

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
Registries Stakeholder Group  
Tuesday 25 March 2014  
Morning Session (Part 2)**

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

(Keith Drazek): Okay, recording is started. So welcome back everybody. Just one housekeeping issue. I've been told that we need to speak directly into the microphones. While we can hear fine in here, with the volume, there is an issue with the feed and the transcription and into Adobe, so we need to speak directly into the microphones.

And for (Sheri), I'll say please, again, remember to identify yourself when you speak. So let's get back into business and I'm going to kick it back over to Jeff or (Jordan) or (Jonathan), anybody would like to speak up about, you know, proposed next steps with regard to the IGO acronyms issue. Jeff, can I kick that over to you?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. I've been spending a little bit of time is trying to write down some of the points because obviously we want to - this is obviously very emotional in this room. But will be presented to the board, it has to be, you know, much more even keel still emphasizing the right points on the process.

I completely agree with what (Chuck) said on the substance - completely. I'm just not sure we should necessarily make the points on the substance. We can touch on them. To spend much time on the substance I think would be not really the point we're pushing, right.

I think the - what the point we're pushing is that policy should, you know, is intended to be bottom-up and that it's important for the board to follow the

processes that are set forth in the bylaws, that an acceptable outcome, although people may not like it, you know, the outcomes are except a reject and go into that.

But ultimately, in this case, what should have happened and what can still happen is that the board uses its role to facilitate dialogue between the DNSO and the GAC so that the bottom-up process can still happen if it rejects it. I mean, if it accepts it, that's fine, you know, that's great.

But if it rejects it - if it decides it's going to reject it, to facilitate the bottom-up process by facilitating dialogue between the GAC and the GNSO to see if there is some sort of solution to the issue.

And I think that's what we need to emphasize. What I'd like to see is a withdrawal, as well, of that proposal because I think (unintelligible) the outcome of that discussion. If the GAC truly believes that the proposal is on the table and the board is inclined to go with that, then the GAC, if they like that proposal or want something stronger, they're not very inclined to engage in our discussion with the GNSO.

I mean, if they consider that a victory why would you go through the motions - and they think the board is going to ask except it - why would you go through the motions?

So the - we need to emphasize that that should have never have happened. It's not (the role) the board to do that. And that to, go on the record of withdrawing the proposal and then facilitating dialogue between the GAC and the GNSO, I think that's the most productive way forward.

(Keith Drazek): Okay thanks very much, Jeff. So what I'm going to suggest here is that we take volunteers for a small drafting team who can start putting down these points that you've raised and sort of the approach that you phrase and try to circulate something to the group because I think that it's important as we've

talked about the document, the concerns and be very, very clear about the process issues that you've raised.

So I'm going to look for hands right now for folks who will volunteer. (Jordan), (Jonathan) and (Brent). All right, thanks so very much for volunteering and we'll look forward to, you know, some continuing discussion and an opportunity to review what you've come up with as short in order as possible.

So with that, let's move on to the next agenda item which actually is not on the agenda. We're going to skip over the rest of the stakeholder group business and so (unintelligible) here in the agenda.

I take this opportunity to welcome Akram and Cyrus and Krista and her team and the other ICANN staffers that are here to join us. So thank you very much for making the time.

So with that, we have an agenda that we pulled together. I don't think we necessarily need to stick directly to that agenda if there are other topics that need to be raised, but the first item that we have actually - I was going to go to Krista first and give her the opportunity to provide an update on any number of issues and then we'll get into an open dialogue.

Krista Papac: Thanks (Keith). Krista Papac for the record. I just had some operational updates I wanted to share with you guys. And I know your agenda is tight so I'll try not to talk too fast but somehow get through them quickly.

The first thing I wanted to talk about is - has to do with IRTP-B and (fee) implementation. There's a consensus policy that recently went through public comment - or that went through public comment and a (sound) implementation that deals with - the piece that's relevant to you guys is that there is now going to be a need for all registries to publish the (IANA) ID of the registrars or the GUR ID.

I think most of you are - actually most of this is probably already happening but there's one piece in there that I want to make sure you guys are all aware of.

So this will now be required of all registries to publish the IN ID of the registrars and to also publish the status codes in the Whois output with a link and the link is the part that's going to be, I think, new to everyone - with a link that will go to an ICANN page where the definitions of the various (EPP) codes -- excuse me -- status codes are contained.

We're going to - the link will be shortened so won't take up - I'm out of my technical capabilities here - but won't (unintelligible) that your ability that, you know, keep that (unintelligible) or make it too cumbersome on the registry.

We currently have a draft of the Webpage that will describe all of the - what the different status codes mean and I was wondering -- this is the question to you guys -- if you are interested in reviewing the draft before we put that out.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, tanks very much Krista. I see Jeff has his hand up.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think to answer your last question, yes, I mean we would obviously be interested. A question I have - and I'd like to make sure there's flexibility - that link, are you saying it has to be in the actual output or can it be on the Webpage itself, like where the terms and conditions are?

If it has to be in the actual output, which is not what I envisioned with the PDP, there are massive code changes that need to be done. If it just has to be on my Webpage, so that someone can click on it, that's easy.

Krista Papac: I'm going to ask - (Caitlin)'s heading up implementation of this. (Caitlin) is on the registrar team so I'm going to ask (Caitlin) to answer that please.

[\(Caitlin Tubergen\)](#): Hi, this is [\(Caitlin Tubergen\)](#) of the registrar services department, for the record. I believe that the link to the EPP status code document does actually have to be an output. It will be - I'm not very technical person so I apologize - but I believe it will be now (unintelligible) months implementation. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: I'm not sure where that decision was made because it wasn't in the PDP that way. And I strongly - I mean, I cannot emphasize this enough - we don't want to mess with actual code and EPP outputs and there is a lot more than six months.

If you do anything with EPP outputs, it actually has to go through the (IETF) process in order for new standards to be developed. I think the point is they want anyone to be able to link - to click on the link to see what the codes mean but of actually have to be in the output itself, I don't see a technical reason for that and I - it's not in the PDP that way.

Having it in the output - on the page itself for someone to click through, achieves everything you need to achieve without actually spit out into the output.

Man: So just a quick clarification. I'm not an expert on the PDP but one thing that I believe is the case is that it's not about the (unintelligible). It's just in the Whois output. So in that sense, I don't think there's a need to change (a booking).

Man: Okay, so I've got a clear...

Man: But EPP feeds the output. It has to - and most peop- at least in our system. I'm sure it similar with others, what goes - what's spit out into Whois or we're through, actually comes - it's what comes in, comes out.

So you're messing with it. Again, if the purpose is to make sure that someone, when they read Webpage of what the code is, that they can click

on a link. Let us figure out the way to do it as opposed to mandating some sort of way.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, so I've got a queue. There are about three or four people in the Adobe chat who have plus one Jeff's comment. I've got (Jordan) with his hand up. I think Cyrus wanted to say something.

Jeff Neuman: I think this conversation is bizarre. I don't understand how you can distinguish what is output versus other components of the page. If there's a Webpage that has some content on it, some of which is specific data that is mandated by ICANN and some is not, but there's no part of it that is output.

It's just a Webpage and so I think you're saying it needs to be on that Webpage where the rest of the Whois data is, not - it doesn't have to be in some specific position intermingled amongst all of the other Whois data or does it just need to be on that Webpage?

(Keith Drazek): Okay, I've got Cyrus. Go ahead.

Cyrus Namazi: So thank you. Cyrus Namazi for the record. It sounds like this needs to be revisited by some of - and have some of your expertise included before we actually sort of set this loose. So if I may suggest, let's say, take this off-line, take a closer look with you to make sure that we do it right.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much, Cyrus. I appreciate that. I had a couple of other hands up the let's take this off-line and have a separate conversation of that's all right. (Edmund), go ahead.

(Edmund Chung): (Unintelligible). I just want to make sure that (the Whois) output also includes a disclaimer portion usually. Most registries and registrars have that. And, you know, if the link is included in that, the disclaimer portion, it doesn't affect the input/output kind of issues. And, you know, so that might be something

maybe we should be considering and not only would just be the concern of others.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, so let's take this conversation off-line then and, Cyrus, thinks for offering to engage us and our membership and further discussions on that. So Krista, did you have any other updates that you want to provide? Okay, go ahead.

Krista Papac: So, I took some good notes on that just so you guys know and I'll get back to you. So just a couple of other quick updates. I wanted to - we talked last time we were together as far as, just about sort of the expansion of the services team specifically, the registry services team that supports you and I just wanted to give you guys a quick update on that.

We're actually just about to put out also two candidates in Europe in the Istanbul hub office. If you recall, which you probably won't but I have three opening. I had two in Istanbul, one in Singapore.

So I'm now recruiting for the Singapore position, so just to let you guys know that we are building out the top offices as well as bringing on additional support you scale with the growth of the group - of your group. No questions?

So the next quick update is I also just wanted to make everybody aware, because I know there've been various conversations about - RSTEP is one that came up recently but there's others that have been going on with respect to scaling our processes and the different support services and mechanisms that we have in place to help you guys.

So we've had for - gosh, we kicked off this project actually I believe it was late last year, to not only better define in business terms rather than in policy terms, the various services that we have support you. So that's been going on for a while and now we're in the process of actually operationalizing those

in scaling them to make them more efficient and to help process things more quickly.

So the combination of staffing, as well as operationalization of these services, you'll start to see some improvements and some efficiencies in those types of things.

And just, in that same vein, we also launched a GDD portal a little over a week ago, I guess. It seems like it was a month ago. But we launched our GDD portal which had just the first iteration of the portal and currently only supports new gTLD registries but will continue to evolve support existing TLD registries or legacy, if you will, registrars and other processes.

