

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
Registrars Stakeholder Group
Tuesday 25 March 2014
Morning Session (Part 1)**

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.

Michele Neylon: Good morning everybody. For those of you in Singapore this is the Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting.

There's plenty of room near the front of the room if you want to move forward. We have a couple of microphones in the middle. You guys have all been quiet. This is wonderful.

Did you start recordings and all that? Okay. So the agenda is being uploaded at the moment for those of you who on the members list and which there's a link to us yesterday. It will appear magically on the screen I hope. Yes there we go.

So as usual our schedule is fairly packed. We will be in this room for most of the day apart from when we go to the board and the final session when we'll be moving to the registry's room. And there's the schedule.

Woman: Yes I'd like to take roll call for the members that are in the room.

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Ali)?

(Ali Hope): (Ali Hope), Host Europe Group, Treasurer.

(Jennifer Stanaford): (Jennifer Stanaford) with .com.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Blacknight, Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Jeffrey Eckhaus, Vice Chair.

John Berryhill: John Berryhill, iRegistry.

Susan Prosser: Susan Prosser, Domain Tools.

(Ben Anderson): Ben Anderson, Net Names.

Matt Serlin: Matt Serlin, Mark Monitor.

(Lisa Barks): (Lisa Barks), domain.com.

(Bob Wyan): (Bob Wyan) with .com.

(Graham Bunting): (Graham Bunting) from (Tocals).

(Summer Ornet Trydings): (Summer Ornet-Trydings).

(Fredi Melcur): (Fredi Melcur), (Unintelligible).

(Paul Goldstone): (Paul Goldstone), Domain.net.

(Amadeo Brill): (Amadeo Brill, (Core Hop).

Caitlin Tubergen: Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN staff.

Amy Bivins: Amy Bivins, ICANN staff.

Man: Okay.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann, Key Systems.

James Bladel: James Bladel, Go Daddy.

(Christian Herman): (Christian Hermann), Larson Data.

Peter Larson: Peter Larson, Larson Data.

(Bob Auten): (Bob Auten), (Nationic).

(Peter O'Ladie): (Peter O'Ladie), Authentic Web.

(Stuart Fellow): (Stuart Fellow), Net Names.

(Nertransis Acre): (Nertransis Acre).

(Stuart Telawatin):(Stuart Telawatkin), Telecom PNG.

(Uletta): (Uletta), JPRS.

Mary English: Mary English, Iron Mountain.

(Mike Murphy): (Mike Murphy), Commonality.

(Aaron Hickman): (Aaron Hickman), ICANN staff.

(Calvin Brown): (Calvin Brown) .africa.

Eleanor Bradley: Eleanor Bradley, Nominet.

Daniel Greenberg:Daniel Greenberg, Lexsynergy Energy.

(Mario Pesher): (Mario Pesher), Internetworks.

(Deldid Heischner): (Deldid Heischner).domain.

(Catherine Wynn):(Catherine Wynn).berlin.

(Michael Chohad):(Michael Chohad- Connor), Berlin.

(Neal Retresin): (Neal Retresin), 101.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings ICANN staff.

Jonathan Briggs: Jonathan Briggs, Individual.

(Rob Inurf): (Rob Inurf), KPMG.

(Mikey Huston): (Mikey Huston), KPMG.

Steve Allison: Steve Allison, ICANN and staff.

Man: Has the microphone been to this part of the room - I'm sorry back here as well? Is that everyone? We have folks on the phone. And we have a couple folks coming in. Could you...

Woman: Yes?

Man: Sorry, late introductions.

(Paul Maganva): (Paul Maganva), Global Sign.

(Joyce Lindsey): (Joyce Lindsey), 0079.

Michele Neylon: Thank you James. We will have the first guest speaker we have with us is Cyrus Namazi from ICANN staff.

But after we have a couple of minutes we're going - I'm going to hand over to Jeff to discuss some of the topics we'll be raising with the board later today. Jeff?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Sorry give me one second. I just want to bring up the email that's been going around that we've had. No that's not it. That's (unintelligible) out in front of you.

So I guess I'll start off as one of the items that I had brought up that I wanted to discuss with the board. And I see now that if you see (Bruce) sent around to the Stakeholder Group the board agenda. And one of those items is board GAC recommendation Implementation Working Group.

And the item that I wanted to discuss with the board was that the sessions, these topics where we have the category one implementation that came through there is no discussion with registrars or I don't believe for registries on how the implementation works.

It's sort of and I don't want to go through the whole top down or whatever, you know, sort of piece. But I think that there are a lot of pieces where they say to - for those of you who have read it the registries are said please include in your registry registrar agreement the following provisions and then it's left to registrars to implement that.

And besides that some of the language is vague and it's still unclear I think one of the issues that we've been banging the drum the drum about for a long time is there needs to be more interaction with the contracted parties with us especially with us because we're the ones who have to do the, you know, that sort of last mile and interact with the customers to talk to us about how that implementation happens and is this feasible, what is the best method for it so

that we don't get into situations where down the road we say oh you know what, this doesn't work we need to change this or this wasn't as it was planned.

And I think a little bit of foresight and advanced planning would be helpful. And it's something I'd like to bring up with the board that I don't know if we still are of contracted party working group if, you know, they want liaison for - from each group maybe that representatives is involved at, you know, one or two board calls a week if we have some other method were we talk to them in advance.

And I'd like to, you know, propose that as I said either we're on-call some method versus, you know, sort of the rules coming down from the mountain saying implement this and then we're left to try and figure it out versus talking to us in advance.

And I think we'd have some very good advice on what is the best method for implementation, what works what doesn't and what would help them achieve the result that they are looking for.

So that's something that I'm happy to lead in the discussions in the board. I don't know if anybody else has any feedback on that topic if it's sort of maybe my pet peeve and everyone says kill it or if there's any other feedback on that. I guess I'll open it up for the topic or move on to the other ones that are on our list.

Michele Neylon: So does anybody have any thoughts or input?

And don't all rush. And I can see the queue forming behind those microphones. It's quite worrying.

James Bladel: James from Go Daddy with nothing really critical to add more of a question for Jeff and any of the other folks who are maybe have dual interest and are also involved in the registry side of this issue.

Did the registries have any kind of bilateral negotiations with the GAC on these safeguards? I mean I feel like if they're being handed down to registrars it's probably because the registries were also sort of just had these hoisted upon them as well.

So I don't know that it's a case where registrars were left out of the conversation entirely or if it was just a complete top-down exercise and everybody was left out of the channel.

And I guess then my question is what do we do about it?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Right. So from what I understand is that, you know, if you - if everyone here followed the sort of back and forth with the GAC advice and the letters and then the board came back, there was a letter from Steve Crocker to (Heather) that said here's what we're thinking about here, you know, they laid that whole piece out. And I think that letter was sent on October 29.

And then there was no substantial feedback so they basically said we're now going to turn that into I think it was Spec 11 or I think it's Spec 11 on the registry agreement.

And there was no interaction with the registry saying here's what we're, you know, here's what we're thinking. What do you think about that?

It was just saying here was the letter. We're now turning this into a spec you need to sign it or, you know, agree to it and that this was sort of handed off for, you know, there was no working group, no implementation.

And looking at the GAC board agenda it says that there is a GAC or implementation Working Group but it's weird that there is no contracted parties in that Implementation Working Group.

James Bladel: So then I guess the question to us in terms of what we do about it I mean are we talking like about a reconsideration request or something?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: No I think for me I would say I would, you know, I already got the sleeves rolled up. I would, you know, volunteer myself to be in a sort of, you know, consultative working group or whatever it may be. Others would want to do to work on how we work through those implementations before they become a specification or, you know, sort of maybe a registry registrar advisory panel -- something along those lines so that some of the issues that we see are headed off at the pass before once they're written into a contract it's very difficult to, you know, make those changes. I'd rather have that consultative discussion before it's turned into a contract.

James Bladel: Okay. And, you know, forgive me if I feel like I'm just asking a whole bunch of newbie questions here but they're not going to just form that group or that effort. I mean even if we want to get involved the question is how do we compel them to open that dialogue because from their perspective this is done right? So we want them to reopen this issue or a new issue?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: I think this one is sort of its baked.

James Bladel: Okay.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: I think it's more of a go forward basis to get this going. And I think we've mentioned it in the past and that they've said great idea, great idea. But I think maybe as a group we need to put down a specific proposal and send it to them as an official request for this to happen going forward.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. I'm just being reminded to remind everybody to state their names for the remote participants and transcripts and everything. Thanks.

Moving on the - another topic that we wanted to raise with the board was with respect to Fadi representing registrars as one net.

Does somebody want to speak to that one?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Yes so I can speak to that one. I don't know if...

Michele Neylon: Jeff.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: No Jeff. I'm sorry. So I don't know if I - people want me to speak to that one at the board but I'll speak to that right now.

So for those of you who may or may not know our bylaws very well both registries and registrars are prohibitive from acting as a group outside of sort of this ICANN construct.

So this, you know, what's going to happen to this one net, this whole meeting I'm honestly still somewhat at a loss there.

But and it's not because, you know, I'm sort of looking down. I just haven't had a chance to follow all of these pieces. But we are not as a group allowed to be represented there ourselves because it's not within ICANN.

And if you read the letter that Fadi sent he said I will be representing registries and registrars there, would love to know, you know, what's the plan for that? Is it something the board is aware about - aware of that plan?

Is that something we'll know about? I'm assuming it's coming up in the next couple of weeks.

So that was one of the topics that had gone around the people would like to know is like how are our interests going to be represented?

Is it just that - I mean I don't know if this is for just, you know, Fadi or is it the whole board how is that discussion being brought up? And again is there any sort of consultation with us on and maybe that could be wrapped in on what are our concerns about this meeting? Hopefully some others will be able to speak more to it since who are following the internet governance debate better more, closely than I am.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Jeff. That was Michele Neylon the record. A couple of us are involved in the Cross Community Working Group. I know several people have been trying to follow the (one net) discussion.

I think Ali has (Ali Hope) has plan to attend the meeting in Brazil. I'm not sure if there's anybody else want to speak to this.

Mr. Bladel has volunteered. Yes again. Good morning James.

James Bladel: Oh thanks. So (Ali) and I were both I think invited to attend this meeting. Are you going for sure because I had a family conflict? I don't think...

(Ali Hope): Yes.

James Bladel: ...I'm going to build a make it.

(Ali Hope): Yes I'm going.

James Bladel: I think the question that, you know, no one has been able to answer at this conference is what - what's the - and maybe it's a question to the board. What do they see this conference achieving now that the in the light of this amendment a lot of - they'll point out oh, you know, we've got X number of people attending. We've got Y number of contributions coming in from the community.

But a lot of those contributions are not compatible with the NTIA announcement, you know, or potentially incompatible with the NTIA announcement.

So the question then becomes did, you know, was this done to take the air out of the sails of this Brazil conference or is it going to go off in a different direction or how do they see that the importance of this conference in light of that announcement? That would be my question to the board.

Michele Neylon: So James is that you volunteering to help lead the discussion with the board?

James Bladel: Sure I would love to.

Michele Neylon: Thank you James. Another topic that somebody wanted - I hear from Cyrus and Mike. Okay so what we'll do is we'll hand over to Cyrus and Mike now and we can come back to this later in the day as we have breaks between speakers and everything else.

And obviously if anybody has any strong feelings please do email us. Good morning Cyrus, good morning Mr. Zupke.

So we have Mr. Cyrus Namazi from ICANN and Mike Zupke who most of you I'm sure you know are joining us here so I'll hand over to Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Good morning everybody. Thank you Michele, always a pleasure to be here with the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Don't have much to update you on that you don't know already. Just briefly from the composition of our registrar services team let me just maybe spend a couple of minutes to describe to you how our team is organized post the reorganization of ICANN by Fadi last summer when he decided to create the Global Domains Division which is now headed by Akram.

And the real objective there was to separate the policymaking and what we call stakeholder engagement pieces which is really separate from the contracted parties of which you and the registries are a part from the operational side.

So the GDD is really focused on implementing policies providing you services and enforcing policies basically.

So I belong to the GDD side under Akram. Two parallel teams exist there. One of them is headed by me and it's called Domain Name Services and I'll describe to you shortly what that means.

And then counterpart to that is my colleague (Christine Billet) who is in charge of our operations and customer support.

Within my team I have five smaller teams. One of them of course is the Registrar Services Team that until recently has been headed by (Tim Kohl). But as you probably know (Tim) has been having some severe medical issues.

