conventional information is punishable under the administrative court.

The second thing is about the abuse procedures. You told us that you have some means to prevent the parties from repeatedly requesting the same thing again and again and again. It would be really nice to see it in array because formally saying they see our array and they see that there is on punishment. For example, I can talk to students and 1000 students one day will harass all of us for some formal reason and it's not punishable.

And we need to insert something to prevent you from doing just unnecessary work, to prevent us from spending time and money on the same unnecessary work. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you (Maxiam). Next in the queue is (Donna) and then (Reg). Sorry (Reg).

Reg Levy: No worries.

Donna Austin: Thanks (Keith). I'm (Donna Austin).

So I just want to clarify something and I may have misunderstood what Victor said but I kind of get the sense that every time the GAC asks a question in the community about what ICANN is doing in relation to certain issues with the pick specs that there'll be an inquiry that comes from compliance to try to get the stats to respond. Can you - someone provide a response on that?

Victor Oppenheimer: Victor Oppenheimer. The answer is not necessarily. It just for pick, I mean I think we, you know, can agree that the pick has been one of the most sensitive issues in the new - this launch of new TLD and it's just not the GAC.

The community also had concerns and again I want to - I want to focus on the positive aspect of this monitoring which would show that like (Sally) stated yesterday, this is a DNS industry that operates with public interest in mind and that's what the numbers are going to show.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Victor. (Reg) and then Edmon and then we need to wrap up because (Maggie) and her team need to move on.

Reg Levy: I have a question building on (Arianna) question. She received a request for two particular RRAs as I understand it and I'm confused about why ICANN would request specific RRAs with a registrar because my understanding is that all RRAs must be identical and I also note that some registry's RRAs are trade secret to some extent so just simply issuing them to ICANN - I'm not positive that there is justification for that in the RRA and I'd like to have you speak to that.

Victor Oppenheimer: Thank you (Reg). Victor Oppenheimer for the record. Most likely if (Reggie)'s trees got two different RRAs, it meant I can certify in the RRA mandatory provisions for non-GAC streams versus the RRA mandatory provision for the GAC streams. And so that's the answer and the second question - I'm sorry - if you can restate the second question. I thought I had it but...

Reg Levy: That's alright. Where in the RRA does ICANN have the authority to demand trade secret documents including RRAs? I'm sorry - where in the RA does ICANN...

Victor Oppenheimer: Yes, thank you. So if you or TLDs think this is confidential information then per the agreement - I think it's article seven - there is a process where the registry would communicate to ICANN that this is confidential information

and ICANN is obligated to trade that information provided with the strictest standards and under strict confidentiality.

Reg Levy: Can I ask you to confirm that you said that it's totally okay to have different RRAs with different registrars as long as the GAC information in those RRAs is correct because that seems to be what you said earlier?

Victor Oppenheimer: Thank you. I didn't. You're right. The article 2.9 states that all RRAs have to be mandatory but of course they are our RRAs that require certain mandatory provisions versus others. So no, I've never intended to say that they're different.

Reg Levy: I'm sorry. I don't feel that the question about why you would ask for two particular registrar registry agreements has been addressed but I'm going to go to Edmon now.

Victor Oppenheimer: (Reg) we will take your question and we'll make sure we answer that either on a newsletter or some other public mechanism.

Reg Levy: Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Reg). Alright, last question. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So two items I want to bring up. First of all on the topic of the inquiries that were done for the pick. I - now I've heard the few times with compliance what ICANN has to say about this and referring back to what I think (Brent) said. We take notices from, you know, or inquiries - anything that comes from compliance very seriously. I hope you appreciate that.

And from what you've just said and from what compliance has told us, I'm thinking this is not your job. Get the GDD or the policy staff to send us the stuff. You're still trying to figure out what to monitor or what to do, right. This is not compliance. If at the end of the day policy staff or GDD staff collect the information from us and then feed to you and you take a look at it, that's fine. So don't do it again I guess I'm saying.

You can get policy staff to ask those questions just like surveys that come to us for policy development, right or GDD staff. But when compliance sends us something, you know, the whole registry, you know, the whole escalation chain goes up and then we - the whole organization looks at it. And it's, you know, I'm not saying that you shouldn't do that but not on these types of things. These types of things should be done by policy tasks or GDD. The more you talk about it, the more I think that should have been the case. That's one for you.

The other one is completely separate but recently we got a - we got a notice - well we got a - one of our registrars got a compliance notice and in it it implicated us as the registry and which created a situation, you know, that the registry is in compliant that it's not, you know, in compliant. And it obviously triggered a lot of fuss from our side as well and eventually we realized, you know, it's the registrar. Registrars are noticed but you have created a situation where the registrar thought the registry was the compliant issue.

So I think, you know, these are some of the issues. This is one thing also somewhat related to what I just said earlier to be a little bit more careful because, you know, when registry skipped these things, we tend to knee jerk a little bit which I guess is not unreasonable.