So I know that as I'm sure that most of you can relate, software development projects, they don't work perfectly the first time you launch so I know that there's been a number of you that have experienced challenges or have questions.

I would encourage you to please continue to provide us with that feedback if you have - if you already have - or if you haven't, to please provide us with that feedback so that we can implement these things so that we're aware of it.

So if we don't know what the challenges are, we can't actually fix them. As well as, you know, feel free to suggest new features or things that you'd like to see in there. We have a pretty good list going but we can't think of everything, so your, you know, input is really important to this.

And then the last thing I have real quick, I know this is been something that's been asked for, for a long time and we're very close to being able to deliver to you and I was really hoping to have it by today, but it's still going through final review.

But we have the first iteration of the new gTLD registry operators welcome kit. So it - the way - is to give you what the welcome kit is going to - the goal of the welcome kit or what the layout of it will be, we're basically thinking of it in two (chapters).

For those of you who went to the session yesterday, you're hearing this a second time and I apologize for that. But there are basically going to be two chapters. We're looking at it from the perspective of the first chapter is, now that I sign my registry agreement, what do I need to do to get the (general) availability? What are the processes and steps?

That's what will be the first iteration and so some of you - well, this is the registry stakeholder group meeting but I realize there are (NTAG) members and here - some of you may already be in (general) availability or very near. You will still get the welcome kit sent to you just let you have it.

And then for those who are not currently - haven't signed their registry agreement yet, once you get your registry agreement signed or once it's signed, you'll then receive that first chapter in the welcome kit.

We've already - we're already working on adding the second chapter and when that's done, of course everybody will get it. But that's regis- I mean, a gTLD registry. But the second chapter is going to be ongoing operations.

So now that I'm in general availability or now that I'm a registry, what are the things that I need to do on an ongoing basis? It's not meant to be comprehensive. It does not supersede your registry agreement. The agreement prevails always. Or, you know, whatever is in the agreement is the thing that really spells out your obligations but it's really meant to be a helpful tool that you can use to sort of raise awareness about the different things Asia be doing.

So the welcome kit, Chapter 1 is imminent and Chapter 2 will come right behind that, probably - I'm thinking it'll probably take us about four to six weeks to finish that up but - and those were my updates.

(Keith Drazek): Good. Thanks very much, Krista, and, yes, that's great is about the welcome kit among some of the other things, so I see Jeff has his hand up. Jeff, just before we get to your question, we have an agenda on the screen that includes some things that are not really specific to the GDD.

So I want to, you know, sort of open this up and save there are any questions or topics that folks would like to raise with Akram and Cyrus and Krista in the room, we don't have to talk about, for example, strategy panels or Internet governance.

If there are other topics that folks want to raise in this session, we can certainly do so, so feel free to make any recommendations that you like. So with that, over to you, Jeff. Go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, a question I mean - thanks Krista and thanks for the portal. I think it's going to be good and when you add the additional functionality, I think it's - I look forward to the - taking - instead of having two different customer support - just having them integrated I think will be easy.

On RSTEPS, in particular, and I think I actually asked this question about five or six years ago, when something goes through an administrative and completeness check, for most people, that's kind of a black hole. They don't know exactly what that means.

You may know internally but I think most people, when they submit the RSTEP request, it doesn't - we don't know what that means. So any guidance that you can provide, because I know people have filed RSTEP requests. I believe it's more than 15 days old for a couple of them and they don't

understand why they haven't been posted yet when they haven't gotten a determination yet.

And you said it - because it hasn't gone through this check. In the past, before all of your time at ICANN - although Krista and (Payma) remember this, you know, because you've been involved in the community for a long time - it was oftentimes used as a period in which ICANN can choose to delay things it didn't want to deal with.

And I know things have evolved a lot since then. But there were certain (things that went to) RSTEP that wouldn't show for about eight or nine months and they would always be under administrative for (completeness) review.

I don't think that's what's going on here but it would be good to provide that guidance and also (unintelligible) process is going to be used a lot. I think there'll be a number of people to submit things like wanting to use two character names, maybe someone that's an RSTEP to do a wildcard to try to get in front of the name (coalition), right. There are a whole bunch of things that we could use the RSTEP for so would be good to know what goes into that admin process.

Krista Papac: Yes, thank you, Jeff. Yes, absolutely everything, you know, everything you said - just to be clear, well, just to add to that, a couple of things that are want to do the RSTEP, is long-term things, but again, there are a lot of policy definitions and instructions that are included there but there's not some real business process stuff.

So much like we've done with a lot of the processes in the new gTLD program, I want to - I do want to create something that helps sort of step you through those things so it's clear what these different statuses, for instance, mean.

The administrative and completeness check, yes, you're right. There's nothing going on there other than we're just trying to re-scope out how we get these things through more quickly because the process that worked for 22 registries doesn't work as well several hundred and seem to be over 1000.

So - and so the vision I have are that we have right now is that the RSTEP would eventually be pulled into the GDP portal as well which will help improve efficiencies but that's not going to happen in the short term.

So what we're actually doing right this minute is redefining the internal business process, a short-term solution, to make it more, you know, again flow-through our steps more efficiently is a way to help improve the turnaround time between now and we can bring it into the portal which is the long-term fix. So I'm definitely aware that there are some challenges they are and we're definitely working through them so I appreciate the feedback. Thank you.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much, Krista. I'm going to hand it over to Paul with a question.

Paul Diaz: Yes actually, just a follow-up. Paul Diaz for the record. Just a follow on, Krista. As we discussed the other day, you know, you're aware there are some specific examples of RSTEP, the challenges that we have, this black hole phenomenon and very much appreciate the reengineering that's going on, the (processing) you have, and I think it's clear that this is something that's very important to us, so let's make sure the channels of communication are open as you're doing the reengineering and then talk to us.

We might have some very useful, helpful win/win kind of solutions to help you along and public interest registry for sure. Happy to do that because we have RSTEPS with you and others. And you've received emails. You know who we are - that are out there. Reach out to us. We want to work with you on this, make it work.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much, Paul. (Edmund), then (Liz). Anyone else want to get in the queue? Okay, (Edmund), go ahead.

(Edmund Chung): Thank you. (Edmund) here. I don't know whether (I'm jumping the sub) topics but I wanted to (relay) something about (names collision), is that...

(Keith Drazek): So you're certainly welcome to raise it. We do have a presentation from...

((Crosstalk))

(Keith Drazek): ...from JAS global advisors here on the agenda for the segment, so you can ask it now or you can wait.

(Edmund Chung): Will the team be still here during that presentation? This is - I'll just throw it out. So in the presentations and in previous debates there wasn't any mention about what to do next with (unintelligible). Are their thoughts at this point (having to do with those three)? And just as the reserves going forward, it doesn't talk about - there is no particular indication of what (unintelligible) the applicants.

Akram Atallah: Thank you, (Edmund), for your question. So we have the open comment period since nothing has been decided on how to move forward yet on the (collisions) and same with (unintelligible).

Now, I suggest that if you have recommendations for how you'd like to see the ECS moving forward with that, then please do comment. The recommendation right now is to reserve them indefinitely.

I think that's what the JAS working group has - the JAS recommendation has been. So if you have any other recommendations, please use the public comments so that we're aware of all those.

(Edmund Chung): Thank you. I just want - you know, just indicate that, for the other ones, there is at least some indication of what to do next. These ones are internally applicants and this one doesn't. So that's the reason why I brought that up. There is a slight difference. I understand it's still in public comments, but...

Akram Atallah: Let's be clear that moving forward that application is not in the scope of the JAS team. They are looking at the technical evaluation. And the recommendations are based on that. So I think that for how we move forward with the applications, we would like to hear from the community and how they would like us to see - to deal with that, so.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much (Edmund) and Akram. (Liz).

(Liz Finberg): (Liz Finberg) for the record. Krista, I wonder if you could give us a little bit of guidance. It's hard to jump around but again with respect to the RSTEP. Not only the process getting to approval, but once the RSTEP is approved, we have a question about when we then should expect to see our contractual amendments from ICANN. How is that communicated?

Would we receive it as an E-document? Does it go out on hard copy? And what, if any, coordination occurs between ICANN legal and the team that has reviewed and approved the RSTEP process?

Again, our - as you know, we've had some in the queue I think as (all) registries, we want to make sure that, with respect to our new gTLDs, we get to launch on time and we're not simply waiting for paperwork. Thanks.

Krista Papac: It's Krista again. Thank you, (Liz). So the - you've got a process question and I want to address the timing that you brought up in there as well. So the - now that we have the GDD portal, if it's an RSTEP for a new gTLD registry operator, we would use that as the mechanism to communicate the amendment - or the contract amendment with you.

I know that that's an outstanding item with you guys and I'm working on that just so you know, for your direct interest in this, were specific interest. And one of the things that I'm trying to understand right now, is I think in the past, I'm not mistaken, and some of you that around a while will know this, we've asked you to propose the contractual language versus us proposing it.

I wanted to look at that again is it doesn't - I'm not sure I understand that sort of the, you know, Dan Halloran, you've been around here since the beginning of time question. Can help you understand this as well as with Francisco? So we need to - I need to figure that out and then we need to coordinate that with the effective registry operators directly, I think as a follow-up.

(Liz Finberg): I do. Just to answer your question - and I'll tell you what my understanding is. When the RSTEP is submitted we are asked to propose what the contractual amendment would look like. And in our case, again - forgive my pure self-interest - but we did have some back-and-forth with the RSTEP processors who requested that we make changes to our proposed language.