He came back briefly in the fall of last year but unfortunately his medical issues have reoccurred so he's back on medical leave. So I'm happy to say that Mike Zupke has stepped up to fill that position for us.

The other change in the Register Services Team was affected Steve Gobin who was our representative in Brussels has left the company as of the earlier part of this year.

We're actively actually recruiting additional people to add in our Brussels and Singapore offices. We've had Amy Bivins joining us in our Washington DC office. And of course you guys know - you all know Caitlin as well and (Kimberly).

So the Registrar Services Team is headed by Mike. Parallel to that is our Registrar Re-Services Team that's headed by Krista Papac.

We also actually hold out what we call Technical Services Team which used to be a part of our Registry Services Team and now reports directly to me under (Francisco Arias). And we have (Gustavo Lozano) also as a part of that team.

And I also have a team focusing on what we call policy research. And I was reminded by my GNSO colleagues yesterday that I make sure that the definition of policy research for us is with the little T.

It's not, you know, the objective is not for us to make policy but actually just to understand the existing policies, be aware of them and interpret them and define and implement the right services based on those policies.

And the last leg of my team is the IDN variant project that I guess ICANN has been involved in and that's headed by (Nayo Lasaras).

So that's basically the composition of the team. Instead of me telling you more things I wanted to actually have more of a dialogue perhaps. And let's open it up. I want to hear your issues and be able to hopefully respond to them. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Cyrus. And Michele speaking just for the record, just to make things a little bit easier for those of you who may not be familiar with all of Cyrus's team Caitlin and Amy if you wouldn't mind standing up and making yourselves known?

Okay. So does anybody have any questions, any queries, any thoughts, any comments, any rants -- anything? Rant...

(Amadeo Brill): Yes.

Michele Neylon: ...(Amadeo) you - rant), understand this? Yes okay.

(Amadeo Brill): I'm warming myself up with that all morning.

Michele Neylon: Well this is because I've been prepping you for this.

(Amadeo Brill): Okay and may I say something which is not a rant?

Michele Neylon: Give your name first for the record please?

(Amadeo Brill): Okay (Amadeo Brill), (Core Hop). I have a couple - a question - a suggestion or a request more (unintelligible).

The suggestion is just from a suggestion for the registrar team two outreach to the individual registrars more regards regarding the 2013 RAA the TMCH requirements in new gTLDs.

There's a meeting a couple of meetings in Europe where, you know, most of the registrars seem to be I would say relatively unaware of all this.

Not those that are in the register list, not those that come to ICANN meetings. But there is, you know, those (unintelligible) that seem to be a little bit, you know, out of the picture and out in the room trying to, you know, wait for

something and they don't know exactly what they are supposed to do and they should.

I think that information is very clear. But if you just take the list of registrars that have not yet applied for 2013 some of them is just willing decision, some of them is because of in Europe for the waiver, some others because, you know, group strategy.

But we - I find this depressingly high the number of them simply are not completely aware that they should sign the new RAA for the things that are coming now. And then they have surprises.

So if you - I know that now you really have anybody in Europe which is the other way we experience that.

They're looking for that. But you if you have any way to just push for those, don't come to the meetings and even perhaps some of those that don't read English that well that would be somehow helpful.

And the other question is the request. Is there any way that we can as a group channel our problems and compliance with the activities of some new registries with the registrar services?

Should we go to the registrar services? Should we go to compliance? Compliance seems like a high bar. And you can go there, you have to be very formal and they want complaints one by one.

But very often is simply that we relive that some registries are understand the basics of equal treatment for registrars or, you know, even what the agreements of the RAA should be like or even, you know, they start without an RAA, et cetera.

And we tell them we try to teach them individually it doesn't work. Perhaps if we - it could just contact registrar group and the register group deals with the registry whoever contact this registry that will be so much easier.

Now in a moment we have lots of new registries coming and quite frankly it's been a little bit of a mess.

And we are not sure we can do that there because there is sometimes we don't know exactly who is what right?

So what should - if we are a registrar whether we can go to a registry for this, should we go to registrar, we should go to ICANN legal, to compliance, to the ombudsman or nowhere which is where it normally ends.

Michele Neylon: Thank you (Amadeo). Cyrus would you like to address that?

Cyrus Namazi: Sure, thank you (Amadeo). In regards to your first point it sounds to me like you're highlighting maybe be a bit of a deficiency in our outreach in getting the message out to all of the registrars in Europe.

I'm very open to suggestions. I don't particularly think it's because Steve Gobin is not in our Brussels office anymore.

But if there are things you think we should be doing to make sure that the message gets out there let us know.

Just by the way of reference ICANN has roughly 1000 or so accredited registrars worldwide of which we have about 17% of them located in European Union including Russia of which I think announced we have about 170 or so.

And of those 50%, nearly 50% have already signed on to the 2013 RA. I'm very pleased actually to see the progress.

Roughly 83% of all domains are now under the 2013 RAA which I think is a really substantial accomplishment for us. And that translates into about 1/3 of all registrars FYI.

But in terms of getting the message out if we can work to get it to identify where we need to go to inform these contracted parties and how let us know.

We actually like I said are proactively recruiting for additional staff in our Istanbul office in particular to continue to service and support our partners in Europe.

To your second point if there's any ambiguity in regards to actions by a registrar or a registry that you need some direction from ICANN in terms of where you need to go within ICANN to address it you can always come to us.

And part of Mike's job and his team and parallel to that Krista and her team on the registry side is to really serve as your needs.

So you should never hesitate to reach out to us with a concern that you have, any question that you have. And you always have a direct line to me as well 100% of the time. So I hope that answers your question.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Cyrus. Just a little bit of extra information. The registrar XCOM did meet with ICANN staff yesterday morning to go over a couple of high level issues that we wanted to raise. And one of them was specifically around this.

Just we've got one remote question and then we have Volker. I have just one question for you Cyrus.

One of the criticisms several the European registers have raised is all about there is a linguistic challenge from several of them, the - their command of English may not be the best. And has ICANN got any plans to address that?

In other words do you have plans to start sending out some of those notices in languages other than English?

Cyrus Namazi: You're talking about the communiqué that we send out in the form of email and such?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Cyrus Namazi: I mean you might want to come back to that at some point. And if you could come back to us on that it would be appreciated.

And go ahead Caitlin.

Caitlin Tubergeren: This is Caitlin Tubergeren again reading - oh sorry Cyrus do you want to address that, reading a question from remote participant Rob Golding.

The question is EU registrars have been without Steve Gobin for several months now. Who is acting in his place? Why is - when is a replacement sought?

Cyrus Namazi: Yes thank you. In terms of like I said if you don't know where to go to get your comments, questions, needs addressed go to Mike and you can of course always go to me.

And like I said we are actually actively recruiting for two positions to service the needs of our Europe, Middle East and Africa constituencies from Istanbul.

And we have some very good candidates in the pipeline. It unfortunately has been a longer process than what I would've like it to be for a variety of reasons but we're proactively looking to fill that position - those positions actually.

But if you have any good candidates though send them to me.

Michele Neylon: You mean to say you want us to give up our bad staff is that it?

Cyrus Namazi: Well we're all in this together.

Michele Neylon: Volker and then James.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Volker Greimann speaking for the record picking up on something that Cyrus just said.

I feel that the needs of the European registrars are currently not being serviced by ICANN in a way that's - we were led to believe when we negotiated the RAA in good faith.

We talked about the data retention problem. I think even from day one of ICANN asking to perform data protection so ICANN has been aware, acutely aware of the problem or at least we thought we had made them aware of the problem.

However during the negotiations during registrars providing waiver requests it has become painfully evident that ICANN does not ever see the problem at the same level that we do or it does not even understand what we mean when we have a problem with data retention.

Now that we are in negotiations I would like to stress that this is again is not what we're seeking. We cannot negotiate measures of law. We cannot meet like on a bazaar and agree on a timeframe that might be appropriate or not.

What we need is a timeframe that exempts the registrar from data retention beyond the end of the contract which is compatible to local law. I.e. in most European countries I'm not aware of any U countries that handle this differently.

We need a legal basis of that allows us to retain data after the contract has ended. This is not a matter of let's do six months. This is a matter of we do this for the customer, do that for the customer. The customer has this right against us for this amount of time.

And for this amount of time where the customer still has a right against us still can't enforce something against us, still kind of asks us to do something.

We could argue that the contract continues and we are therefore allowed to keep certain data.

We're not asking to delete all the data elements immediately. We're just asking that we limit it to what we have to keep to what the law allows us to do.

And there has to be a specific provision in each in the law that allows us to do something. Hence provisions, business purposes are one thing, billing purposes are another. But we need to find a solution here and solutions based on law and not in the negotiations. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Cyrus do you want to address that?

Cyrus Namazi: Yes mean I understand that I mean this is more of a comment than a question. And of course myself, Mike and Caitlin and quite a few of you have been intimately involved in these discussions for quite some time.

I just want to reiterate the fact that I'm completely in tune with the time sensitivity of this situation and the grand magnitude of it.

We're not trying to enforce something that actually I don't know is for ICANN.

It's the - from my perspective the RAA is there because it was - it's the representation and the culmination of the entire community of ICANN which ends up becoming a contract between ICANN and the registrar.

The particular interpretations of privacy laws in each jurisdiction within Europe and beyond really has really turned out to be a much more complex problem than I think many of us at least myself initially were led to believe.

The fact that it's not moving as fast as we would like to is not by any means because of inaction or lack of focus on the part of ICANN. We have local counsel in Europe in each jurisdiction for which we've received a request for a waiver proactively engaging in discussion with your representatives.

The law as you know is not definitively black and white in terms of its requirements when it comes to retention of personal data.

So it really has come to being able to define the gray areas of these particular laws in each jurisdiction again. And of course each site - our side and your side end up with different interpretations.

So that I just want to stress the fact that we're moving this as fast as we can. And I'm very sensitive to and in tune with the fact that it might be stressing some of, you know, your business requirements in terms of being able to participate in the new gTLD program. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: We have one remote oh sorry. Go ahead.

Mike Zupke: Do you mind if I just add to that? So this is Mike Zupke and I just wanted to add that, you know, what I heard Volker say is exactly where we want to end up.

What we want to understand is what exactly are the requirements that are in place for registrars in terms of, you know, the billing data and that sort of thing?

And so, you know, while we've sort of used the word negotiation I see this as more of like a collective defining of what those parameters are.

So, you know, I don't think this is supposed to be a, you know, a situation where we've got, you know, two people on different sides of the table negotiating, you know, what the outcome should be.

Is what we're really trying to understand is what the law is. And I think as Cyrus said very well it's not always perfectly clear.

Michele Neylon: We have one remote participant and then we'll go to James.

Caitlin Tubergen: Caitlin Tubergen reading a question on behalf of Rob Golding. I'm sure all these groups Fadi arbitrarily decided to set up are great.

What was the reason there wasn't a public comment on them before spending time, resources, and more importantly our customer's money on these things? Yet every aspect of our contract including items which are law and not open for negotiation seems to be put out for all and sundry to discuss?

Cyrus Namazi: I'm sorry Caitlin can you read that again? I didn't quite follow it?

Caitlin Tubergen: The question is I'm sure all these groups Fadi arbitrarily decided to set up our great. What was the reason there wasn't a public comment on them before spending time, resources and more importantly our customer's money on these things? Yet every aspect of our contract including items which are law and not open for negotiation seems to be put out for all and sundry to discuss?

Cyrus Namazi: So if I - thank you Rob. If I understand the question correctly this is in regards to some of the strategy panels and such?

Michele Neylon: Cyrus this is a - this is Michele speaking for the record. It's a combination of the strategy panels plus - well other things but the strategy panels is part of those and the fact that strategy panels were set up.

There's no comment yes and all aspects about the contracts that ICANN has with the registrars including things as far as we're concerned are matters of local law are being put out for public comment.

Cyrus Namazi: So I think it's important to make the distinction between what we end up doing between ICANN and the contracted party which is obviously culminated through a legal contract versus what ICANN, Fadi, and the leadership of ICANN tries to determine as a proposed course of action to the community.

So what the strategic panel then and other groups within that working environment are doing is to come up with proposals for the community.

It's not definitive directions and courses of actions that they decide on and top-down - up down. It's being imposed on the community.

I hope I'm answering your question Rob. Please feel free to reach out to me on the side if I'm not responding to your question.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. James and then I think (Amadeo) but next will be Volker.

James Bladel: I think we're recycling speakers after me so or I'm recycled speaker probably. So just I don't want to belabor this point too much further. I think that we've got quite a bit going on on the weekend to discuss this.