Victor Oppenheimer: Victor Oppenheimer. Thank you very much. I agree on your first point. I agree that TLD takes complaints notices very seriously. We - in general the collaboration has been extremely well so yes, we know you GTLDs like to collaborate.

Regarding that last statement, it would help us if you could send to with the subject line item 51 rated through stakeholder session and email them that and maybe we can clarify any things that need clarification.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you very much Victor and Edmon. So (Maggie) thank you very much for you and your team joining us. Please any last words? I know you have to go.

Maguy Serad: So we heard you. Now I'm not necessarily saying I agree with everything I've heard. Overall it's to do what - I think the most important message that I am proud to say to this audience - when meeting and talking to the board members. As recent as yesterday a board member stopped me in the hallway. Is it true that we have TLDs that are causing high risks? I said what are you basing your data on?

There are a lot of dialogues going on so our preventive approach - I'm not sure how policy can help review those things but we'll take that offline Edmon. But what compliance is doing here and I'm not selling it to you. First of all I want to thank you. I know it's a burden. I've been on the business side. I know what audits are. I know what inquiries cost the business unit. So thank you for collaborating.

Yes, you're not obligated to respond to everything. What we're doing is what if scenario. We don't want to wait until there's a harm or there's a pick TRP and we discover that there's going to be a remediation that's going to take

months to address or there's a complexity or something. We're trying to proactively bring confidence to this area by showing stats and data and facts.

Last thing is we have a session tomorrow that's all inclusive. I would encourage you to join us. But Thursday and this one reflects it just right - youth session is at 11:30. The agenda that's posted is correct. It's a closed session for registry operators. Please join us. Let's continue the dialogue. We're not going to present to you. We're just going to have the slides ready to kind of address if you want to talk to us but it's more of a Q&A and dialogue with us.

Thank you very much for your collaboration. That's the message I'm giving. Think of us at this point as almost like marketing because everybody's coming to compliance. Is it true? Is it true? We're saying did you read the newsletter. We're saying we're monitoring to everybody, you know, to (Pam)'s point and everybody else's point and (Keith)'s.

Why? Are they PIC DRP complaints? No but we are monitoring - the paragraph above says we're monitoring some of it. So I understand we need to improve on our communication. Thank you for the input. Grant audits are not every three years. Sorry to deceive you. The program we run for three - at the three year program was a project or a program to level set the baseline because there was a perceived perception that the system is broken. So this is our third year for the legacy TLDs and the registrars on the 2009 RAA.

Now we're going to put forth the methodology and approach going forward and we will bring it to you guys in an outreach session to collect your questions, bring more clarity and discuss with you. So look forward for additional collaboration. Thank you for your input and hope to see you on Thursday.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much (Maggie) and to your team as well. Thank you.

Allen Grogan: (Allen Grogan) just real quick. I know we need to get out of here but I just wanted to introduce myself to those of you who don't know me. I'm now a chief contract compliance officer. I worked with a lot of you during the process of signing the new GTLD register agreements and a lot of you do know me well.

I do want to start thinking more strategically and analytically about these contracts and how we're going to enforce the picks and what they mean and how they're going to be interpreted and I'd like to engage in a dialogue with them with you about where you think there are ambiguities or differences of opinion and how we can resolve those things.

In addition to (Maggie)'s compliance team, I want to thank - I think they're a great team and have done a superb job - very professional. I'm also going to have a consumer safeguards director reporting into me - position not filled. That's in recognition of the fact that a lot of the safeguards we're talking about in the new GTLD agreements and the RRAs are really directed more broadly than just protecting registrants or registries or registrars.

They're aimed at protecting the public and so we want to have somebody within the organization whose job it is to think about how to implement those kinds of protections and safeguards and maybe go beyond pure contractual safeguards and then we have to be careful about how we do that.

We can't exceed our authority or remit or our mission, our values but we might be able to do things to help encourage good behavior in the community through best practices through sharing ideas, education through things that

might help sort out some of the bad apples that give the industry a bad name for the actions of a very small number of people.

So happy to have this dialogue out in the hallway and if any of you show up on Thursday, we can continue it then too. Thank you.

Victor Oppenheimer: Thanks very much (Allen) and welcome. We look forward to working with you or continuing to work with you in some cases so thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay so we will continue on with our afternoon session - registry stakeholder group. The next item on our agenda is a discussion of the GSO council issues and motions. I know we talked about this at some length already with the registrars but I'm going to hand it back over to (Jonathon Robinson) for any further discussion as needed. (Jonathon).

(Jonathon Robinson): Thanks (Keith). It's (Jonathon) speaking. I feel that we dealt with emotions properly in the - with the registrars. I don't think we need to go through those again. We also dealt with the item on the agenda which is the liaison to the GAC so that was at the satisfactory dealt with.