We've - we agreed to the changes in so, again, we're just sort of - I think in this weird black hole trying to figure out when and how the amendment actually gets forwarded to us and what it looks like.

Krista Papac: Yes, so for that (piece), then we would take that language and put it into the amendment format that we normally use and then we would get that to you for signature and then it would (come back to us) for signature and get posted on the registry agreement page.

And there was something else about that that I wanted to address that was in part of your - I don't remember what it was but as far as having those - and I think that your - you guys are clear on this but I get this question a lot, so I want to make it used (unintelligible) so I want to make it for everyone else in the room.

The RSTEP, once you sign the registry agreement, you can submit an RSTEP which is a request change add or delete services from the registry from (Exhibit A) of the new gTLD agreement.

The RSTEP doesn't prevent you from proceeding through the rest of the steps that you take from registry agreement signing to delegation or launch or what have you.

But what happens is - and this is - it's a business point for you guys but it's not a process point, is just can't offer that service until your registry agreement, you know, assuming the RSTEP gets approved, your registry agreement is amended authorizing you.

So you might have an internal reason why can't launch without the approval of the RSTEP, but the RSTEP itself doesn't prevent you from launching. And if I remember the other thing I need to point out to you all, maybe you to the (side later). Thank you.

(Keith Drazek): All right, thanks very much. (Jordan), I had you next in the next in queue.

(Jordyn Buchanan): Yes, sorry to jump around. I want to go back to the previous discussion about (unintelligible) because I am more confused from this response data instead of less. So I - are we supposed - is the comment period supposed to encompass the JA- the technical components of JAS's report, whether or not (core com) and mail should be permanently reserved or not?

Are we also supposed to think about, like, if they were, like, permanently reserved, like what would be disposition of those applications be because the things like that rather not have to try to do all that at once.

I'd rather sort of focus on the technical stuff now and then subsequently we can have a separate dialogue with the community about how he would deal with those applications if they were reserved.

Akram Atallah: So I agree with you. The current comments are on the technical recommendations that - or technical - or the recommendations that the JAS and came up with. But we would never prevent you from providing comments on - if this happens and what we do, so - but I agree that if we decide to do that, then we will have to come back and engage the community I were to go from here as well, so no issues there.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks (Jordyn). Thanks Akram. Any other questions, comments? Any other topics for discussion that both would like to raise? This is your opportunity.

So would either of you like to make any comments? I know, Akram, you have to leave to get to the board meeting, so thank you very much for spending the time and coming to sit with us today on our Tuesday stakeholder group session.

Akram Atallah: Thank you. So me as well - I just wanted to thank (Keith) and stakeholder group for forwarding us the opportunity to be here. I just wanted to make sure that you know we are always accessible for any issues, anything that you have. Of course, Krista, is like a lioness.

You know, she fights for you every day, every day inside ICANN make sure that we serve you and rightfully so. I'm also always available and open if there any issues that need to be escalated or whatever else. So thank you for having us here today.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much. We do have coming up the - as I said earlier, the presentation from (Jeff Schmidt), and JAS global advisors on name collision report. We have an opportunity to talk further about auctions.

I know that there were some conversations going on today about auction processes. Contractual compliance - we'll have Maguy Serad in about half an

hour. So there if there are compliance related discussions we want to have we can do that. Jeff, go ahead.

Man: I think - sorry, I think before we get started with JAS with Jeff, I would ask that we - I don't know if he's got a presentation prepared. I mean, he gave an excellent one yesterday. I would hope that we could just jump right into it and have dialogue as opposed to an actual presentation. Is that the plan?

(Keith Drazek): The plan is whatever we wanted to be. So I - you know, Jeff, I take that your - I take your recommendation and maybe if there's a brief update or presentation that needs to be done, that's fine and we jump into Q&A. But I would also, you know, Jeff, if you have preferences on how you'd like to handle this that's fine as well.

(Jeff Schmidt): Thanks. This is the other Jeff. And I agree with the other Jeff. We've given the presentation now four or five times in the last two weeks. You've all read the papers so I think discussion would be the most helpful if that's what you guys would prefer.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, great. (Jordyn), go ahead.

(Jordyn Buchanan): Thanks Jeff. (I guess I'll just, like, keep talking since we've already had a number of opportunities to talk to you but I wanted to, like, since we're just talking about (unintelligible), I wanted to follow up on mail one more time because the subtle quite understand (unintelligible).

So you said yesterday (corp in home) should be reserved as private networks. And then he said mail (unintelligible). It's not necessarily because of the use as a private network but it's also preconfigured into a lot of people's (unintelligible).

So I agree with that. But as far as I can tell, and I guess I'd ask a few questions - as far as I can tell, and the people have the host name mail all by

itself preconfigured into some sort of environment. And I'm just trying to understand what was the risk that you've identified that that would expose people to if mail were delegated but that the (dot list) host mail was still disallowed as it would be under the current ICANN rules?

So mail is delegated you could have (food dot mail) but no one had just the (dot list) as mail. Like, what's the risk that we are trying to protect against in that scenario?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (Jordan). This is Jeff. So - and I didn't give you complete answer yesterday so I apologize - during the session. But what I wanted to describe was we actually had a six point test that we used for kind of going through the strings to see whether we should be a candidate for our recommendations for a 1918-like treatment.

The test included - the first pass filter with a significant frequency of (occurrence) so we focused our, you know, our thoughts on the strings that were on the top, you know, 100, 150 on all the frequency and just the lockout list.

We then filtered by, you know, widespread usage by IP or alternative system number, so very narrow usages which are probably leaking from, you know, internal use or something like that we're not considered, but widespread usage, which will be harder to modify was considered, so that was the next filter.

Then we actually wound up with a couple after that, that were actually easily explainable and so we filtered does out. So there was a number of strings that passed the first two tests but once we dug in a little bit more, once we talked to some of the sources we said, "Okay, that's what that is." There were some reasonable (core) explanations that was, you know, differed by string but we found that it was not in this, you know, widespread for internal use situations.

It was in some - a number of other situations, so we took out the ones that were easily explainable. I can talk about that in detail, but you get the gist. That after that, we filtered out anything that was not will be termed a long live to generic term.

So there are a number of terms that are tied to specific brands, specific vendors, specific technologies, that tended to not be what we termed long lived and generic, recognizing that most IDPFE sorts reservations and other areas tend to be on live generic, not specific to a vendor or a technology (or will be) here five or five years from now.

So we filtered out everything that wasn't long live generic. Then we looked for evidence in use in documentation for (example strips) or all other sorts of areas (unintelligible) actually really (stood) out (in order of) examples, documentation, configuration strips, things like that are coded uses of that mail (in it).

Some fault configurations of some likely use mail packages, particularly if you wind back about eight years actually had (PLDR) coded in and then all that - you know, that's can be (using) a default configuration that's very, very difficult to unwind. The final test was evidence of (hard) coded use so slightly different than documents or example strips but (hard) coded into devices or software, so those were our tests.

That's why you - we, you know, if you look at, like, the inter aisle frequency list or something like that, you know, we didn't just take the top (ten) off of there. We went through and really considered, you know, most of the strings under that in a more comprehensive lens.

So I would say - I apologize. I would say if you want to, in your public comments, right, on our report, talk about that test or that methodology, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

(Jordyn Buchanan): Sure. I guess I have a follow up questions. Just do you - did you see - or did you even attempt to grapple with the fact that - or see in your methodology that there was any usage other than just the host name mail? Are we talk- is there - are there examples out there of (food dot) mail being used in examples as opposed to just the dot list host?

Because I - you know, our public comment on the original (and in our) report (flag) that mail was much riskier than the inter aisle data would seem to indicate because there's a large amount of chaching that affects the mail host name that did (provide other). But as a result of that, I think 99.8% of all queries for mail were for the dot list host and just for the host (named) mail as opposed to SLDs within the TLD.

Jeff Neuman: So thanks. Good point. And - this is Jeff - and yes, we did see evidence of use at the TLD levels (as well), with something else at the SLD level. Yes. And you see that particularly in actually the example scripts and default configurations and stuff where, you know, server name dot mail is actually, you know, hard coded in.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much. I've got a couple of people in the queue. If anybody else would like to jump in, let me know. Jeff Neuman, then (Andrew). Anyone else? Okay, (Edmund).

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. I kind of worked out some notes. I want to take everyone through kind of the proposal and what it means in terms of a realistic launch and just present a scenario.

To start it all out, I think 120 days is completely way too long. And I do have a proposal at the end of this but so let's say you're - I'll tell you - I'll walk you through a scenario.

In June, let's say ICANN starts its auctions on time for the contention sets. And let's say you spend now - predict that you spend \$2 million in getting a string. Okay? Cool. So now you're out \$2 million.

You get your string and let's say you're lucky enough to sign a contract by July 1. Now, you signed your contract on July 1. You're out \$2 million. ICANN sends you immediately an invoice so you can start paying (licensing) fees right away. You've got a (\$5000 minimum) a year.

(What's that)? Okay, it's fair enough. I'll get to that then. So now you go 60 days until delegation. That's about the average time I think that was presented. So now you (get) your invoice.

So you're delegated on September 1, so now you're still spending some (money). You then, on September 1, (unintelligible) TLD. So as everyone knows, it's such an attractive theme to draw people for your (unintelligible) efforts to. It (really works) (unintelligible) to tell you about it.

They say you need (net dot tail) data and one exception they've created for to the name collision rule because it's so important to, as presented yesterday, you have to have your Whois link out there.

(Unintelligible) any names in your zone but you have to have a Whois because that's critical on day one. It's of utmost importance. So you put your Whois on there.