I just wanted to let registrars know that on the Wednesday session of the - your counselors have added this to the agenda for the Wednesday session.

There will be a public - there's not a formal motion or anything like that on the agenda but there is a discussion an open sort of dialogue with the community about what we should be doing in this area, how we can maybe unstick this gear...

Michele Neylon: What time is that James?

James Bladel: That is Wednesday I don't know afternoon...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think that's at 1:30.

James Bladel: Yes it's in the main room, the council meeting and it's going to be addressed later on in the second half of the agenda.

So I would say encourage registrars please come to that session. And let's make sure that we get all of our voices heard. And for those of you who believe while this is a European registrar problem I would say that you might want to consider how this will play out in the future as other countries are watching this.

I think I've heard Argentina in some other South American or Latin American countries are watching how this plays out in the EU.

We've had other folks aggressively point out that this is something that affects EU registrants, not EU registrars.

So, you know, this is proliferating and spreading and so we need to get some resolution to this. Please come to that session on Monday where we can just

discuss what, you know, what the issues are and what our potential options are.

But my actual question for you Cyrus is something that just popped into my head while you were speaking before. And I don't know that we've actually ever touched on the subject which is you said you're expanding your headcount in Brussels and Istanbul or was it just Istanbul?

Cyrus Namazi: No Istanbul and Singapore.

James Bladel: Istanbul and Singapore okay. And my question is do we have any anything in place regarding ICANN recruiting directly from contracted parties?

Do we want that in place or is that - I mean it's a different story if folks were to come to ICANN and say hey, you know, I've been working as a registrar and it's great. But I really would it's been my dream to work for ICANN all these years -- that's one thing.

But think, you know, having ICANN actively recruiting employees from its contracted parties is there anything in any of our agreements that would preclude that?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you James. It's not something that I'm aware of. We definitely are not engaged in the practice of call it poaching of contracted parties, not my words but specifically we post our opening in various places and then people approach us. We've had people actually approaching us from certain registrars.

I consider that (Neal) said to be extremely helpful for what we're trying to do together here but we're definitely sensitive that there is a line that we don't want to cross.

James Bladel: Yes. Yes and I think that that's the key right is is a very unique and some might say specific exclusive set of skills. And, you know, it's one of the reasons why we value...

Cyrus Namazi: And gray area actually as well, yes.

James Bladel: Yes thank you.

Michele Neylon: (Amadeo) go ahead.

(Amadeo Brill): Okay so (unintelligible), you know, this new and never talks about topic of data retention. There's something about the issue itself just (unintelligible) your question, you know, I don't understand since I arrived here we have these public comment period now for, you know, the (unintelligible) for datasets.

My question to you Cyrus what's the position that we, the parties that we have requested a waiver should take here?

I understand and correct me -- if that's wrong that -- this is not a substitute for the new extensions we are having and, you know, the negotiations with all of the caveats like Volker said and essentially we're having with (unintelligible).

The question is whether you expect us to respond as part of this negotiation process? We are fit to do it. It's better we go don't it because we are in negotiations.

I'm a little lost about who is really these (directors are) is the whole communities, the registers, the European registrars? Is the people that have asked the waiver? Could you clarify that for me?

Cyrus Namazi: Yes thank you (Amadeo). What we posted a few days ago is definitely not intended to be a substitute for the discussions that are going on in regards to waiver requests that we have from different jurisdictions.

The true objective of that exercise was that in one particular jurisdiction we actually ran into somewhat of a resistance to continue to engage in negotiations until there was a well-defined bit of well definitions of each particular set of data that we we're asking for retention.

And that actually got us thinking that maybe this is actually not a bad exercise for us to engage the entire community on in terms of here is what we think should be retained and here is why. Are we're on the right track?

But again that's sort of mutually exclusive from being able to continue to move the ball forward and hopefully be able to close on issuing waivers for requests that have come in.

As you probably know to date we've received 15 requests for waiver of data retention in different shapes and forms. And I think it's coming from nine jurisdictions in Europe if I'm not mistaken.

We have granted one in France already. We just posted one that we notice a grant for Belgium. We have one for Luxembourg that actually if things go as I expect them to go should be posted shortly.

I think in the Netherlands we're actually making extremely good progress. I hope and expect to close that in the next couple weeks.

And then in parallel there are some jurisdictions. Germany is an example of it where things do appear to be less well-defined.

And, you know, the collaborative effort that (Michael) has - was referring to is not being as productive.

So this posting of the definition of the required data and why is intended to help in that process. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Mr. Greimann.

Volker Greimann: Yes thank you, Volker Greimann for the record. Let me start with this brief statement and then end with a question.

You had just said that it is less well-defined in Germany. That just means that if it's not defined it's not allowed. That's the way the German law is structured. So when you say it's less well-defined it probably means it's not allowed.

I also appreciate that you said that you're working on this as fast as you can however this may not be fast enough for some of the registrars as their current RNAs are running out and they need to renew under the new RAA which they might not be able to do with good intentions if they have to do something under the RAA that they're not allowed to do under the law.

So they are faced with two options of breaking the law or violating the RAA, both not very fun for a registrar that wants to do business in this sphere for a long time and wants to be seen as a reliable and trustworthy partner by all parties.

Therefore does ICANN consider the possibility to grant waivers that have been requested where no progress has been made so far, put out those waivers for public comment but only for public comment on the fact of law, i.e., if someone can comment in a way that presents should shed light on some factor of the request or the law in that country.

If they can say yes, that's not quite correct. Here if you interpret that now this way then you might be able to do one more - one month more for this reason legal reason?

That way you would have to have - you would have registrars that would be able to sign on to the new RAA that would be able to work with the new gTLDs, have a waiver in place even though it's only a temporary one based that could be withdrawn at some point but only withdrawn if there is actual fact of law that would turn out that the waiver request might have been too narrow.

And when those facts of laws have been uncovered in the public comment phase approval could be granted in the place of the temporary waiver? Would that be a solution that ICANN might consider and consider fast?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Volker. The idea of granting a temporary waiver is something that at least with those of you who have been engaged with us in these discussions we have discussed.

I think that challenge that we run into is that the request has been for a, an across the board waiver for zero retention of data. And that's not something that we find to be practical. In fact it's actually a lot less than what you do already on your 2009 RAA to begin with.

We did embark on a set of discussions that I myself with Michele had with a sort of a preliminary proposal from us in terms of something that was a subset of what's in the 2013 RAA. But it was not accepted I guess by the parties that this was being proposed to.

I guess what I'm trying to say is that we're very open to come up with creative solutions that will keep us moving while we get our arms around the scope of the issue and collectively decide, you know, where the boundaries are and the lines of demarcation are.

But I'm sorry to say that I don't think we've seen anything that we would find to be acceptable to the community the ICANN represents in this particular case.

Volker Greimann: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Do we have any remote questions before we go to (Amadeo)? No okay.
(Amadeo)?

(Amadeo Brill): Third and last time (Amadeo Brill) (Core Hop). And (unintelligible) what Volker said about temporary waivers there's another way of looking at that. And I think especially about those registrars that up till now have been very reluctant to sign the RAA because they don't want to violate the local law or agreement. But, you know, time is running out for some of them because they're all 2009 RAAs will expire soon.

Temporary waivers are what they are. But at the very least could we have something like a compliance waiver or a compliance declaration that during the waiver negotiation there will be no compliance procedures on these procedures precisely because we are still in negotiation with ICANN?

And I think that at least this is feasible because it doesn't set the point of, you know, amending the construct itself. It simply recognizes that these being negotiating and negotiated.

And that would help some of things that have been holding from signing the agreement till now that start to being a really difficult competitive situation especially when (errors) will come to an expiration.

And let me add something about this compliance waiver for this compliance declarations or statements or, you know, these compliance have said that grace period if you want.

ICANN has told Jones Day, at least part of Jones Day as dealing with us that in the negotiation nothing about disclosure that is who we should give the data that we should retain to can be negotiated.

For us this is an integral part of the waiver on the compliance. We cannot accept even a single day of data retention obligation if Article 343 is not amended.

If Article 343 is not amended a valuation will be made, you know, some assurances from compliance that we will not be forced to violate our own jurisdiction and, you know, disclosing that data, you know, beyond the competing law enforcement authorities which is what our legal regime requires.

So it's beyond the waiver language itself and the conflict amendments is there room for negotiating compliance waivers or compliance grace periods for these things?

Michele Neylon: Cyrus before you address that just for the record if you gave me that kind of insurance I'd sign the damn thing today.

Cyrus Namazi: Let me take that back to our team. I can't give that assurance without actually obviously checking with our compliance team and our legal team.

But I guess the overarching message here is that I continue to be an advocate of continuing the dialogue with you and that if there are creative ways to keep the ball moving and obviously enable you to continue to do your business while we get our arms around this issue as I said earlier I'm very open to go champion it for us for all of us inside ICANN.

And I just want to clarify one more thing that the RAA is very specific in regards to the fact that you cannot and will not be in violation of your own local law.

And if there is a law that actually sort of overrules what the RAA requires then it prevails. So we would never put you in that position. I just wanted to state that for the record. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Do we have anybody on remote? No. For those of you that have joined us welcome. As I see more people arriving in I think having the gala on a Monday night has led to a slightly different timing for people's Tuesday morning.

The timetable has an update from Mr. Zupke in this slot because as Cyrus is still in the room and hasn't run I if anybody has any questions for Cyrus now is the time.

Cyrus Namazi: Although I'm here until Friday feel free to reach out to me. I don't think this particular half an hour slot should be the only time that we communicate. I just want to make sure.

But the big part of my job is to ensure that I serve your needs so feel free to reach out anytime.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you Cyrus. Just with respect to the meeting we had with Cyrus and Akram yesterday we've also discussed potentially the - having kind of more regular calls with Cyrus and others to address any kind of ongoing implementation issues or areas where there are issues around the interpretation of certain contract fields.

Maybe (Jennifer) wants to speak to some of this? Sorry I feel like putting you on the spot I mean...

(Jennifer Stanaford): No that's all right.

Michele Neylon: No I believe discussions we have (unintelligible) registrars and what generally.

(Jennifer Stanaford): (Unintelligible) with registrars in general. So it was proposed that we were possibly going to have a monthly call with the team.

So I think that that's the best thing to move forward in increasing the communications and not waiting to have a discussion at every ICANN meeting.

Cyrus Namazi: Absolutely. And I'm a big fan of communication and open communication. So if you think it makes sense for us to have a standing teleconference on a monthly basis or twice monthly we're in if it helps with the communication with the raising of issues and defining solutions for them I think it's a good idea frankly. But if you guys are up for it let's do it.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Mr. Zupke do you have a...

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Michele and the Stakeholder Group for the opportunity for me to be here.

Michele Neylon: Yes I look forward to working with you again soon Cyrus. Thank you.

Cyrus Namazi: I look forward to your blog.

Michele Neylon: Mr. Zupke we'll hand it over to you.

Mike Zupke: Thanks Michele. This is Mike Zupke for the record. So I just made a little list of things I thought might be of interest to registrars but by all means if there are things that you'd like an update on you can add them to my list.

What I've got here are just a quick update on some workshops that are going on tomorrow that I think are of interest.

Caitlin offered to give an update that she gave the GNSO on implementation of policies that affect registrars.

Steve Allison is here and he was going to give an update on (Aeros) and Whois query portal. Anything that we should add to the list or is that pretty good?

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Does anybody have any questions or queries for Mike? Well this is going to be like the shortest update from Mike ever.

Mike Zupke: Well I haven't started yet.

Michele Neylon: Oh sorry okay. Are there any other topics anybody would like Mike to address?

Mike Zupke: Okay and, you know, of course we could always do question afterwards. So Cyrus introduced Amy Bivins and Caitlin Tuberger who are sitting over there. And Amy joined us in January I think right? Yes. So she's working at our Washington DC office.

Right now she and Caitlin are both doing a lot of policy implementation stuff and also helping to fill in on some of the application review work that was being done in Brussels before.

So I just want to make sure that everybody, you know, knows who she is. And Amy's background was at Bloomberg BNA.

She was a writer there. And so that's one of her strengths that we're trying to take advantage of is in our communications both the registers and others is using her excellent writing skills in that way.

So I thought I'll just give a quick update on some workshops and the meeting that's going on tomorrow.

At noon Wednesday in the Moore room is the Registrar WHOIS Validation Working Group meeting that, you know, most of the people in this room are already a part of that working group. But if you're now you're more than welcome to come and join.