Another placeholder on the agenda and in effect for dealing with a letter from the - there's been an exchange of communications with the ICANN and GAC regarding the Red Cross and IGO acronyms and Red Cross identifies. I'm not sure that's developed. We're kind of waiting to see and it's really an informational update.

So for the purposes of this group unless someone wants to discuss it, there's not a whole lot to be discussed at this point. There is a point that is perhaps worth talking about although I'm not that well equipped to lead it and that's the update on name collision because we've got - we've had the presentation

from (Francisco Hernandez) during the weekend sessions to the GNSO council. And really the question of the council is what if any policy work should be undertaken on the back of the name collision work.

Now I don't know if anyone's got any input but I certainly think here is an opportunity if anyone would like to make any input on this point.

Keith Drazek: (Jonathon) I'll take a stab at it and again it's not my area of expertise or specialty but my understanding is that what ICANN staff is currently looking at is the Jazz report, right and we know there's part one and part two. We haven't seen part two yet but there's a report that came out from the contractor JAS - JAS Global Advisors - that made some recommendations. And some of those recommendations go beyond the new GTLD program for example as it exists today.

It goes beyond the mitigation framework - management framework - whatever we're calling it - and actually looks ahead and looks ahead in terms of the lifecycle of the new GTLDs like at what point do you need to continue looking at the possibility or the potential of name collisions for this new GTLD program.

You know, a question about what I raised earlier when (Francisco) and the ICANN folks were here about, you know, the issue of the reregistration of expiring names and drop catching being a concern in the name collision space and looking ahead to say how do we assess the success of the name collision mitigation strategy today for future rounds.

So I think the questions that are being posed are in the context of like future work to deal with name collisions or address the name collision question. You know, I think some of those are reasonable. Some of them I think are like for

example the drop catching one I think is completely off base but it is something that I think we as a community and the council needs to take seriously, particularly if there are areas that need to be pushed back on because I fear that the staff through, you know, holding onto this Jazz report and saying look, it raised these questions. We need to initiate a PDP. I don't think we're quite there yet. So that's just my two cents. Anybody else want to jump in? Yes, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. Actually I think I agree with most of what you said. The only part of that I disagree is that I think we are ready to take, you know, do some policy work and for lack of a better way to say it, I think we need to preempt some precedence that stuff might set just like, you know, the drop catch issue.

If they hold onto it and jump right into implementation, you know, I think we want to open the policy discussion immediately to preempt that happening even. And there are other issues as well so and I think both the JS report and what staff has created is probably enough for us to start, you know, start down the path of a PDP. That's my view of it.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Edmon. That's a very reasonable and I think a great point so does anybody else want to jump in on this? I'll hand it back over to (Jonathon). (Reuben) go ahead.

Rubens Kuhl: Just putting on my CCTLD hat for a while. We have some very long experience in dealing with what we are now calling main collisions inside CCTLDs mostly due to use of searches. So we have avoided registering all the TLDs as SLDs for 20 years or something. Those problems still appear today as somewhat the new TLD experience is showing.

So there is still areas of improvement to look at name collisions and that would probably go into looking at (unintelligible) on wildcarding for registrants, not for registries. We have this today with a TLD that you are probably familiar with which is dot net. So if someone hacked into the net domain, we ban that user from wildcarding it to avoid issues with possibly dot net registrants.

So there are two issues out there that the group for decades - they were not introduced by new TLDs or any new TLDs. They come from a long time ago and they are (unintelligible) to look at that but when they mention drop catching, they are probably overreaching the name collision idea just to use (unintelligible) so far but that doesn't preclude drop catching from being an actual policy problem.

I think there is an issue for domain owners because their domains can be drop catch so that could be looked into but we just need to remove the name collision stuff from that because that moves into a territory where people use security risks to justify everything and that's bad. That's bad land. We don't want to go there but that doesn't mean we shouldn't look at drop catching as the main industry to see if that's a good practice or not.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks (Reuben). So (Chuck) yes - actually hold on one second. How much time do we have with the techs?

Man: We have to reset the recording so maybe (Chuck) you can wrap up and then we'll stop for a moment. They can reset the recording and we can start up again.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I want to follow up to (Reuben)'s question or comments and then I want to take it back to what Edmon brought up earlier today regarding the

expired domains policy which has already happened. Is there something missing in that expired domain names policy that you're aware of?

Rubens Kuhl: No, not from a security perspective but from a responsible industry behavior perspective perhaps. I do think that the process of removal and reassignment of domain names could be different and that would look good for us as an industry but that has really nothing to do with name collisions. We need to move that - take those apart as soon as we can.

Chuck Gomes: So this is (Chuck) again. Thanks (Reuben). So are you then more asking for a review of the expired names policy rather than a new issue?

Rubens Kuhl: Yes.

Keith Drazek: Okay. (Chuck) did you want to follow up with Edmon? Good. Okay so let's pause here. We're going to allow the technicians to reset the recording or do what they need to do so we'll take a pause. Everybody take a breath.

END