If you're delegated on September 1, you are not allowed to have any other names into your zone until January 1st, so now we're going September 1 to January 1. But they say don't worry about it because you can do your sunrise, right.

So let's say you go through the process. You file your documents and if you're really lucky you can start in October doing your sunrise. You could do

your sunrise and you can allocate the names but you can't put them into the zone.

So, of course, all of the registrars - and this just happened today and launches - the registrars get all these questions of I got my name I can't anything with it but to discharge mean a full year. You collected your money and I can do anything with it.

Now it's okay because, you know, under the existing rule it was 120 days from the contract signing so really it was, at most 30, 45 days, maybe 60 days at the most you couldn't allocate name.

So the reason people did it was because in any case you have to do a sunrise. If you do is sunrise for some of the names - if you didn't include your name collision names and sunrise ultimately the name collision names get released. You, at that point, do need to do a sunrise. And so most people, in order to avoid doing two sunrises, they included in the original one, right.

That's just a reality. It's not preferable, so people are doing it, but again it's not a good consumer and not a good end-user experience at all. But people are doing it because they have to because most people can't really do two sunrises.

Okay, so then they set on the slide, well, don't worry. You can also - nothing is stopping you from doing your land rush or claims process because, you know, we're not stopping you from doing it. You just can't delegate anything.

Again, if you thought doing a sunrise and withholding names for a period of time was an issue, try doing a land rush and claims and a GA, general availability, without delegating into the zone. The amount of confusion out there, even if ICANN says, "Don't worry. You can do it," really, for most businesses, it's not very feasible to actually do it.

You can't do anything with (founders), right. You can put any (founders) in the zone until January 1 which is really what you need to stimulate general availability in a lot of cases for a lot of the TLDs. But you can't do any of that because you can't have anything until January 1 into your zone.

It just piles on and piles on as things you can't do. I really urge everyone - this 120 is an incredibly long period of time. It makes things commercially unreasonable. And I go back to the purpose, right. The JAS report did a fantastic job in allo- discussing the controlled interruption and how that's supposed to work.

And most controlled interruption that exists, whether it's in the telecom industry - and I pointed out an example in - it's still the telecom industry but it's called US (com) and short code which is a five or six digit code.

They have a 60 day period which they are actually talking about shortening but it's a 60 day period in which, once a code is deleted, you can't register that code for 60 days because what the code does, it carries traffic data in between mobile phones and the short code and the applications that things, but they're trying to avoid collision so they have a 60 day period.

Most collision periods where everyone call them, are as (unintelligible) yesterday between - what is it - 60 to 90 days or 30 to 90 days, it kind of ranges in there, so 120 days is way even above that.

I would propose that - and I propose this on the NTAG list - oh, and just one more thing. And controlled interruption, it's really the standards that they've set which is that they won't really ask for anything to be done to - with that name, (it kind of reports) about collision, unless it's - (help me remind me of the standard). It's a...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...to human life, right. So the argument of 120 days was that people to do things quarterly, they only test their systems quarterly, (unintelligible) case that for people who do things quarterly, if there is a system that presents a clear and present danger to human life, think that they would their test system probably little more often than once every 120 days or every quarter.

So my proposal would be to take 120 days from (the date of contact) (unintelligible) out there or revocation of certificates and things like that. But you'd basically say that the greater of 120 days from contract signing or - and I can't remember (unintelligible) - and (30 or even 45) days from when you start the control interruption.

A control interruption period of 30 days a sufficient enough that we will know that something's going wrong. I do want to separate something though. The 120 initially, as proposed, was both for detection of the issues, the collisions, as well as mitigation.

In my proposal, it would be 30 to 45 days of controlled interruption to get - to put a detection part. So if there's an issue that's reported with any names in that 30 to 45 days, I would suggest a time period for you pulls names out, only those names, and so you can investigate further as to whether it does present a clear and present danger to human life but you'd be allowed to move forward with everything else.

I think it satisfies every one of the points - the 120 days from the certificate authorities, the 30 to 45 days of control interruption for detection of the problems, and it allows people to move forward more quickly with their (watches) so that it makes things a little bit more palatable.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much, Jeff. I've got three folks in the queue. I've got (Andrew), (Edmund) and (Jordan) and, you know, feel free to raise additional comments, questions for Jeff who's still here with us or responses to, you know, the discussions (going on).

(Andrew Merriam): This is (Andrew). That's for Jeff and Francisco. I'm going to press on something I asked yesterday on behalf of (Rubins) who's participating remotely.

So I understand non-delegated (KOBs) who answer controlled interruption (unintelligible) zone can delegate it a (unintelligible) controlled interruption for only those labels in their blacklist in the (ATD list). So if (entering) controlled interruption for the block list is considered good enough, why can't all (KLDs) have the same equal option?

Jeff Schmidt: This is Jeff. Is the question why use the wildcard as opposed to just using their resource records? Is that the question?

(Andrew Merriam): The question is asked on behalf of (Rubens) so I want to make sure I'm...

Man: I can clarify it for you, Jeff. It's - I think (Rubens) is trying to ask whether - yes, instead of using a wildcard for the - for any (PWE) you would always use the block list and just use the controlled interruption mechanism for the names that are on the current - that would be on the (SLD) block list if the alternative (past the delegation ones) being used.

Jeff Schmidt: Okay, thank you. So the issue being - there's actually been a lot of great papers about the potential churn in the (SLP) block list. Several of the VeriSign presentations in the London meeting were regarding the growth in churn of the (SLP) block list in certain cases.

The - using a wildcard that's every query - there should be no valid query going into an indelicate space so limiting yourself to just the strings on the block list is unnecessary. The wildcard has a superior approach because it gets everything, whether it's on the block list or not.

I'd appreciate comments either here, or think about it, and then put it in - of a comment period about - from a registry perspective and from implementation perspective, which is easier? Is it easier or harder for you guys to do, you know, resource records or a wildcard?

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much, Jeff. Over to (Edmund) and then (Jordan).

(Edmund Chung): Thank you. (Edmund) here. In the report, I'm wondering if you have any comment with it, consider the impact on second-level, what the results here are the recommendations would have in the second round.

The reason why I'm bringing this up is because, you know, the recommendations here give potential bad actors a pretty good template to play with for future rounds of new gTLD and I find it a little bit irresponsible if we don't consider the impact of these suggestions or the findings on the future rounds. So I wonder, you know, what those considerations on (or your thoughts).

Jeff Schmidt: This is Jeff. Thank you. No, the impact on a potential second round was not expressly considered mostly because we don't know any more than anybody else what a second round will look like and when and et cetera. That was not a consideration.

(Edmund Chung): Can I just quickly follow up? As mentioned, I think it's, you know, as the community as a whole, it's a little bit irresponsible probably for the program overall if you don't consider it because this gives a, you know, whatever we recommend it kind of gives a template of potential bad actors to do certain things before the second round (between on the) second round to create situations, create use cases, to create havoc, if you will, in future rounds.

So, I think before we, you know, jump into conclusions on exactly how we deal with it, we have to consider the impact of these recommendations and actions on second and future rounds.

Jeff Schmidt: Thank you. So I'm intrigued. Which bad actors are you talking about? Are you talking about outside criminals or - yes, outside bad actors or you talking about potential new applicants or other interested parties in the second round?

(Edmund Chung): That's a good question. That's why, you know, I think we need some study on it but (competitively), you know, I see some new gTLDs being applied for. I would create a very difficult experience for them for a startup.

I can, you know, try to do something where it creates a situation that is widespread. Let's say, I'm a bad actor and I have a pretty good install base. Not necessarily a criminal kind of bad actor, but I want to - I want nobody to be able to apply for certain TLDs. I make it fairly prevalent.

I don't know. I can come up with a few more scenarios probably not I just think, you know, it seems to me, it makes sense to do - at least evaluate the potential impact.

Jeff Schmidt: To me it makes sense. I'll just say we considered extensively the potential impact within the current round of bad actors or of commercial gaming, I mean all of those sorts of things inter (round), we considered extensively.

With respect to, you know, a future round, I'd appreciate thoughts or ideas, you know, in the comment period about what we could actually do now knowing what little we know about the future round, what considerations we could actually take now based on that. I'd appreciate thinking on that. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Quickly sorry - do you think these recommendations would still work in the second round? Perhaps that's another way to ask part of the question. They weren't designed for use beyond the current round.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks very much. We've got a comment in the Adobe chat from (Rubens). Would somebody care to read that? I guess I've got it here. Hold on one second.

(Rubens)' comment is most of the churn it's from algorithmic sources like JAS owned research have shown - and hold on as I scroll down - and the question is not whether it's superior but it's good enough. I hope I got that in the right order. So just wanted to - and if there's any response to that, by all means.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, okay, he's right. Most of the churn, the additive churn in particular, new strings that appear year-over-year, is coming from algorithmic sources and it's actually very isolated to a few TLDs. But I guess my question back would be, what is the energy against using the wildcard?

(Keith Drazek): Okay, so if (Rubens) has a response - it looks it is typing right now. We'll give him a minute. In the meantime, let's move to (Jordan) and I think we have (Maggie) from compliance who's here with us scheduled to start in about five minutes.

So I'm not trying to wrap this up prematurely but let's try to identify - if anybody else would like to get in the queue, let's do that now and try to move on.

Man: (Rubens) finished typing.

(Keith Drazek): So (Rubens) finished typing. He said out against using, just having both options.

Jeff Neuman: That's fair. I'd actually appreciate that in a comment. I mean, that's fair. Thanks (Rubens).

(Steve Machin): Hi, so I think this is mostly - more of a question for Francisco then for Jeff, but I want to pick on the discussion that started yesterday which seemed like our

goal here is to give people as much time as possible in order to detect and remediate potential problems.