The purpose of the working group is to work on an issue that's identified in the 2013 RAA. In particular the RAA says registrars must perform across field address validation on the registered name holder's address and the account holder's address and cross field validation meaning that they house number exists on the street, the street exists in the city, the city in the province, the province in the country and postal code is correct -- all of those things.

But it doesn't become effective until registrars and ICANN have come to an agreement that such validation is technically in commercially feasible.

And we measure that agreement by a vote of the working group where 2/3 of the registrar working group one vote per registrar would agree with ICANN and at some point yes we think this is technically and commercially feasible.

So we have a, our first face to face meeting is tomorrow and part of that is because we've never met face to face just to sort of have that opportunity to have kind of a more real-time live interaction.

The other thing is that we've got some issues to address. One is that along with the expert working group we pushed out an RFI asking for information from vendors to provide data validation services.

We have some responses that we can talk about. The other thing is the Expert Working Group put out a survey to ccTLD operators talking about data validation and other issues.

Add one of the questions on the survey was are you interested in potentially working with ICANN or other ccTLDs in trying to come up with sort of a universal data validation scheme?

So we got responses from some ccTLDs on that. And so a question for our working group is how do we want to integrate them into our work if at all or at least how do we want to include them in the process?

So those are two big issues that we're going to discuss tomorrow. And I think it will be worthwhile to, you know, to have as many registrars as we come - as we can come to that.

It's a closed meeting. I don't think it appears in the public schedule so you might want to just make a note of it. It's at noon. The room is Moore. It will be available on Adobe Connect. And rather than use the public URL for that room, the Adobe Connect room it will be icann.adobeconnect.com/mikezupke.

And I'll just send that link to the Working Group and the Registrar XCOM here then make sure that the Stakeholder Group is aware of that if you can't attend in person would like to attend remotely.

We've got an RAA FAQs workshop at 1:30 tomorrow which Caitlin is leading. This is intended to be kind of a overview of some of the most frequently asked questions.

You know, you're probably where we have the RAA questions ticket queue. And so we got some of the high points from that and more importantly I think is an opportunity for registrars to ask questions either of staff or of each other.

We put out word maybe a week or two ago saying that if registrars would like to sort of help in kind of a leadership role in that we'd welcome that. That's in this room Cannon.

And so feel free to bring any questions you have about the 2013 RAA.

And then at 3:30 is a workshop on I just wrote here the word underserved. And that was supposed to remind me of the full title. But it's about supporting marketplace in underserved regions. In particular we'll be looking at registrar accreditation issues.

A number of issues have been raised by registrars particularly in Africa saying here are some of the hurdles that we see in either becoming accredited or in becoming successful in the registrar marketplace.

So we're going to have an interactive discussion on that. And the idea is to kind of invoke the community's collective brain power to see if there are some of these issues that we can come to solutions on and those that can't be solved.

Tomorrow we're going to figure out whether they're worth working on and if so who do these belong to?

So we'll say is this do we think a GNSO issue? Do we think this is a staff issue? Is this a marketplace issue? So I would encourage you to attend. That's going to be I think a valuable workshop. And it will be all the more valuable if we've got your expertise. So...

Michele Neylon: And Mike?

Mike Zupke: Yes?

Michele Neylon: ...sorry just rather than going through the agenda could you go to the (Aeros) thing please?

(Jennifer Stanaford): Speaking a bit on (Aeros) and where we stand with that and any recent...

Mike Zupke: Yes.

(Jennifer Stanaford): ...new...

Mike Zupke: Steve would you mind coming forth please? This is Steve Allison. He's going to give an update on (Aeros).

(Jennifer Stanaford): Welcome Steve.

Steve Allison: Good morning everybody. This is Steve Allison. I'm the Product Manager on (Aeros) at ICANN. So just a little background, we left Buenos Aires, we've done a couple demonstrations and took an action item to do some Web demonstrations and follow-up with beta testing of (Aeros) in January.

And we actually got some really good feedback both from registries and registrars. And since that time we finish our first phase of development of the product.

And as an application it's in a pretty stable place and is ready for us to launch to registries to begin collecting information and configuring their TLDs.

However prior to launching we have the challenge of creating a credentialing process so that both registries and registrars can securely opt into (Aeros) and identify their points of contact that will be given user credentials so that as an application (Aeros) can be seated.

So I don't know if everybody is aware but ICANN announced about a week ago that they launched the first iteration of the GDD portal as it is today.

It's an application that provides registry services. The longer term vision is that that application will be both registry and registrar services.

And one of the services within that will be the ability for both registries and registrars to opt into (Aeros) and do all of that credentialing.

And then they'll be an integration between that portal and the (Aeros) portal which we'll list separately. And so the fact that we actually have that portal launched now sort of opens up the door for us to begin completing this work to do the credentialing process.

So that's where we're at today. It's obviously it's a little behind the schedule that we had hoped to have but, you know, us being able to do that launch is a huge first step for us to be to have a platform to do the credentialing process.

(Jennifer Stanaford): So do you have a timeline that you can provide to us as far as worthiness or prepared?

Steve Allison: I don't have specific dates. (Aeros) is an application that is quite large under the covers. And it's been a lot for our QA analysts to take it and to really see how it affects the GDD portal.

And there's so much sensitive data that is going to be integrated with that it's taken them I think considerably longer than they imagined to make sure that we're not actually sending the wrong data at the wrong locations.

And so we're going through that effort now. And I mean I would hope that by the end of April we have a pretty good vision as to, you know, what that way forward looks like.

But I don't have at the moment a timeline. So kind of a follow-up to that is that we're doing a couple things. One is that we're beginning work on some of the

phase two enhancements that people had requested such as API and some of like downstream pieces of functionality that we'll need to support (Aeros) long term.

And then two I'm working concurrently to revamp the entire community wiki so that people have more visibility into the process that we're going through so that they can not only track their timeline of development but also start a dialogue on the, you know, features and functionalities that is in (Aeros) and what the, you know, various feature variations would look like as well.

(Jennifer Stanaford): So can you commit to provide an update or a timeline to the stakeholder group by the end of April?

Steve Allison: Yes we can do that.

(Jennifer Stanaford): And just for this transcript this is (Jennifer Stanaford) speaking. Rather than getting an update every ICANN meeting can you also commit to providing us an update on a monthly basis?

Steve Allison: Yes it sounds good.

(Jennifer Stanaford): Thank you for your time. Any questions Adobe Connect, in the room?

Michele Neylon: (Elliott Maas) wanted to add a topic I think to this didn't you (Elliott)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay. Okay go ahead Mike.

Mike Zupke: So I'll leave it up to you. Steve can also talk about the Whois query portal if you're interested. And Caitlin is going to give the updates and implementation. But I personally have really no more to add.

So however, you know, whatever you find to be the best use of your time.

Michele Neylon: Well can we do the WHOIS portal thing quickly?

Steve Allison: Yes I can do it quickly. So just a quick background is that the Whois lookup is called for by the board 2012 resolution is in response to the WHOIS Review Team recommendations.

So we have completed in pre-Buenos Aires was the information portal whois .icann.org.

We've completed development of the global lookup which is basically a Web interface that allows users to search across top level domains and second level domains of gTLDs both registry and registrar.

And we're going through the process of doing a security evaluation of the application prior to launch to make sure that it's secure and has the stability as well to handle the number of queries that we expect to come through the site.

A few weeks ago we had a meeting with the registrars. But I guess is an update we just wanted to call out that if the stakeholders, the registrar stakeholders would like to suggest some feedback and open dialogue we can schedule something whether it's working sessions or whatnot.

But in an effort to make sure that the best practices and the mechanisms that registrars need to become comfortable with this application are actually put in place and that we don't just want something and then, you know, not get the feedback so...

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. This is Michele speaking for the record I was on that call as you probably remember. I think there were a couple of registrars who are here who might have been on the call. But the call was organized on quite

short notice so I think some people may not have had the opportunity to attend.

So maybe if you want to follow-up with me directly we can see about scheduling another call to just kind of go over what you've planned so far. That might be helpful.

Does anybody in the room remotely have any questions on this Whois portal?
No okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Yes sure.

Man: Sorry Caitlin, would you mind coming forward to talk about policy implementation? Thanks Steve.

Caitlin: Good morning everyone this is Caitlin Tubergen for the record, just going to quickly go through some of the policies that are in implementation currently.

So first we have Inter Registrar Transfer Policy Working Group B Recommendation 8 and IRTP C Recommendation 3.

Both of these recommendations have been incorporated into the additional Whois information policy which has gone through public comment and implementation will be announced by May 1.

These recommendations are about EPP status codes.

The second is IRTP B Working Group, Working Group B Recommendation 9. That deals with a mechanism to unlock domain names. That has also gone through public comment and will be implemented with IRTP B Recommendation 8 and IRTP C Recommendation 3 by May 1.

Third we have IRTP C Recommendations 1 and 2. That deals with the change of control but a change of registrant policy and also the time limiting of FOAs.

The Implementation Review Team has been formed and we've been working together on an implementation schedule and started working on the text of Recommendation 2.

Fourth we had the UDRP Locking Implementation. The Implementation Review Team has been formed. They've gone over a draft implementation timeline. And the first draft of the updated UDRP rules has been circulating and it should go through public comment in May or June of this year.

And last there is Thick Whois. Policy staff has recruited volunteers for this Implementation Review Team but there has been no meetings yet. And a member of the Registry Services Team will implement this policy work.

Mike Zupke: And then just one clarification. For IRTP B and C Recommendation 3 we said those will have implementation announces by May 1 right?

And I think if I remember correctly then registers will be given - registries will be given what six months? So there will be a compliance deadline giving six months to do those things.

Michele Neylon: Don't go running away just yet. Does anybody have any comments, queries or anything else on any of this implementation stuff?

I mean there's several people in the room here are on some of these - those working groups that are looking at transposing the wonderfully abstract into something concrete we all have to work with.

So no nothing, okay. Just with respect to the Thick Whois do we have any idea on timelines with that or is that kind of up in the air or what is that?

Caitlin: It's - that's just starting so we don't have any sort of timelines but as soon as we know more information we will definitely share that with everyone.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Mr. (Maas)?

(Elliott Maas): (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Well we need to be able to hear you or you - I mean whatever way you want to do this.

(Elliott Maas): Yes thanks. Mike I'm wondering if you had any - I mean sort of a small and simple question. I'm wondering if you were getting any, you know, you or in your group or team getting any positive feedback from law enforcement on registrant validation?

Mike Zupke: So I met with some people in law enforcement what day is today? I think it was yesterday. And actually they were asking the same question was is it you know, are registrars finding this working the way it's intended and that sort of thing.

So I haven't heard from them, you know, a success story saying, you know, this is mission accomplished. But I think this is a dialogue that registrars and law enforcement should have but I think...

(Elliott Maas): So let me clarify it because...

Mike Zupke: Yes okay.

(Elliott Maas): ...I think you kind of went to I think what I heard you say so this is a clarifying question that law enforcement was checking with you to see how we've implemented it.

Have you got any sense from law enforcement of any positive results of it? Have they told you about any or provided you with any sense of either metrics or their plan for, you know, judging whether they were getting any benefits from it? Did you ask about that?

Mike Zupke: Yes. So the answer is no, no I haven't said anything. I haven't asked. I'd be happy to bring that up.

(Elliott Maas): Please do.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Okay is that it?

(Elliott Maas): (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Mikey do you have any closing remarks that you'd like to share with us about how much you love us all or anything or...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I usually try to channel and call at least once and I'm just too jet lagged to even do it right now.

But, you know, it's always, you know, a pleasure to be invited to come and speak to the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

And one of the things that we talked about what we met with the XCOM was it's really our goal to be trying to provide you service and sort of a way into ICANN whether it's dealing with, you know, an issue that might involve another contracted party or whether it's something involving our compliance teamer or what's going on in the policy world.

That's really what we're here for. We're a resource for registrars so by all means please, you know, feel free to use us that way. Thank you.

(Jennifer Stanaford): And we have one question for Caitlin before you come back. From a remote participant Rob Golding. With respect to moving to a Thick Whois does this remove the requirements from registrars to operating Whois server?

Mike Zupke: So this is Mike. I don't think that the policy explicitly addressed that but I'm sort of speaking out of turn.

What I do know is that the 2013 RAA it removes the requirement for registrars to provide Port 43 Whois data if the registry is thick.

So that much I do know. I don't know if it specifically calls out something for registrars. My understanding is it's mostly a registry facing policy.

Man: Can I jump in on that one?

Mike Zupke: I saw Marika in the corner earlier. I don't know if you're still here? She's going to give a policy update later. I don't know if there's time for her to speak now or if you'd just like when the policy team speaks later maybe she could talk a little bit more educatedly about that.

Michele Neylon: Mr. Bladel?

James Bladel: Yes I'm happy to speak an educatedly about that and just note that you're correct that it would remove the Port 43 requirement once a registry becomes thick. It's only a matter of maintaining the interactive Web Whois service.

But I think that we would probably just as a professional courtesy and as a Stakeholder Group want to make sure that everyone is clear that we are going to eliminating Port 43 especially for something as big as common net

because I think that could cause - that's not, you know, synchronized or at least published that we are going to do that.

I mean it could cause delays in transfers and disruptions from automated systems that are looking for a response from a Whois server that's no longer there.

I just wanted to - and maybe this is fodder for Marika's update but for the Thick Whois implementation do you have registers participating in that group or is it exclusively registries or who is participating in that group?

Mike Zupke: So I think that the call is still open right now but that's probably still a Marika question.

James Bladel: Okay I would just caution registrars to be careful and maybe monitor that. And maybe we should draw straws to see who's going to jump on that hand grenade.

My concern is that there's going to be pressure from the outside community during the process of converting it from a thin to Thick Whois model or particularly for some of these large registries that the Implementation Team is going to be pressured to insert additional processes let's call it to change the data and modify it from its current - it's not going to be just a transfer from one container to another. It's going to want to be transformed or something like that.

And I would say that could be something that would really ultimately inject a lot of time and cost and potential error into this process. So we should avoid that and I think we're going to have to put a register in that group. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: I believe we've got a question on the remote.

(Jennifer Stanaford): This is a follow-up question from Rob. Hold on just a second.

Rob Golding is asking would it then make more sense to also move the requirement to cross validate fields to the registry from the registrars still have the data?

Mike Zupke: So I assume this is referring to 2013 obligation on registrars do they address validation?

And, you know, I'd have to give that some thought but, you know, sort of off the top of my head I'm thinking that because the registrar has the customer relationships and would be in a position to go back to the registrant if there's an issue it seems like the registrar might be in a better position.

But that's something, you know, maybe we can talk about that some more and maybe the Registrar Working Group on this topic can talk about that too. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Hi Mike, Volker speaking. No worries, I'm only going to talk about data retention once. Now that I've done so it's behind us.

The real reason why I'm up at the microphone right now is I don't know even if you're the right person to talk to you about - to talk to us about that.

But we knew the registrars like to onboard with the registries and currently it's still a bit cumbersome and problematic.

ICANN has to develop the (Aeros) system. When is that ready for deployment and when will we see widespread adoption? What's ICANN to do to get the registries to jump on board this train and help registrars to onboard more quickly?

Mike Zupke: So this was - this is the topic that Steve Allison I think is really more expert in. And he had to run away.

But the - what, you know, what we're committing to registrars is that in the coming month we'll begin providing as monthly updates on what the timeframe is.

But the bottom line is that we're on our critical path is the GDD portal and getting both registries and registrars integrated into that first so that's kind of where we are.

But we hope to have a better more defined timeframe for you by the end of April.

Michele Neylon: Marika?

Marika Konings: Hi so this is Marika. I'm just coming back to the Thick Whois. On the Implementation Review Team currently we have Frederick as a member as well as Susan Prosser.

The group has basically still the process of forming as I think Caitlin already pointed out we're really at the starting point here.

One of the requirements or one of the recommendations of the Working Group as well as the GNSO council is that a legal review will be carried out to assess whether there will be any privacy implications resulting from the transition from Thin to Thick.

So that work is currently undergoing and I think in parallel staff is actually working on, you know, developing a timeline and assessing what needs to be done. And at that point the Implementation Review Team will be involved as well.

But I said we're still in initial phases there. But yes definitely if there are any other members that would like to join in principle, the focus is on those that

were involved in developing the policy recommendations because, you know, the intent or the objective of Implementation Review Team is really working with staff as a kind of consultation body to make sure that staff implements the policy as it was intended.

So if there are any questions or issues that require clarification we have a counterpart to go back to. So, you know, if there are any additional registers that would like to join just let me know. We'll add them to the mailing list.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Marika. Unless there any other queries that are terribly pressing we need to move on with our agenda. So thank you Mike and your team. Are you going to be staying with us or are you running off?

Mike Zupke: So I will be a pretty much all day.

Michele Neylon: Who-hoo.

Mike Zupke: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: All right thank you. And now we have an update from ICANN compliance and Maguy Serad and possibly Mr. Owen Smigelski. I can't even pronounce that today I'm...

Man: You got past the IRIS part no problem.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Maguy Serad: Good morning everyone. My name is Maguy Serad. We are happy to be here really. With me in the audience today from the Compliance Team is Owen Smigelski.

Owen has taken on a much more larger scope specifically focusing on registrar support. And in the audience in the back I have let's see, can I see them yes, (Sonya Lee) if you'd just raise your hand.

I have (Yung Chang Wang). And I also have (Roger Lim) from our Singapore hub office.

As we have been accustomed to do in this forum we'll bring you a very brief update. We are - we did prepare a few slides to share with you as it relates to the 2013 RAA.

We too are having growing pains like you all. And we wanted to just share with you what we're seeing and what we're working towards and then also hear from you how we can improve and deliver the service better.

So with that please?

All right so compliance now it has global presence. You guys heard Fadi speak on Monday and he focused mostly on Singapore but we also have presence in Istanbul.

So the Compliance Team now is located across the three hubs. And we almost say now we're providing our service six days a week 24 hours a day with the different time zones.

It is going to be providing consistently through the process, through the templates, through the communications that you have been accustomed to.

A brief update to the audience, the bulk Whois inaccuracy submission we used to be 100 submissions per week per user has been increased to 300 per week per user.

The team has completed all efforts required for readiness and for the 2013 RAA but also for the new registry agreement.

What that means is the work forms are all on icann.org. We also have uploaded a lot of the Learn More which is some people refer to as frequently asked questions.

We have the templates all up to date and soft training is ongoing.

IRIS program year two is in progress by ICANN 50. We will report to the community and we will have a much more intense session on the audit report, on the statistics, but also sharing with the community the next steps as relates to the new registry audit.

Next slide please, a few slides here on stats just to share with you. And I hope that you guys are seeing it from a compliance perspective.

I'm not going to talk to every bar here. Just look at the left bar where it says close before first notice.

This is our effort in additional automation staff validation and quality work before a complaint is sent on to the registrars.

If you are still experiencing or you are seeing some quality in the complaints that are coming to you please let us know. By providing your input it allows us to review the process, the systems and how we can improve and avoid those bad complaints coming your way.

Michele Neylon: (Unintelligible).

Maguy Serad: Yes it's okay. You have access to the presentation. If you have questions afterwards just shoot me an email, just want to respect the time and open the floor.

Another thing I wanted to share with this audience is the closure region - reasons. Again you can read the slide at your leisure but look at the three complaint types.

These are the highest volume we see. And on the chart below you'll see what are some of the closure reasons we are doing for those complaint types.

Whois inaccuracy volumes, we wanted to put it so you have an idea what is going on in that space. And we would continue to report to you the blue bar is the Whois inaccuracy volume that we are seeing and tracking.

With that we're going to now turn it to Owen to share with you some of the 2013 RAA discussions and guidelines that were requirements.

Owen Smigelski: So the first set of slides here I'm going to go over the - relating to the Whois accuracy program specification of the 2013 RAA. That's the one area that we've seen difficulties with registrars as well as - staff as well had to do some intensive training to get out all those requirements there.

So one point we like to make is that if there is any type of Whois inaccuracy complaint even if it's say about the address, the registrar must verify or re-verify the email address even if it had been previously verified and also if there's an account folder, that must also be verified.

And if the domain is not suspended after 15 days - calendar days, the domain must be - we need to see some sort of manual verification or that the domain has been suspended.

We're going to maintain for the first notices a 15 business day timeline that will allow for sending the notices receipt in processing by the registrars. But by the time the second notice comes along, the 15 calendar day time period should have elapsed either for verification or a response from the registrar.

And beginning with the second notice compliance will inquire about why that domain was not suspended or deleted.

And so there are two concurrent parallel tracks we're going to be looking for for Whois inaccuracy complaints and we've modified our notices for those accordingly providing the information that we're expecting to receive back. Next slide please.

The - this is the first track that we're looking for. This is from Section 4 of the spec. The receipt of the notice by the registrar starts the 15 calendar day timeline. And this is where the registrar must verify or re-verify the email address of the registrant and if different, the account holder.

And what we require is an affirmative response from the registrant. That needs to either be a reply email or a linked in click or a phone call or something that the registrant does. Simply just sending an email and not receiving a bounce back does not satisfy that.

And again, if there's no response from the registrant there needs to be a suspension of that domain name or a manual verification by the registrar. Next slide please. I'll just wait a second until that comes back up. (Guys) next slide.

And so this is the second parallel track of the Whois inaccuracy and this is from Section 378 as well as Section 5. And the timeline is a little bit different on this one. This is when the registrar sends the email - the inquiry to the registered name holder. That starts another 15 calendar day timeline.

And ICANN is looking for three possible results out of this. That is the Whois is updated and that the registrars provides a validation of those address fields or telephone number or whatever it may be and that there was a - also that there was verification of that as well too.

If the - the other option is that if there's no response within the 15 days if the - domain is suspended. And then the other one is that the registrar verified the Whois information is correct and that there's documentation of that verification. Next slide please.

So as an example illustrating here there's a Whois inaccuracy that comes in, which compliance would then send to the registrar. The registrar must do the path on the right of the affirmative response email verification or suspension. And the other side - those are the three options that would go for the underlying complaint.

If the Whois inaccuracy complaint is about the email address, then both of those can be accomplished in one thing. But, you know, again as a reminder, if the complaint is about the street address being incorrect, the email must be verified as well too. Next slide.

Here's some of the top five concerns that we've been seeing with registrars regarding the Whois format. What is in the specification for this there's an example in there. We expect to see that example in there in the requirements. So you can see what those common problems that we're seeing. Next slide please.

Some of the things that we are - most typical issues we're seeing with the registrar information specification is that either the information coming back from the registrar is incomplete or that there is no supporting documentation to demonstrate that the entity is in good standing. That must be included with that. Next slide please.

The Section 3.18 has two parts to it, 3.18.1 is for the general public in that registrars must take reasonable and prompt steps to investigate and respond appropriately to any reports of abuse.

There's no time requirement on that. But we have been seeing registrars that are doing the same response time that they're doing with the second part of the abuse, which is for law enforcement.

Those have to be monitored and responded to within 24 hours seven days a week. You don't have to actually take - answer the phone but you do have to respond to that within 24 hours. And the reports can come from...

Man: Owen, just to interrupt you, this is - there's quite a lot of questions that are going to come up. So rather than...

Owen Smigelski: Okay.

Man: ...that you run your natural course as things were, I thought maybe just to slow you down for one second please. I know I have at least one question. (Jennifer) had a couple of questions. (James) has questions. I see a gentleman down the back waving. I see Volker waving. I see other people waving. So - oh and Mr. Serlin as well. He's not even waving. He's just nodding his little bald head. I'll go to (Jennifer) first.

Owen Smigelski: Can we - can I just...

Man: Oh sorry.

Owen Smigelski: Finish up and then we'll - we can come back...

((Crosstalk))

Owen Smigelski: ...go back to the slides. And the other thing we've been seeing is registrars not having an email address on there doing a contact form for the abuse. The contract does state that an email address must be provided on there.

And then the registrars do need to take action for types of these abuse reports. Some have stated they need to have a court order to do that. But ICANN needs to know specifically which local law or regulation requires that the court order must be applied to do a report abuse complaint. Next slide. It was - because we want to get moving we can go onto the next slide.

Two things we've been noticing with the privacy proxy. Just wanted to clarify that a privacy service is where the actual registrant's name is included by has alternate contact information whereas a proxy service is the registrant and licenses the domain to a beneficial user.

We've been encountering registrars that are having some conflicting definitions of that and there's some information on the icann.org Web site about that. Next slide please. Next slide. I think we're done with that.

(Jennifer Stanaford): Owen, Maguy, thanks for coming. This is (Jennifer Standenberg) for the transcript. As it relates to Whois inaccuracy verification validation summary slide, in there you state the domain must be suspended or the registrar must provide proof of manual verification. Could you please elaborate on what is considered a valid proof of manual verification?