Then it's clearly superior to provide the controlled interruption notice as early as possible and, you know, 120 days maybe - yes, I would sort of say, "Oh, that's probably good enough." But, you know, I'm sure there are some people will think, you know, maybe they made 180 days or something like that.

And doing that for all cases is probably significant overkill and 120 days, you know, may be too long. Maybe Jeff's right, we only need 30 days or 60 days. I don't know where it is.

But it seems like we would -it would be best off if we could give people as much notice as possible. So why don't - like, what's the harm to adding every applied (core) name to the root now with a wildcard and the 127.0.5353 IP address today?

And then make sure that that holds for at least some period of time, whether it's 30, 60, 90, 120 days before we start adding other names to any particular TLD.

But for TLDs that are, you know, have an even signed a contract yet, that would give them a significant - you know, then this would become - you wouldn't see any of this push back at all, I think, from the registry stakeholder group if most of the names could proceed without any additional delay.

So I guess, Francisco, Jeff asked yesterday what the harm is. This seems just like not what the harm is. It seems like clearly superior from a notice and remediation perspective as well, so I'm sort of wondering, should we be having more of a discussion around providing controlled interruption as early as possible as opposed to waiting until the last possible moment before (unintelligible)?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, and (Steve), this is Jeff. Just since you (unintelligible), it was all - it was really what's with harm putting it - with delegating a TLD that hasn't been - hasn't had a contract yet because the worst thing that happens is, yes, you tested out. You've got the controlled interruption and you never delegated. I mean, who cares at that point? So that was really what's the harm.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks Jeff. Francisco, go ahead.

Francisco Arias: Yes, Francisco here. So I think that (unintelligible) an idea that it's worth to explore. While the considerations are that I will (rate) here is that we cannot know for sure that those things will become formally a TLD once we release the contract.

And that's, for example, one of the reasons why the (CAB) form has the (unintelligible) period for revocation of internal name certificates counted from the contracting. So just putting ideas here, perhaps another option would be to consider some (clients) to put the names in the (unintelligible) immediately after the contract.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Francisco. The last idea was exactly what I was going to - (Jeff here). I think it would be clearly better to do it now for everything because then you give the most possible notice. But as an alternative, if you do have this contracting concern and on the day that the contract is signed and immediately put in the route, and then the 220 day periods toll simultaneously instead of being potentially overlapping.

Francisco Arias: Yes, another consideration that comes to mind is we have a limitation on 1000 strings they can go to the (routing) a 12 month period.

Jeff Neuman: Sure, but that's based on change rate of the route, right, whereas if you did of the change that once, then you would actually be doing less. I mean, you know, it would just be a one day change, right.

Francisco Arias: I think all that people (would need to agree) with that.

(Keith Drazek): Okay, thanks, Francisco. Thanks (Jordan). And Jeff, you had one comment and anybody else like to get in the queue on this...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, a follow - sorry.

(Keith Drazek): I was just seeing if there was anybody else and then over to you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, a follow up to that - to the answer of while we don't know if they're going to sign a contract or not, and it's - now the certificate is already - I would just ask how many withdrawals of a complete string - not applications because there are always contentions - but how many withdrawals have you seen of any strings completely after the passage of evaluation?

I think the answer is zero. And I don't think you will see any. I think it's safe to say that every string that's passed evaluation at this point will actually be delegated. I think you could pretty safely make that assumption. So I'm even talking after evaluation.

(Jon Nevett): Jeff's saying that there has not yet been an instance where there has been a string where at least one applicant has passed (unintelligible) or has moved into the phase where they could contract and the entire set of applicants for that string has withdrawn. So all of those would eventually...

Jeff Neuman: And the point of that, (Jon), and I don't think you'd disagree with this - the point of that is that ICANN could today delegate every string to itself and start the controlled interruption regardless of whether a contract was signed and feel pretty comfortable that at least one application for that string will move all the way to delegation.

Man: Yes, I agree with that. What if they did in a contract signing though is that...

Jeff Neuman: Because I think at that point again if you do it all at once you get kind of kind of the efficiencies of doing it. And second it just delays us even more right?

Man: Well not necessarily but it seems like our goal is to provide as much notice as possible doing it as early as possible the better right? So...

(Russ Weinstein): Hi Jeff. This is (Russ Weinstein) for the record from the gTLD team. I think your point's taken. It's probably a pretty high percentage for folks that don't withdraw after evaluation.

Because there are things that cause a string not to be delegated. You know, there's staff advice. There's objections. There's those things that so it doesn't have to necessarily be in contention or a string doesn't have to necessarily be in contention to get eliminated from the pool.

So I think we are down below the total number of unique strings that applied now. And there is potential for that to continue to reduce. But I think in general the concept still holds that if you can - you have a pretty good set of what's going to go into the root.

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Thanks Russ. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Just a quick comment. We might hit the root scaling issue on the suggestion as well just to...

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Before we wrap up and moved to the session with (Maguy) on compliance any final comments, questions, feedback?

Okay. Well sorry, Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: I just want to say thank you and please comment, please use the public comment period. We will look at those very seriously and very much appreciate your feedback. Thank you.

(Keith Drazek): So and Jeff thank you very much for being here with us making yourself available and engaging in the dialogue. I think it's been very helpful and (Francisco) thank you also.

So with that we will move into a conversation with ICANN compliance and (Maguy) welcome.

(Maguy Serad): Good morning everyone. My name is (Maguy Serad), Contracts and Compliance.

With me in the audience today (Sumi Lee). (Sumi) has been working with me in registering space. And also with me in the back (unintelligible), (Roger Lee) from the Singapore offices and (unintelligible).

(Keith Drazek): So (Maguy) thank you very much all of you for being here. I just wanted to note that I see you got some slides and if you want to run through a quick presentation that would be fine but I would like to reserve some of the time for (unintelligible). Thank you.

(Maguy Serad): So we have to (unintelligible) on the agenda. But I want to tell everybody that is a registry outreach session on Thursday that we have allotted an hour and a half to have more in-depth discussions.

This - the purpose of us being on the agenda today is just to let you know we have a few things would like to share with you and talk to you about but join us on Thursday. With that I'm going to turn into (Sumi) to share with you what's being worked on.

(Sumi Lee): Thank you. Good morning. And again my name is (Sumi Lee). Next slide please, so as we mentioned we're going to do a high level overview of what's been going on with compliance on the registry side, what's happened since the last ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires.

So this slide here just shows you since November of 2013 till February the different complaint types, the number of complaints that we've received and the pie chart that shows you the distributions and the percentages.

Next slide please. I'm sorry next please.

Woman: Number six.

(Sumi Lee): Oh I'm sorry back up, thank you. So these were or are the current registry complaint types. And as of today we have all of them available for submission on our main Web site under registries.

And we have learned more FAQs also that go along with each of the complaint types, all 40.

Next slide, so thank you. So just a brief overview of some of the lessons learned but this is the primary one that we want to touch upon today and that's that the obligation starts upon delegation.

So I think there was some confusion perhaps and we wanted to point this out and we're going to go into more of this discussion at our Thursday session.

Next slide, and this is again if you've been to any of our sessions we talk about this but an overview of our guidelines to please respond directly to the email and not send tickets directly to compliance tickets.

Next slide, and this is our overview of the scope in terms of our efforts and what compliance does.

Next slide, and I think that's the end. So we do have some time for questions.

(Keith Drazek): Yes thank you very much. Thanks for the very concise slides. And I have Jeff in the queue anybody else? (Jordan), anyone else? And (Maxim). All right Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Thanks for the presentation I know it was short and quick. I want to for - (Maguy) you and I had a discussion - we'll actually before that.

When you came into ICANN what I really liked was your presentations about wanting to be business partners with the registries and to, you know, really have a good relationship with us and talk things through with us and, you know, just really act as partners.

And I think what's happened with the new gTLD process and kind of the formalities that have to be put into place I feel like we've lost a little bit of that.

You and I had this discussion about this a year ago where a lot of things can be settled with a phone call or just reaching out even with an email instead of a formal kind of notice.

I think there was a lot of confusion as things had to start upon delegation or didn't necessarily make sense that delegation day.

For example on your site when you - I didn't know until you still don't know the exact date the something is going to be delegated right?

So people didn't know necessarily that on delegation day you had to have your DNSAC practice statement. I mean there's a lot of things that you have to have in the contract but I ask that your team you some business judgment in sending certain notices out.

I've noticed that I got a notice - I tell people this that we know that the name collision listed has - for 120 days after the contract's signed you can't have

name in zone until that 120 days or 121st day I think it is where I get into one issue with one of our TLDs is the first one.

I guess we miscounted 120. We got 119 or something like that and we delegated Whois. whatever that TLD was.

And Whois.tld is it's fine. It wasn't on the name collision list but it was less than 120 days. We count it as 120 days because I think we started on that one day on delegation.

But I think ICANN counts a day later or something happened like that. It was an innocent mistake but we immediately got a notice.

I actually commended them because they caught it. But to get a notice that says legal notice on it, you know, and then it also can provide a root cause analysis on how this happened.

And every notice goes and says we need a root cause analysis, we need this, this and this. I don't think it's very business friendly especially for certain types of notices.

It doesn't really feel like much of a partner. But I think my response to that was we've miscounted and we'll just re-delegate and we'll take it back and re-delegate it three hours later right?

I mean that was literally the extent of it. So the main point is let's try to be a little bit more business friendly and think about how things are worded.

You don't necessarily have to put in the subject line of everything legal notice and scare the crap out of people like they're breaching - like it's a serious breach of the agreement especially when it can be something incredibly minor and can be cleared up in a second.