Owen Smigelski: Manual verification isn't specified in there. So it is open to interpretation. But it needs to be some sort of active steps that the registrar takes to actually verify it. Some examples are if you have a, you know, a photo ID on file from the - from that person or it's regarding the address if you have in your billing system you have a credit card address on file that works for that, that could be a form of manual verification.

We don't want to state that those are the five things or whatever that would qualify. But we do need to see, you know, on a date or in time that somebody did one of those manual steps to contrast with the automatic where, you know, an email goes out and a link is clicked. That's kind of an automated validation.

(Jennifer Stanaford): So if there was a outreach via telephone, a date and time in which that outreach took place (be) considered valid?

Owen Smigelski: Yes. And also, you know, who, you know, who was contacted, you know, for the information.

(Jennifer Stanaford): Okay. And the stuff that went about contacting them. Correct?

Owen Smigelski: Yes.

(Jennifer Stanaford): Great. Thank you.

Man: (James).

(James): Oh, you're going to start with me? Awesome. Hi Owen. Hi Maguy. So this has caused a lot of issues internally and I think for a number of registrars. And I think particularly I have two cases that I would like to raise and bring to your attention because I think that your interpretation - it'd be great if you could go back to the chart that shows the two tracks on the bubble.

Does anybody have control of the slides can do that? Thanks (Jen). It's back a couple, couple, couple - it's like it shows like - do just one more. Go for - there. This guy.

So here's where I'm struggling to understand part of this process flow and I'll give you a very specific example. We have someone report an invalid Whois on a domain name and we initiate contact with the registrant who says no, this domain name was registered in 2007 and has been untouched. All the contact information is current and accurate.

And the response from ICANN - there were two. One was that we needed to re-verify that name; that we did not demonstrate that we re-verified the name.

Now my understanding is if the registrant has (affirmatively) responded to us, we should not have to re-verify that name.

Secondly, the name - the compliance came back and pointed out that that particular domain name failed the validation because they did not include a country code - a plus one country code in the telephone number. Now to my understanding that is applying a new standard to a grandfathered name.

So my question is does simply the receipt of a complaint mean that a name this is registered prior to the new RAA suddenly now become subject to the new standard? Because I can tell you that was certainly not the intention of the negotiation team and not the intention of the RAA to open that door for folks to simply fire complaints away at old names. So what's your response to that?

Owen Smigelski: That had been the interpretation that we were going with and that that wasn't what the intention was and they send us a dialog we can have for that. But that was just we were going based upon if there's a complaint that does need to match that format. And there's nothing in the contract that states that, you know, if it was something registered before you entered into that they wouldn't apply.

(James): Well no, it does say essentially that we're not required to revalidate names until we are made aware that the domain - the information...

Owen Smigelski: Yes.

(James): ...is invalid. In this case the information is not invalid. We are made - in fact we confirmed that the information is valid. So that's where I'm confused as why we now have to subject - I can tell you that we're talking about hundreds of millions of domain names. So this is not an academic question.

Owen Smigelski: Yes.

(James): It could be extremely important change in the rules here if we start to - we need some clarity on this.

Owen Smigelski: (Okay).

(James): The second point and this was extensively discussed both in previous compliance sessions in regard to the Whois inaccuracy program. I think we discussed it during the discussion in Beijing about the (full) reporting tool.

And certainly it came up during the RAA negotiations as the repeat filing of complaints against a single domain name, essentially to harass the registrant into, you know, maybe they'll miss one and then it'll get suspended and I can buy it, you know.

And then it's certainly a practice that we see, you know, for example that we have one domain name that had several or at least two invalid Whois complaints that were submitted and correctly responded to in 2013. But then a new one came in in January of 2014 now under the new RAA. And we were informed by ICANN compliance that we need to go back and subject that to the new verification.

So I'm very confused here. I want to make sure that we're very clear on what discretion registrars have in terms of maintaining that grandfather status for old names that have been previously verified and are still known to be - known to possess contact information that has not changed since it was last verified.

Owen Smigelski: And then in that case if it was something that it was previously verified and you have the documentation that could be provided. If there do tend to be - it was an abusive report, then that's something - let us know. It is part of our process to check the complaint history.

But it only goes back until we moved into the new consolidated tool. We don't have that history prior to I think it was March of 2013 is when everything was put in - started going into there. So we couldn't tell if there was a complaint against that in 2012 without going back to the other system.

So as we go forward we'll be able to, you know, be aware of that and the tools are good at keeping track of the domain history for all reports so we can see every kind of complaint that was done for that domain name transfer, whatever. Yeah. So that is part of our process is to check that.

(James): Okay. Thanks. I'm going to get back into the queue here but I do want to get some firm response...

Owen Smigelski: Sure. Sure.

(James): ...on when this new standard for validation and plus one of phone numbers in the U.S. and I can tell you that most people in the U.S. don't even know what their country code is.

Owen Smigelski: Yeah.

(James): They don't. You know. So, you know, but...

Man: But so tempted to say something about that.

(James): Huh?

Man: I'm so tempted to say something about the fact that (unintelligible).

(James): Well when your country code is one.

Man: Oh, you had to do that. Did you have to go there?

(James): You know, certain privileges for inventing the phone system. But my point...

Owen Smigelski: It's the same country code for the Carmen Islands by the way.

(James): Yeah. But my point is is that we need to be very clear on this.

Owen Smigelski: Sure.

(James): If - in particularly in light of the fact that you now have this (live full) reporting tool. Because essentially what it does is it says the complaint itself is enough to remove the grandfather status of a pre-2014 domain name registration. I think we need to understand that.

Owen Smigelski: Okay. We'll get back to you on that.

Volker Greimann: Hi Owen. Hi Maguy. Volker Greimann for the record. I'm going to talk about this slide as well because I have two issues about it. Well I had three but (James) took care of one with the grandfathering issues. So I'm taking that out.

First, you're seeming to imply that any old Whois inaccuracy complaint would trigger that verification requirement. In my book being aware of inaccuracy is not the same as getting a complaint.

A complaint can be un-based, can be obviously false, can be related to a different topic. A complaint is not awareness of inaccuracy in my book. There has to be some more, so sort of substantiation that makes me aware there's actually a probably, not just thinking there might be a problem.

So we want - might want to differentiate between substantiate with an inaccuracy complaint and just repeat complaints, annoying complaints, obviously unfounded complaints and anything else.

The second thing is that you seem to imply that any complaint even if they are - if they're unfounded trigger a requirement to verify the email address. Now that was certainly not our intention when we negotiated this terminology in the RAA.

As an example, if somebody says this Whois is missing the middle name of the person. We must verify his email address. If the street address is missing the (postcard), we must verify the email address. If we have validated the phone numbers of the email - we must validate the email address. Why? Makes absolutely no sense.

Only when the email address is claimed to be invalid should we be required to validate the email address because otherwise we have no indication that the email address is invalid. And why should we validate something that we have no indication of being invalid? Thank you.

Owen Smigelski: So on that point Volker, compliance now takes a stronger line. If you notice the slide, I think it says like 42 or 47% of complaints are closed before first notice. And one of the reasons is we do require quite a bit from the reporters if it's not clear from the complaint that they filed what the alleged inaccuracy is or why it's inaccurate.

We request additional information. If they don't provide within five days we close the ticket. So the complaints that we are forwarding on are ones that have been manually, you know, reviewed by compliance and, you know, appear to have, you know, an alleged accuracy with some support in that. That applies to every ticket including the bulk ones or the previously filed ones.

Then with regards to having verify the email, that's what Spec 4 that says there's - the registrar has any information suggesting that the information is inaccurate, they must verify or re-verify the email address. It doesn't limit it to that saying that oh if the complaint is about the address then you don't have

to verify the email. It just says that the email has to be verified. So that's why that was put in there or that's why we do that.

Volker Greimann: Yeah. Let me just clarify this on what we intended when we negotiated that position and this was also not something that ICANN asked of us when they brought the request on the table. Maybe it's just missing a comment, comma in the language or an and in the language. So please bear that in mind when you go into those details.

The verification of email address when the email address (isn't) even an issue or the registrars told them to - about a email verification, about a telephone verification that makes absolutely no sense to have email verification when there's no such indication that email is in any case problem. Because that requires an active response from the registrant and puts this domain name registration at risk or at least the resolution of domain name at risk.

And I would be very, very careful in anything that causes automatic suspension after a certain time. If we cannot reach him because he's on a vacation and this domain name that makes couple of thousand a day goes down because we can't verify, he won't hold ICANN responsible. He'll hold us responsible and that's something I want to avoid at all costs.

Maguy Serad: Thanks Volker. Yoav.

Yoav Keren: Yeah. Yoav Keren from Domain The Net for the transcript. Sorry I may take you back to things that you might cover. But I want to make sure that I'm - that I clearly understand what are the requirements that you think the compliance takes.

When a complaint comes in and I'll put aside because Volker said everything about the email issue but say we verified the email. And the part of the

complaint was the address was not accurate. And we got an answer from the registrant that the address is accurate. Is that enough?

Owen Smigelski: Unless there's additional information to suggest that it's not, then yeah, if you do, yeah, send the email, this is your information, yes. We have - occasionally there are ones where, you know, the report comes back says no it's false, it's a Chinese restaurant or something. You know, there are occasions where there is additional information required to document that.

Yoav Keren: Okay. So you will provide us with information that - so once the registrant - this is what I want to make clear. So once the registrant says this is valid, okay, you're talking about a case where you have additional information that says no, this is not. Right.

Owen Smigelski: It would be something - I can't make a blanket statement that every one is going to work. But if, you know, the complaint comes in and says the - that's not the person's address. It's a restaurant. Nobody lives there or it's a - this case - in that case just saying oh yeah, that is address, you know, that would not be necessarily sufficient saying this is something can be verified.

We do look, oh, is that - they say it's a Chinese restaurant. We will look it up to see is it a reporter, you know, just doing something to harass. We'll do that step first. And, you know, in that case that might be required. But if there's nothing to suggest otherwise, you know, you know, that would be something that would be sufficient.

Yoav Keren: Okay. And the - another clarification - so let's say we've got a problem with the address and we validated it. We look at the address and we're actually going to discuss translation transliteration of Whois data later on and especially in countries like the one I'm coming from we have these issues. And we look at the address and it's valid - the actual address. Is that enough? And we confirm that this is a valid address. (Is it clear)?

Owen Smigelski: The - I mean depending upon - if there's anything additional, I mean that you could say that something looks like an address but if the allegation is of the person, the registrant is not contactable at that, you know, there'd be something more to have that manual verification because that just, you know, it looks like an address I mean it wouldn't suffice.

Yoav Keren: Okay. Thanks.

Daniel Greenberg: I'm Daniel Greenberg from Lexsynergy. I have a question regarding Whois privacy. And what normally happens in a trademark matter is a squatter can put a domain name under Whois privacy. When then contact the registrar informing them of a potential dispute. Some of them then do email the record that they have on their account or that was provided by the registrant. But it's not reflected on the Whois.

And that information's incorrect. You know, I just want to clarify that the position. What does the registrar then have to do if that information is incorrect?

Owen Smigelski: There are - we've encountered two types of complaints regarding privacy and proxy provider of contact information. The biggest is generally, you know, that's actually one of the reasons we do close all of the complaints is they're complaining let's say, you know, doing their proxy that address in incorrect. You know, we obviously know that that one is one that's well known so we close those complaints.

The ones we frequently see is that the email is incorrect and there's two types of inaccuracies associated that we usually see. There's a problem with privacy proxy providers email address and not forwarding or that the address that we'd be forwarding to is inaccurate such as if you send an email to the privacy proxy email, it would bounce either from the privacy proxy provider or the beneficial, you know, the actual underlying registrant information.

So there are two points of that. We're, you know, sometimes that information we get does say that the forwarding didn't work or failed. You know, we would - we do request that in terms of emails being inaccurate we do require from the reporter's documentation to show why that. So we would before that what we want to see is what's in the Whois - the public Whois. Does that work?

Daniel Greenberg:Okay.

Woman: May I pause? Can I just pause for a moment please? Thank you.

Patrik Falstrom: So Patrik Falstrom. I'm Chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. We were supposed to have a session with you for half an hour but we decided that you will have a very interesting topic to talk about that we would cancel that session and give you all the time to (contend with this).

Now if you're interested in the SSAC activities, I encourage you to come to our open session, which is Thursday morning at 8:00. Thank you very much. Good luck.

Daniel Greenberg:Thank you Patrik. And I just wanted to find out if there's any obligation on the registrar to validate that information because the information that isn't behind Whois policy was obviously supplied initially and then replaced in a way or when the domain was registered it used the Whois privacy service.

So surely that has to be validated somehow because, you know, obviously they're just hiding incorrect information behind this privacy service. And privacy is one thing. Inaccurate information is another thing.

Owen Smigelski: Yeah but the inaccuracy is that you can't contact the person through that email address and so that would need to be investigated. And just the verification is sending the email and getting the affirmative response. The validation as it's defined in the contract is is this an email address that isn't a correct email for, you know, username at pov dot, you know, pov, that way.

That's the validation. Verification is sending the email and getting that affirmation response. You know, can the - is the registrant contactable via that email address?

Matt Serlin: Hi. Matt Serlin from MarkMonitor. I think we owe the SSAC drinks tonight for giving us more time. So just to echo what (James) and Volker said, being involved in the negotiations of the 2013 RAA, I'm curious how you came to the conclusion that enables you to have this requirement to validate.

Can you walk us through how you got to that conclusion? Was that a compliance requirement to validate? Based on the Whois inaccuracy complaint of an address, the requirement for a registrar to now validate the email address and/or phone number.

Owen Smigelski: Whois accuracy programs Spec 4 states - I mean I don't have the contract right in front of me but it - the opening words are something that if registrar has information that suggest that Whois is inaccurate, they must verify or re-verify the email.

Matt Serlin: Okay. So that was entirely a compliance...

Owen Smigelski: Yes. And we're reading the Whois spec as a whole, not oh, you know, Section 5 is the only one being - we look at what would be applicable in any Whois inaccuracy report. We don't just look at oh, Section 5 is implicated, Section 4 would also be implicated. Four doesn't limit itself to if there's a complaint about the email.

Matt Serlin: Right. Exactly.

Owen Smigelski: From us.

Matt Serlin: This is from you.

Owen Smigelski: From us. And we - there are - we do have a standing weekly meeting with legal regarding 2013 RAA interpretation as well as the new registry agreements and this is the items that have been discussed and so they were participate - legal was participating in these discussions.

Matt Serlin: Okay.

Owen Smigelski: Yeah, just legal. Also, you know, the registrar DNS engagement is also involved with those meetings as well too.

Matt Serlin: Sorry, the registrar like this group or...

Owen Smigelski: No. (Caitlin) attends those meetings.

Matt Serlin: Okay. So I guess then - and (James) and Volker will probably echo this. I guess what's frustrating for us is there was never any consultation and discussion with the stakeholder group because it's directly impacting registrars and you said, you know, that wasn't the intent.

Well we were involved, you know, we were in the room. So I think what I would suggest is - I don't know the mechanism by which to do it but I think clearly this is a hot topic and maybe there's different interpretations. So I don't know if we as a stakeholder group need to, you know, formally request that this issue be revisited. But however, I think we need to do it. I do think it's something that was not the intent of when we - yeah. Right. Thanks.

(James): And so I do have the contract right in front of me. And the specific - sorry, (James) for the transcript. And, you know, just echo some of what Matt was saying. The specific examples that were given were a bounce back or an ICANN required message, for example, the Whois data reminder policy.

Clearly that is an indication that your Whois data is out of date and you need to go re-verify. And, you know, I think the other one was non-delivery of a - some other ICANN required email address. Like for example, a renewal issued.

I don't think we envisioned that the simple complaint process would kick off a revivification - unless the outcome of that complaint - that invalid - who is complaint was that we could not contact the registrar to get them to or they did not respond, you know, within that time frame.

But a registrar responding - yes that's me. My data's correct, you know. The thing should just kind of disappear in a puff of smoke.

But I want to step back from all of this. I had a long list of things. I was the last person in the queue. But I think - hopefully, you're hearing us on this. This is a room full of registrars that are not trying to get out of their obligations.

We're trying very hard to understand what we need to do here. And we're trying to get it right. And, you know, you have a group of - I would say, motivated and intelligent and resourceful companies that are just baffled here, you know.

And I think the reason is because we've got some indication that you guys are inserting your own judgment into what we believe to be - what we understood to a clearer process then what we're faced with.

So I would ask that we do revisit - or reopen this dialogue and make sure we're on the same page. This is not a question of registrars trying to get out of this - get out of doing this.

This is making sure that our customers are not subject to - I mean, you know, to (Elliot)'s point - I would love to hear someone in law enforcement or someone in ICANN to say that this program has resulted in X percentage

increase and who is the equality. Or we caught some bad guys because of this.

All I see are frustrated registrants, frustrated registrars, confused registrars, developers that hate me and don't answer my phone calls anymore. Because, you know, every time I call its bad news.

And a number of high profile false positives of dominions being suspended for people doing things like, you know, updating a telephone number or an email address. So I think we need to get this fixed because I see all downside here.

I have not yet seen the upside of this implementation. So let's reopen the dialogue. Let's get this fixed.

Man: Sure and we'll follow up on that new procedure and make sure. But we do appreciate you bringing these issues to us. And, you know, we do want that open communication and dialogue.

And we appreciate the struggles. You know, we've had that internally, as well too. You know they are from different interpretations of that contract and make sure that we're all aligned on that.

Volker Greimann: Yes Volker speaking - sorry to sneak up on (James) like that and taking away his last thoughts. I just wanted to get into one more thing. The (unintelligible) complaints are not just for registrant data.

We also get complaints for admin, tech, billing details. While billings now out but admin and tech details that might be wrong. And still we must re-verify the registrant email address.

Doesn't really make sense and as (James) explained, we were looking at this verification requirement under very special, specific circumstances where we have knowledge the email is balanced.

That was the intent when we talked ICANN about this. This was seen as a fix for certain cases where we have - that would require us to monitor balances for outgoing emails.

That was with the intent. We monitor the responses and what can expect - undeliverable. Hey, there's the problem. We verify that. That was what we were looking at.

Please talk to the ICANN negotiating team again. Ask them to remember what was discussed back then and interpret this term of the RA - not to what you believe might be a possible interpretation but what was intended. The intention is important here.

Man: Thank you Volker.

(Jennifer Stanaford): This is (Jennifer Stain) reporting for the transcript. I have two questions.

My question is related to (Elliot) and (James) point - related to how law enforcement or compliance is seeing the validation of the, who is success.

And I think one thing you need to think about is coming up with a set of matrix in order to measure that success and present to the registrar stakeholder group for discussion.

And the next question is, as it relates to mandates - as far as registrars being given timelines to respond to complaints audits, you know, we are very clearly instructed to respond in a certain amount of timeframe to complaints and audits.

And as - from personal experience, we receive several on a weekly basis. I'd like to clearly understand if we can propose (unintelligible) been discussed before. Having the compliance group also then tied to timeframes in order to respond once we send in the data related to an audit or be filing response to who is complaining.

Sometimes, you know, we get responses immediately. And sometimes we don't get responses. And sometimes we get responses months later. So if we can get a plan in place to where you - compliance is also hold accountable to the timeframes in which we're held accountable too. We'd like to see something proposed to the stakeholder group.

Man: For the first part of the question of we have closure codes that we do for our - who is inaccuracy complaints and one of the closure codes. And that will be reported on the presentation on Wednesday.

If you can't attend, that'll be published on ICANN.org on the outreach section. It will have a breakdown of that, you know, domain corrected or information corrected or information verified correct. That is one of the closure codes.

So you can see that in there. I do know that the - there's the - for the, who is accuracy of PDP that's going on out there - that will be one of things. They will be saying from across TLD's. It'll be 2009-2013 REA.

It'll be Legacy TLD's and the new GTLD's. There be a, you know, a very broad scope to see. Action levels out there and those are things that are included in that picked study.

In regards to the turnaround time, our priority is to respond to the registrars or the contracted parties in the complaints before putting priority on the new complaints that are coming in.

So we do try and timely turn that around. And we do report on that as well, too. That we don't have that slide here but we do have the staff turnaround time for first, second and third notices.

Generally the turnaround time goes up for the further long winds you go on. That's just because it does get more complicated. We need to review and verify it back.

But, you know, we do have a - I don't know - remember exactly what was committed on that Maggie.

Maggie Mansourkia: If I may just summarize, if you are experiencing non-response, you know how to reach me because I watch those queues like a hawk. We do have the turnaround time. And we report back to the community. But we also report on our turnaround time.

We have seen some opportunities of improvement. But if it is happening, please do not hesitate to let us know.

(Jennifer Stanaford): I think the question and the responses are really the turnaround times.
But the question that I proposed is, almost more towards a SLA that will receive a response within X business days. And that's what we're seeking.

Man: And we refer to that as a turnaround time. That's the SLA that we do on that.
And we do have continuous improvement. We just recently launched something in the last month or so to further improve the staff turnaround time.
That is, you know, one of the top priorities.

(Jennifer Stanaford): Something in form of a mandate would be appreciated.

Volker Greimann: Hello, Volker speaking again and now for something completely different.
You're not monitoring us alone. So looking at registries and I just would like to know what kind of information you would need from us.

How we can help you monitor registry compliance when we see that there might be an issue - even if we're not sure of how certain obligations of registries may be interpreted where we see that there might be a problem.

So we might be unwilling to raise a complaint because some of the registries are business partners of ours. And we would not like to step on their feet. On the other hand, when we see certain action or certain behavior that's relatively concerns, we would like to raise that with you in an informal way before we start raising a formal complaint. So what would be the best way to interact with you on that level?

Man: You know, there are a number of registry complaints on there. But we included new complaint forms. And with consideration for the registrars, we do have the option to make - have those complaints submitted anonymously.

We retained the contact information, obviously, so we know how to follow up with. But when - if you check the box for anonymous, that information has been stripped from the complaint summary that goes into our system.

So we do have a lot of those. Registry complaints do have that option for, specifically, so that registrars could submit those complaints and not, you know, be singled out for complaining about a certain registry or something like that of getting retrIBUTions.

So if there's one that is missing - that you'd like to be able to do that - let us know. And then you can always also email us with concerns that you have.

Volker Greimann: And what kind of information would we...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry, we prefer through the system. But if not something that's in the system, you know, if there's not a complaint form for that specific concern that you have, then compliance@ICANN.org

Volker Greimann: Okay, what kind of information would be helpful for your emails - description of their services - if we...

Man: Sure, I can't speak to the registry complaint forms that are on there. But I do know - that depending upon the different complaint types - you know, we do, you know, check the boxes. And we, you know, any information that you might have.

I think you can put the 2500 characters in the problem description - as much information as you can provide that would help us.

Man: Just to make sure, because when we send emails and documentation of conversations that we had with registries. Of course, it would be very easy to track. When was this sent? What did we reply? And we look at their replies and see which registrar they sent that to.

So please make sure that when you forward those complaints to the registries, to (unintelligible) those well enough. So not only the sender of the complaint is removed but also information inside the complaint is anonymized sufficiently as to allow - not to allow the registry to track back on basis on what they wrote - what we wrote - when there was something sent and so on.

Man: Yes and we - if you request to be anonymous in the complaint, then we'll keep that as such. But unless that request is made then, you know, that types of things will be forward.

But if you do say you want to be anonymous, then that would be something we would then forward that information on.

Man: I have a comment - I think - from remote and one question from remote which you have (unintelligible) because it's coming from another channel. Do you want to go with the comments, please?

Woman: Yes a comment from remote, it's from (Rob Golding). And he says, "Having dealt with compliance or the audit, I just like to say thank you to Owen for the assistance and understanding."

Owen Smigelski You're welcome, (Rob).

Man: Just a quick query from (Benny Somboson), "ICANN compliance, publisher's notices in relation to registrars that are in breach, will you be doing the same for registries?"

Man: Yes, absolutely. They'll go on the same section. And that's once we've gone through the one, two, three notice process - the informal stuff that will still remain confidential. But if there is a notice of breach, it will be published in the exact same place.

So (Benny) to answer your question, the answer is yes. There are going to be treated the same way.

Man: Yes.

Man: Gentlemen there, please. Could you state your name for the record?

(Paul Lomax): Yes my name's (Paul Lomax). I just want to go back to the thing of the importance of getting the feedback from the LEA's. Because I assume the reason that we're doing all this work on validating the, who is dead. It's to stop the bad guys.

And one of my concerns is that we're going to do all this and it's not going to make any difference whatsoever. I would say (unintelligible) for the last five or

six years, I haven't seen a single fraudulent demand that has an inaccurate who is dead.

The data is always perfect. So valid name - it's about if that person lives at that address. The telephone number's correct. Pick up the data from a phishing site.