But especially for us backend providers it's front end sees something that says legal notice they get all freaked out as if it's some serious breach.

Things like that I think just think about what's being sent out and just be more mindful of business partnerships.

(Keith Drazek): Let's go to the questions and then...

Woman: Yes. We'll address those (unintelligible).

(Keith Drazek): Yes okay. So then (Jordan) and (Maxim). (Jordan)?

(Jordyn Buchanan): Sure. Maybe building off what Jeff said is I've got to say I'm a little disappointed in where energy seems to be being invested in terms of compliance.

There's a lot of like sure there's legal obligations in the contract to provide certain reports or uploads starting at the time of delegation.

But in general those reports are entirely empty for the first 120 days of operation right like so show us what's on file out. Yes sure it's great. We'll give that to you.

But whether if they're not maybe it is a technical requirement of the contract but in terms of the benefit for the community and for the community and for ICANN in terms of actually what's the benefit of that compliance seemed incredibly low because it's pro forma. It's not substantive.

And on the other hand I see some pattern emerging of a fairly blatant disregard of substantive elements of the contract in terms of like I don't want to pick my own business police but I - at least in my opinion there is fairly substantive disregard for significant elements of the registry agreement that

are out there and as far as I can tell no effort whatsoever being made in order to benefit those.

And they're harder to enforce right like you have to actually go in like make judgment calls about the meaning of the contract and probably engage and you have a fight with people and not just having people say oh yes I guess we'll upload my report.

But we're spending tons of time dealing with technical violations of the contract and no - and as far as I can tell no time of all dealing with important substantive violations of the contract.

And it just seems totally backwards to me. It doesn't seem like it's doing the community or the public at large any benefit.

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Thanks (Jordan). I've got (Maxim), (Statton) and then (Reg) in the queue.

(Maxim Alzoba): (Maxim) (unintelligible). In the register agreement we have delegation dates which has no definition. And as we all know we will face soon the bank for all delegations for 120 days.

So that doesn't mean that the delegation will be delayed for 120 days. And we have to start our obligation starting from that point including fees whatever.

(Keith Drazek): So (Maxim) just so I'm not - was that because of the name collision issue...

(Maxim Alzoba): Yes.

(Keith Drazek): ...or different?

(Maxim Alzoba): I reference to the name collision and the prohibition of delegations. So I assume there is no delegation date before the delegations are allowed by the way it sounds it seems to work.

(Keith Drazek): Anybody else want to jump in on that one?

(Maxim Alzoba): Also we - I suggest that if we are not allowed to conduct business as usual the fees should be delayed too.

(Keith Drazek): Okay thanks (Maxim). So I have (Statton), (Reg) and Brett.

(Statton Hammock): (Statton) here from Brightside Registry. Since we signed one of our first registry agreements right before the end of last year we got a nice kind reminder that we needed to complete a compliance audit to the code of conduct at the end of the year for each year pursuant to Specification 9.

So we of course did that. There wasn't much guidance to it but we did and submitted the information and paperwork that we think along with a certificate of compliance to the code of conduct.

And we got a notice from ICANN that was well received and closed out that requirement.

But my question is should I assume now that the way I have done our compliance audit is, you know, the way that ICANN would like to see it done or would there be some other guidance coming over the course of the year to registries that, you know, this is how the compliance audit should work and this is what we're looking for and maybe that matches what I submitted previously?

So I was just curious to know, you know, if there's any further guidance on any kind of compliance audit related to our contracts coming? Thanks.

Krista Papac: Hi (Statton), Krista Papac. So this is a little bit of a compliance question but a little bit of an operational question too which is like everything else not always obvious.

So one of the things we were just talking about the other day -- so your timing is good -- is those exact - that's one example but those exact notices and will it makes sense for us to maybe develop some sort of template that everybody could use that would need to do that?

Because while this year we only had a few registries that had that obligation when there are many more that may have that obligation getting the data in a somewhat standardized format would make more sense.

So on this particular one we have until the end of the year which is great news. A template should be pretty easy to pull together and I think that something we think would be good to use and then you would get some sort of communication about that or whatever.

(Statton Hammock): Feel free to use my template.

Krista Papac: Thank you for the suggestion. I think (Maguy) just was to add one or somebody wants to add something.

Woman: I just want to clarify that we don't call it an audit at least from compliance's prospective just because we have a separate audit program.

And I don't or we don't want to confuse the general registry groups or audiences but we certainly appreciate your prompt response. And yes it's a great example. Thank you.

(Keith Drazek): Okay thanks. In the queue I've got (Reg), Brett and then (Sarah). Anybody else want to get in the queue? And (Pam) okay. Thanks.

(Reg Levy): Okay so just going back to that quickly that's an annual review. It's a self-review and not an audit I mean I'm just asking for your terminology?

Krista Papac: It's a requirement under the registry agreement and it's in the code of conduct. It's a requirement to submit this information...

(Reg Levy): What do you call it?

Krista Papac: Oh if I could finish. It is - I can look it up the specific term in what is called in the registry agreement. (Sumi) was just trying to make the differentiation that they - that compliance can do audits.

That's not what this was. This was that particular thing that's under the registry agreement requirements in the code of conduct.

If you give me a second I'll pull out my registry agreement and read you what it's called.

(Reg Levy): That's all right. I was just trying to get the terminology right.

So earlier in the slides you indicated that we were not supposed to send anything directly to -- and I forget what the email was -- but then you also said that was supposed to directly reply to each email.

It's - that's the reply to address.

(Maguy Serad): I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

(Reg Levy): That - if you go back in the slides it says do not send any email directly to and there's an email address. But that's the reply to email address. And you also said respond directly to the email.

(Maguy Serad): And perhaps that's confusing I'm not sure but the please respond directly to the email is in the actual ticket. The ticket that you receive its responding to that ticket. We can clarify that in the slide for Thursday but that's separate.

(Reg Levy): So it's okay to send the email if they're in response?

(Maguy Serad): Correct.

(Reg Levy): Thanks. And can we get these slides?

(Maguy Serad): Sure. And it's called the code of conduct certification.

(Reg Levy): Certification. Thank you very much.

(Maguy Serad): Yes.

Woman: And thank you.

Krista Papac: Sorry that's our internal term. Let me share with you what it's called in the contract.

(Reg Levy): That's okay. No problem.

Krista Papac: So that's what we call it at ICANN. In Specification 9 Section 3 it says that you'll conduct internal review at least once a year.

So it's that language that's in the agreement.

(Reg Levy): Thank you.

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Thanks very much. Three people in the queue Brett, (Sara), and (Pam) and then were going to wrap this up. Brett?

Brett Fausett: Thank you Brett Fausett from UniRegistry.

I had a question about the three-year audit program and maybe this dovetails into the, you know, difference between the audit and the certification.

But my understanding is that 100% of registries will get audited over three year period. And year one was fall of 2012, year two was the fall of 2013.

And so is it the ICANN's intent that all of the new gTLD registries will get their audit list 2014 or will we be starting a new three year window just for us?

(Maguy Serad): So the three-year audit program that's currently in effect is the baseline the current environment of the registrars and what we refer to as the current registries, the legacy registries.

This trimester we are in the process of finalizing the details as you all know the contract the registry agreement and the stuff just got finalized recently.

So we're revisiting the audit program. And we're building the strategy for auditing the new registry agreement and that will be communicated in the next trimester before ICANN 50.

We will engage and hopefully through what we call an outreach session will invite you to join us on the phone so we can share with you what this program is going to be about, the scope, the approach.

And then at ICANN 50 we plan to communicate that to the whole ICANN community that the new registry agreement audit plan is X to begin on why specification A and so on.

So the planning for the new registry agreement is a separate effort.

(Sarah Falvey): This is (Sarah) at Google. I have a sort of process high level question. I know that it makes sort of because of the way it's setup compliance needs to be sort of a separate entity within ICANN.

But one of the things that we're running into is that when the two of you try - it's nice to see Krista's group and you guys together because when you don't talk to each other what happens is we get a lot of compliance issues that are actually ICANN issues.

So we've had a lot of things like you - escrow issues, you can't access our, you know, reports and things like that but it's actually because their systems on ICANN side that are not working.

And I think it makes sense in the beginning as we'll work out the bugs that there's going to be problems on everyone's side and that makes total sense.

But the challenge is that when you guys don't talk internally it's up to the registry operator to put the pieces together. And you can't bring all the people together to talk about it.

And it's caused a ton of extra work. And I think something that really highlights this which I actually find sort of funny is that you guys are both holding sessions at the exact same time which I think really shows how tomorrow which really shows at least it was on the agenda when we came to Singapore.

I think it really shows sort of how you guys are looking at it. And so we would really just encourage you to as much as you can understand there needs to be separation to sort of work together as much as possible because it's really helpful for registry operators to really understand what is the actual issue, what do you really need to be back in compliance, et cetera, et cetera.

(Maguy Serad): Thank you for the feedback (Sara). We did realize there was a hiccup at the beginning. And it's part of this growing pain right?

We've delegated TLDs in the past but it wasn't in this vast - and we didn't face that challenge so yes we did have that challenge.

It's not we don't talk we just didn't do that check. So to avoid that we have put a process with Krista's team where we do validate on there and first before we initiate any activity.

As far as the meetings are concerned if you've ever been involved it's quite a production. I'm not again my hats off to the meeting team.

We did bring it to their attention you cannot put our sessions together. But I think you all attended the ceremony where Fadi said I don't know if he did say to you guys but we know we got our staff input before the meeting.