So just saying, oh we're about validating that this street exist in that time. And so accurate data is - that feedback from the LES, is going to be vital to make sure that what we're doing actually has a purpose.

Man: Sure we do have an ongoing dialogue with law enforcement over...

(Paul Lomax): Yes, but start to feedback us as well.

Man: Okay.

(Paul Lomax): Thank you.

Man: Send him up there. Go ahead (Graham).

Man: So I got to break it down.

Man: And guys just please bear in mind, they need to leave. So please keep us as briefly to the point as possible. And they are here as in onsite. So if you want to chase them down, corner them and beat them up, you know how to find them.

(Graham Huntington Tucast): I'm so long winded. This is (Graham Huntington-Tucast). I just want to echo some of the sentiment we're seeing around law enforcement feedback on how this is working.

Clearly, there's some problems with interpretations. It's causing lots of pain and implementation. But in the privacy and proxy working group for the accreditation, we're seeing people who think the system is working. And they want to expand on it and push it into other areas.

And it's pretty clear that the community as whole needs to hear more about how this is going and that it's really successful - if it is really successful. Otherwise, we're going to be seeing this in all sorts of corners at ICANN. Thanks.

Man: (Shinals).

((Crosstalk))

Man: And (Shinals), I'm giving you the last word on this. Am I going to regret this?

((Crosstalk))

(Shinals): I'm speaking on a different topic. So I don't want to miss, you know, there is so much problem with registrant validation. Because that is causing huge issues for registrants, you know, now in the hundreds of thousands.

You know, I didn't hear you guys come back with anything firm around when we can talk about these interpretation issue - when we're going to come back with metrics.

I want to go to another issue. It's smaller. It's simpler. But it's also terribly failed and broken - which is the publishing of the, who is of use email address. You know, I think that, you know, a lot of us have talked lots about this.

It is simply a bunch of spam. And the last thing - you know, other than giving certain bulk complainers an additional nectar of complaint - we are seeing.

Nobody that I've heard is seeing any benefit from this publishing of the debate abuse email address.

This is, you know, law enforcement was asking for it. IPU was asking for it. They're not using it at all - is all of our data. And in addition, it's doing two things. It's draining resources from dealing with all of the rest of these issues we're having to deal with.

And it's raising the bar for new registrars in the developing world. Because now they need to probably put some full time employee because it's all just spam boxes. They don't care if it's, you know, (James) or I with hundreds of persons organization or if it's a guy with one or two people in the organization.

They've got to answer, probably the same volume of email address. So my question for you is, again here, is what is your plan to track the positive benefits from those in the community who insisted on this requirement?

Man: That's actually - there will be a slide on our presentation on Wednesday. We do have a keep track - I don't remember the exact numbers of those abuse complaints that we do have received.

I am aware of people that are using the email abuse address for certain registrars. And there have been success cases of online pharmacies being shut down - those kind of sites.

But those are metrics. Certainly, we just launched that in February. So we don't have that...

Man: So what you're going to have to demonstrate - what you're going to have to demonstrate is not - you know, first of all it should not be antidotal. Second of all, it's not online pharmacies being shut down, but it's online pharmacies being shut down that wouldn't have otherwise been shut down.

So in other words, these are complaints coming from entities that wouldn't have been able to - or don't have pre-existing relationships with the registrar community anyway.

So, you know, in order for you to demonstrate a benefit, it should not be slight. And it should not be trivial. Otherwise, these obligations that continue to suck up resources and unnecessarily raise the bar, or going to pile up over and over and over again.

The takers will continue to take. Because you - when I say, you - the organization puts no obligation on the other side to demonstrate benefit.

Maggie Mansourkia: I'd like to just make a brief comment. Measuring - we are measuring the volumes and the resolutions. Measuring benefits of that (Elliot), I think we need to have that conversation with Mike Zupke and law enforcement because we are just enforcing the contract.

Similar to what I heard many of you say earlier, the intent of this was not - were not in those discussions. What we do, we take the black and white of a contract. So this discussion also on the intent would need to be engaged with Mike Zupke, so.

Man: So wait. But I want to understand because I want to be precise here. You are measuring or you're not. At first, you said, there's a slide on Wednesday that's demonstrating the benefits.

So then I think Maggie, you just said, we're not the ones responsible for demonstrating the benefits. So let's parse this in a couple of different ways. One, are you guys the entity inside of the organization that's responsible for demonstrating the benefit - yes or no?

Maggie Mansourkia: I'm not understanding what you mean by demonstrating benefit. We measuring metrics of what is being reported and what's being resolved.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I'm sorry I don't understand. You're talking about abuse complaints that come through the abuse email that's published.

Man: No we...

Man: Okay, so whatever then you're talking about is...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Has nothing to do with topic.

Man: Correct.

Maggie Mansourkia: Correct.

Man: And that's not compliance is mandated but complaints that you receive...

((Crosstalk))

Man: You say go (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Man: Great.

Woman: I think.

Man: Okay, (Mike) do you have anything to say on that? Are you doing anything to measure the benefit there? He can just shake his head no, if he wants. And I'll put it on the record. Let me save you the trouble (John).

Man: Thanks (Elliot). So, you know, I think I understood when you asked me sort of a similar question, if this is something that we need to do some work on. And I'm prepared to take that on and work with law enforcement.

Man: And are you prepared to give us timelines like you asked for timelines from us. I thought what (Jen) said earlier was great. You know, what timelines can we hold you to?

Man: Yes so I'm just hearing this request today.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I can see if I can, you know, grab a few people in the hallway while I'm still here.

Man: Awesome.

Man: Start the conversation and get this going.

Man: Thank you (unintelligible).

Man: So I wasn't planning on doing this. But I'm going to back up (Elliot) for just a moment. You didn't hear the request say, you heard it yesterday morning.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And Maggie and Owen have to leave. They're already late for another group.

Man: Okay.

Maggie Mansourkia: I just - a brief comment guys, please don't wait to this forum. We are there. We can hold calls. We had done that with many of the registrars. Let's address them as we face them.

We're available. Initiate an email. Tell us your availability. And we'll put the right resources. Send back your questions in advance. We're willing to do that. Because I know there's a lot of questions and a lot of clarifications.

Man: Thanks Maggie. So Maggie and (McCalla) and - what are the next steps for this? So how are we going to resolve this?

Man: I just had a quick word with Maggie and Owen while somebody was talking or something. If we're going to see if we can find a couple of time slots maybe tomorrow or something that where if a group of you would like to meet with them to follow up on some of the specific points. Okay, great so I see some - okay more of you.

Man: There's a RAA session - RAA...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes and do the other thing as well.

Man: (Unintelligible) upon that. I mean this sounds like that's right in the wheel house here.

Man: So maybe the RAA sessions over the next - tomorrow - guys - the RAA sessions tomorrow.

Maggie Mansourkia: Because our Wednesday session, we have the RAA that compliance is, you know, coordinating with the DNS engagement team. But again, if you

have a specific topic, let's make it topic specific. We set up a conference call. We dial in. Send us your questions.

Man: Okay, so look guys, I will follow up with Maggie as well. You know, some kind of ongoing engagement.

Man: Okay.

Man: Thank you, Maggie. Thank you all.

Man: Do we have a break now.

Man: So when do we break for lunch?

Man: So (McCalla).

Man: 11:30.

Man: 11:30, okay we have a break now scheduled from 11:30 to 11:45.

Man: Can I just.

Man: Yes go ahead.

Man: Sorry.

Man: Well I'm waiting to see if - you know, but one of the new mechanisms of the 2013 RAA...

Man: Did you want to wait until they were out of the room?

Man: No, they can hear us. One of the new mechanisms of the 2013 RAA was that both ICANN and the chair or the stakeholder group - that's Mr. (Nallen) here - can reopen the agreement for potential amendments and negotiations.

It's that amendment process that was the unilateral nuclear or whatever we were calling in Toronto. But it's now kind of, that door swings both ways now. So I'm hoping that maybe we can get this resolved just through some bilateral workings with compliance and with ICANN legal.

But, you know, as a hedge, maybe we ought to consider as a group, this is affecting all of us. And maybe we need to start to build shopping list here of all the items that we need to discuss and get clarification on in that - if we don't feel like we're, you know, that road is taking us where we want to go.

Man: Yes, I think you're right. Because I don't think we're going to really get anywhere other than, you know, what you just heard which is - here's what the contract says in black and white.

And we're going to follow this literally and not give it some interpretational gloss that you need to look for somewhere else.

(Bob White): (Bob White) again with Web.com. I'm going to mimic what (James) said. I think that - I don't know if the (unintelligible) needs to come into play here or what we need to do.

But I look at the, you know, the four corners test with contract law. I think that there's different interpretations of this contract. I've interpreted differently than the ICANN compliance group has.

And my concern here is that when we communicate with ICANN compliance, there - it's a one way conversation. They're telling me how I should interpret the contract. I'm in disagreement.

They're saying that my interpretation is wrong. And I proceed to go from a first, to a second, to a third notice. And the, you know, hammer over our head is that we're going to call you into breach and potentially remove your accreditation.

So I want specifically, the initial RAA negotiating team to reassemble - along with some of the other folks in this room. And have a candid dialogue with the ICANN compliance team about how this agreements being interpreted.

And if we can't come to an agreement, I don't know what, you know, maybe like (James)' suggestion is the right one - where (unintelligible) gets involved. But this is something we need to get on very, very quickly because it's not working in its current form, thank you.

Man: Okay maybe just to react to that, I think there's no reason why we shouldn't, you know, look at engaging with ICANN compliance and ICANN legal or a mixture of. And my concern is on that ground, you know, the whole lot of them.

And the other thing is that with respect to the (unintelligible), we have - I reached out to him on the matter of the EU waiver situation since I'm the general consensus from all the European registrars I've been dealing with was they were all bashing their heads against the wall. They're not going anywhere fast.

So that, you know, has helped to put a bit more pressure on them to, you know, make a move. And I think there's something we can follow up on. But I would also ask you that those of you who feel strongly about this, please, you know, actively engage with us on this rather than throwing it at us because, you know.

Jennifer Wolfe: Be supportive.

Man: Yes, as Jennifer's saying, we just need support with this.

Man: Can we - and we can take this on the list. But can we, perhaps, say set some sort of timeframe by which we will try to work this out directly with compliance and with ICANN legal. But, you know, we can't just let this draw out or let them kind of draw it out.

Man: Okay just because my poor head's going to explode otherwise because I won't be able to keep track of this myself, would one of you like to volunteer to take the lead on this. I mean, either yourself or (Bob) or somebody - I don't know.

Man: Yes, no I'll take it.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes this is for you.

Man: You going to take it out for (unintelligible).

Man: No I (unintelligible).

Man: I thought you would want to fire your negotiating team.

Man: Well no, I mean it's a fair point, that maybe I can use to negotiate with somebody else. But no, I think I will take the action item to say that we could probably expand that team.

Man: Right.

Man: Right.

Man: (James) is one of the people Volker is another.

Man: (unintelligible).

Man: And let me get this...

Man: But I just think that we have to say like at X date, you know, we're looking to have this resolved by, you know, such and such date or see progress, you know, toward some sort of resolution.

Otherwise we're going to have to start looking at what our other options are whether it's (unintelligible) or whether it's the amendment process, you know, hey. They're still in California. And there's courts there too.

Woman: So (James) we're going to add it to the list of topics for the working lunch today around putting together a timeline.

(James): I can re-take it to the list, honestly.

Woman: Okay.

(James): I mean - I don't mean - I know that everything's inviting for. And our agendas, you know, been torpedoed here a little bit. But I think we can take it to the list and just kind of reinitiate that conversation there (unintelligible).

Woman: Great thank you.

(James): And I'll do that. I'll do that.

Woman: Okay, so just a quick announcement bond before break. They'll be - lunch will be served in this room. And we'll have a working lunch. And we hope that you will join us.

Man: And, obviously, priority is given to stakeholder group members. No offense to those of you who aren't stakeholder group members and - sure.

Man: (unintelligible).

Man: That's what this meeting is about.

Woman: I will - I'll reach out to (Glenn).

Man: I've some back and forth with ICANN's technical services. If you're having specific issues, I mean, you know, do you have trade through tens and above that you can share with them?

Man: It works out there. It does not work in here.

Man: Okay because it's working fine for me up here.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay.

Man: Guys we're on a break now which is a few minutes late. And then after the break, we will be guessing a short update from the NonCom. And then after that we have our working lunch. Thank you.

Woman: Please stop the recording.

END