We have over 250 sessions planned so it's like we're fighting for real estate. If you do not have the opportunity to attend the session again please reach out to me. We' be more than happy to have a conference call and go through some of this material with you or schedule it and we'll go through.

If I may quickly address just I'm not going to go over time (Keith).

(Keith Drazek): No problem.

(Maguy Serad): If you are not able again let us know for Thursday. But I want to just go back to Jeff's first comment about collaboration.

And Jeff the process, the way it was built takes into account that collaboration. If we have to - the way we follow the process the first three steps are part of that collaborative effort.

It's internal between ICANN and the contracted party. We do not publish it.  
It's not a legal notice. It is what we call a proactive collaborative approach.

But we have to follow it consistently and systematically the same way  
because the model is no more 18 TLDs. And we have established, we started  
establishing a process over two years ago and we conducted the sessions  
with everybody.

And it is understood the community the first three steps of that process is our  
collaborative approach. and it has to be done through the system through the  
standard templates.

Especially now that compliance of global that's even a much more benefit for  
that process and that consistency in the templates because now we have  
staff in Istanbul, staff in Singapore, staff and the US.

We want to make sure we are working with you consistently and  
communicating in the same way. We will take note of the legalese and some  
of the requirements in the notices and we come back to you on that one.

Jeff Neuman: Just to respond like even having a phone number at the bottom of the notice  
saying if you have any questions please call so and so that would be great to  
actually have a human voice.

You get a name at the bottom which is good but to actually be able to call  
someone and understand a little bit more about it would be fantastic.

(Keith Drazek): Okay yes so I still have (Pam) in the queue and then I'm sorry Krista you  
wanted to respond?

Krista Papac: I can do it at the end that...

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Yes all right so (Pam) go ahead.

(Pam Little): Okay. My question is really related to a lot of comments people have already made started by Jeff about those notices you send out.

We could go back to your first slide on those statistics please, the notice that you sent out. So you can see a lot of registry operators got - what happened to the data (unintelligible)?

Woman: Registry data (unintelligible) 51%.

(Pam Little): Okay. So and a lot of them also got monthly reports. They are minor technical oversight or whatever.

And you send notices asking for (unintelligible) and you send - you're asking for information about short term corrective action and implementation date and long term preventative actions and implementation dates.

I cannot find the definition of short term and long term or all this information as mandatory in the registry agreement. Can you please just enlighten us where it - where this might be?

And what will be your definition of short term and long term and what corrective actions or plan will be satisfactory to ICANN?

Because I think you're creating a lot of human judgment here or discretion that will probably not achieve a goal of standardization but actually more labor intensive. And also it really is up to the discretionary judgment.

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Thanks (Pam). All right so Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes on that two things. On the data escrow which is kind of interesting is the data escrow providers at least one of them Iron Mountain has its own kind of

process internally which it requires you after your delegated to fill out a form to get set up in the system which could take a couple days.

But interestingly enough we sometimes have gotten compliance notices within the time of us trying to get something straight away with our escrow providers not that we don't have the ability to do the escrow it's just that the - their own internal procedures have stop that from happening.

So if you guys could build in a little bit of a buffer at least like a week or so after you're delegated to literally I thought NYC was delegated and we got a compliance note was it eight hours later that we weren't escrowing our data. So...

((Crosstalk))

Man: And I had to tell you, you were delegated.

Jeff Neuman: And I didn't know we were delegated actually.

(Maguy Serad): So Jeff please get up on the public forum and say that compliance - order compliance (unintelligible) if you want.

Jeff Neuman: But then the second point just on what was raised of about root cause analysis normally things like root cause analysis are really reserved for major breaches.

You shouldn't have to do a root cause analysis on the tiniest of little things but it seems it's in the standard processes - it's in the standard notice right now.

And it can be something as incredibly minor like the one where I was just talking about not getting, you know, within eight hours of being delegated that notice of the escrow.

So really if you could have some types of notices be for root cause analysis and not all of them because that is labor intensive.

(Keith Drazek): Okay thanks Jeff. So I think we need to wrap up here but I just want to note that, you know, on one hand I'm sensing some, you know, little bit of frustration I think to (Sara)'s point that there was, you know, you talk about extra work that translates to extra expense right for registries and businesses.

But I also am sensing there is, you know, sort of like a really strong attention to work this out and work together and to engage.

So I'm going to suggest that on one of our next two registry stakeholder biweekly calls that we have a follow-up session with the compliance team and invite you to participate so we can keep the conversation going and comparing notes.

And I certainly encourage everybody who can to attend the session you said on Thursday is that right? Okay. But I do - okay great.

But I do think, you know, this is - compliance is obviously important but, you know, we need to make sure that the process is streamlined and sort of right sized I think.

So to the extent we can continue to work together on that it will be very helpful. Okay. So thank you very much for joining us (Maggie) and team.

(Maguy Serad): Thank you for this opportunity. Again I understand there are growing pains. It is an intense wrap-up stage for all of us.

I come from a business background. I have a true appreciation for running a business. I'm not a lawyer. But I do want to add a minimum at a minimum I understand Jeff's saying put the phone number but again it's a global model.

I want to make sure responsibly, you know, say I want to talk to you, if that person is not available we'll make sure somebody will call you, give us a number and we'll call you.

But at a minimum respond to whatever it is you're seeing and we'll take care of it. And if it's not happening properly you have my contact information.

Let me know, don't send me bitching or complaining emails. Send me facts. I work with facts guys. So I've taken the comments, you know, about the definition as (Tom) was stating short and long term.

I've heard a lot of the feedback from you that we are also having growing pains. So thank you (Sara). Thank you (Patrick) -- everybody who's brought for the feedback.

Thank you (Keith) for the opportunity. We'll take you up on it.

(Keith Drazek): All right. Thanks very much. Let's break for lunch everybody. Thanks.

Cherie Stubbs: And there are boxed lunches in the back for those that are registries and NTAG members. Thank you.

(Keith Drazek): Yes so everybody just a reminder this is a working lunch so, you know, let's take a 15 minute break and reconvene and continue the business.

All right if we can start the recording. Great. Thank you very much.

So everybody let's spend the next 15 minutes to the extent we need it going over our conversation points with the board.

We have the items on the agenda. And maybe what we could just do is run through the four items, the folks that have been assigned or who have

volunteered or been volunteered to lead the discussion with the board, just give a couple minutes of an overview about, you know, sort of what you plan to say and, you know, what the issues are the, you know, we might want to raise.

And then I think will break at about ten minutes before the hour which will give folks an opportunity to use the restrooms and head over to the board meeting room which is the large room the (Pang) Room.

Okay so with that if I could ask either Brett or (Jacob) to just sort of lead us through what we'd like to talk about with regard to the experience of the GDD?

(Jacob Malthouse): Thanks Keith. It's (Jacob Malthouse), NTAG Chair. We'll start by noting that GDD is continuing to become more responsive and open in our view.

There are a number of sort of oddball issues as Steve Crocker referred in his opening speech that are still causing indeterminate delays for some applicants. So we're going to ask the board to encourage the GDD to identify and resolve those as soon as possible.

We'd like to see more specific information delivered to applicants where they've being placed on an on hold status or generally unsure of where their status is in the application process so that can be moved along and they can had some more certainty in where they are in the process and when they're going to be of the move forward.

We'll note that we're working on comments on the name collision issue. And we hope to see some progress on that issue that's going to reduce challenges for applicants as they become registries and launch.

We found that the Specification 13 was published really close to the meeting so ICANN's well aware that is always a challenge and just want to keep raising that with them.

And then we'll ask them to think about the future and starting to think about what future applicant rounds could look like, start that discussion so that we can make progress on it as we get to London. And that's it.

(Keith Drazek): Okay thanks very much (Jacob). Brett you want to add anything? Okay any comment, feedback, discussion? Any other issues related to the GDD that ought to be considered? Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes not necessarily sorry, not necessarily a comment on that issue. Do we still feel like we should do it in this order?

(Keith Drazek): We think we haven't discussed it so I think if you - if there's a recommendation to change the order around we can certainly do that on-the-fly.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I mean I think certain of these issues may take longer than others. And if we all think that number four is as much of an issue as we discussed this morning if people still feel that way maybe we should move that one up.

(Keith Drazek): So I'll respond to that Jeff. I think some of the concern was that if we led with the protection of IGO acronyms as an issue it would dominate the entire agenda and we wouldn't get to the other three.

So, you know, that's open for discussion but I think maybe we ought to...

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

(Jacob Malthouse): I think that presentation that we are going to make, that James is going to make to the board is really not much longer than the one he just gave to you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

(Jacob Malthouse): So probably less than five minutes I'm thinking.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

(Jacob Malthouse): Now the board may hijack that and take that for a 20 minute ride to discuss it with us but I think at least our comment to them is going to be very short.

Sarah Falvey: Yes I think the Internet governance is going to be really quick too especially since we don't have any information. And we'll basically just be asking for information.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I just worry though internet government I mean if Fadi could take that and run for a mile and I think it's important I do.

But if it's a quick request and maybe we wave that as a closing thing because like I said Fadi all he wants to talk about the board they love this Internet governance stuff. They eat it up.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: I agree Jeff but remember this is our time with the board and I have no problem cutting him off...

Woman: One thing we...

Paul Diaz: ...in the sense of, you know, it's do we want to raise the issues we need to raise it's a unique opportunity not for him to repeat the things that he wants to talk about.

So I think your issue a good one in terms of maybe moving it up in the queue and for what it's worth Chuck and I will get through finance in a few minutes literally because they don't have anything to say.

But there is no progress. We know. But we have to put the marker down. But I think if Fadi starts going on about the big picture and Internet governance we're just going to say hang on a second, we have other issues that need to be addressed.

Jonathan Robinson: Two quick points and thank you (Sara). Two quick points in response to that, one when we met with the board previously you as the GNSO council Fadi took very much a backseat. And I think my sense was he thought this was the board's meeting.

Now to the extent that there are issues related to executive functions that may shift in our meeting. But then to (Paul)'s point I think we hold the pen or the chair in this meeting and so I think we should exercise that.

(Keith Drazek): So my recommendation I think is a compromise is that we leave GDD first financial accountability second and then flip ideal acronyms in IG okay?

Okay. So we'll put IG, Internet governance at the end we have time to get - sorry (Sara) is that all right Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: And I don't want (Sara) to be mad at me but...

I don't want you to take all my time on my very important issue. No just kidding.

(Keith Drazek): All right but I do recognize the concern that you raised Jeff about, you know, the IG issues can sort of dominate where we don't necessarily wanted to.

So all right now let's get back to the substance. We have a few minutes left so the financial accountability. Chuck is - had to leave for a few minutes with his mentees. (Paul) you want to just run is the real quick what your plan is?

(Paul Diaz): Yes we thanks (Keith). We're - Chuck and I basically had the same view. If you'll remember in Durban we raise this issue frustrations with ICANN's process, promises to provide analytical tools and promises that these would happen in this current fiscal year budget planning.

And none of that's happened and we're so far along in the process now that this will become yet another transition year basically.

We're stuck with the same broken process and a lack of tools. So (Chuck) and I are both just going to make the request again that the schedule for the budget planning get rationalized, that it get started earlier, that there's more opportunity for meaningful input.

And I will reiterate the call for the analytic tools that have been promised so that we can kind of rapper heads around where all this money is being spent.

And that's it. I mean like I said there are markers that were putting down again because we know there's no answers that they have that are going to make a difference between now and the end of June when this budget is approved by the board.

(Keith Drazek): Go ahead (Reg).

(Reg Levy): Thanks. This is sort of a late addition to what's going on here in Singapore so I don't know if this is something that you and (Chuck) are going to be talking about.

But are you going to mention the fact of auction proceeds and the fact that we need to start - they need to initiate something so that we can start deciding where that money goes before it just goes to ICANN?

(Keith Drazek): That's a fair question (Reg). We didn't plan to. We're just going to talk about process but if people want to raise that. (Sarah)?

(Sarah Falvey): Well so one thought is we can raise it in the Internet's governance because now that that is sort of opening up I think there are a lot of things auctions and things like that are - they're becoming bigger issues if we're thinking about the broad scale ICANN accountability and how we're going to do this.

And in many ways the auction proceeds are going to be an extensional threat to the organization given all this going on.

It does appear nicely but we can tee it up in that discussion if we want.

(Keith Drazek): Okay. I mean I think it's, you know, the ICANN board has been on record, Steve Crocker has been on record, you know, frequently saying that this - the disposition of auction proceeds will be a community issue right? It will be up to the community to determine.

And I think there is - it's absolutely appropriate for us to, you know, sort of, you know, reinforce that and also call for the initiation of the beginnings of that process.

So wherever we do or however we do it I think it's appropriate so okay any questions? Yes go ahead.

Tim Switzer: Tim Switzer. Just along that point I mean I think the key drive -- point to drive home when you said that. I'll just reinforce it is let's start sooner than later because this will not be a short process.

I mean it's going to be there is a lot of people have their eyes I think set on that money. They're going to be watching it.

So the point is it's - we will - knowing auctions are coming for a long time but the point is let's get the process started.

We understand it's going to be a community process. We understand that but let's just get it started sooner than later.

(Keith Drazek): Okay thanks Tim. I see I think (Ken) is typing in the chat not a good time for auction. Hold on, sorry I've get to scroll up - not a good time. Hey Ken do you want to just jump in?

(Ken Stubbs): Yes can you hear me all right?

(Keith Drazek): Yes. Go right ahead. Thank you.

(Ken Stubbs): Yes I just think it's not a good time to discuss the auction proceeds. Over and over again every time we brought this up we've gotten the same response from (Steve).

And that is it's not time yet. We have no idea what we're talking about, how much we're dealing with. And frankly at this point in time I think the board will view it as distractive.

They're trying to stay focused on other items. And if you bring the auction process up at this point in time if I was a board member I'd say I don't need this distraction.

These people would just go nuts trying to figure out how to spend money that they don't even know, the amounts aren't even ascertainable yet.

I think that if we're going to do something like that what we should do is we should probably bring it out in the form of a correspondence to the board that gets published.

But I don't think you're going to get anywhere with that. That's just my own personal opinion. I think (Steve) will just cut it off and it will just be the same question that's been asked for the last four or five years because I asked that in public comments for three years straight and every single ICANN meeting. Go ahead.

(Keith Drazek): Okay. All right thanks Ken. I've got a bunch of hands went up as you are speaking so I've got (Jordan), (Andrew), (Reg) and (Jonathan) in the queue. Anyone else? Okay (Jordyn)?

(Jordyn Buchanan): And just to agree wholeheartedly with (Ken) it's not a good use of our limited time with the board. We only have so many topics we can talk about with them, they've heard our position on this. Nothing's changed. Their position is not going to change.

They don't know if it's a \$10 million pile of money or \$1 billion pile of money right? Until there's some evidence of like magnitude at least I think it's not even a very useful conversation to have at this point.

Like we can talk about frameworks, we can talk about how are we going to decide how we're going to spend the money which is fine.

But I just like let's focus on the things that we really care about and that are actual problems for us like staring us in the face.

So I think they're going to feel the same way right like they've got massive Internet governance issues and they've got us yelling at them about other decisions they're making.

Let's focus on the stuff we care about. Okay?

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Thanks (Jordan). (Andrew)?

(Andrew Merriam): This is (Andrew). We can bring this up tomorrow at the NTAG as well with I think we have discussed bring it up with (Russ) at least asking for time frame.

I mean there's scheduling options for June now right? So this seems (unintelligible) so we should at least ask for a timeframe about where those proceeds are going to end up.

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Thanks (Andrew). (Reg) and then (Jonathan).

(Reg Levy): I think (Ken)'s point about issuing a letter a public letter is very good. I was just sort of envisioning this is an offhanded remark in the financial discussion like oh NBT dub this is coming down the pike real soon.

I think that it doesn't need to be focused on and it may in fact be dismissed once again but if now is not the right time to start this I really don't think that later is.

(Keith Drazek): Okay. Thanks (Jonathan). Two points. I think I'm with (Ken) on this. We've raised it a few times. And although I understand the substance of it's - I'm just not sure we'll get anywhere so it must be we should have to think about other methods.

Second on the Internet governance I mean that's such a broad topic. The one issue is if there's any impact on accountability for the contracted parties. Is that part of your thinking or yes because that's very different to the Internet governance issue.

It's like how are we going to ensure ongoing accountability with respect to contracted authorities and registries in particular?

(Keith Drazek): Okay thanks (Jonathan)?

(Jonathan Robinson): I want to agree with what (Reg) said, respectfully disagree with what (Ken) and (Jordan) said. I don't think we need to talk about it very much but I think that if we jog their memory a little bit at a time when it comes to reach the issue they'll think about it. So I mean I think we should just mention it in an offhand way.

(Keith Drazek): Yes I'm sensing - as chair I'm sensing that there's sort of, you know, people's views on both sides on this and I think both are very reasonable views.

So maybe the approach here is as part of the financial discussion (Paul) you - it's just simply a reference to it, just, you know, we need to start the process of start thinking about the process.

Not that we have to decide how much money it is or where it's going to go but, you know, the process for the community being able to start engaging on it. And just leave it at that. I don't think we need to dwell on it unless there's strong objection I think that's the direction we ought to go.

Okay and then let's see the next item we talked at length about the IGO acronyms issue Jeff. Do you want to talk any further about the approach with the board?

Jeff Neuman: No. I think we covered it.

(Keith Drazek): Yes okay good. Thanks. And then (Sara) I'm going to hand this one over to you.

(Sarah Falvey): Yes. So I just going to make two points. So first I have a question. Did we ever finalize our statement?

(Keith Drazek): If you're talking about the proposed joint...

(Sarah Falvey): Yes.

(Keith Drazek): ...statement of SOACSG lead no. The answer is we...

(Sarah Falvey): Okay.

(Keith Drazek): ...did not finalize anything. I think we ended up with, you know, a statement that had consensus within the group but we never actually, you know, sort of had a vote or a formal, and, sort of temperature in the room that said, you know, are we ready to go forward with this.

(Sarah Falvey): Okay.

(Keith Drazek): Let me give an update on that. I think, you know, there was a push from ICANN staff after the Friday NTIA announcement for the leaders of the various supporting organizations, advisory committees and the stakeholder groups and constituencies to come together and coalesce around a statement in support of NTIA announcement and the fact that ICANN would be moving forward.

And there is particularly in the GNSO and I think (Jonathan) probably jump in on this but particularly in the GNSO there are various groups who are uncomfortable with simply signing onto a staff draft and, you know, sort of cheerleading statement where much of what had been announced had clearly coordinated without really getting input from us and that there were procedural issues and concerns about it being top-down and not bottom-up.

So I know that the BC, the IPC and we the registries were sort of a little bit more reluctant than to just sign on to that statement.

We end the others I think have gone through a process of sort of developing or drafting, you know, some amended or adjusted comments. But my sense is that based on emails today that it looks like the steam is - or the wind is out of the sails of that effort.

I saw a note from Bill Drake from NCUC saying that he thinks that it's probably you know, the opportunity has been missed to have this joint statement.

I just don't think there was enough consensus for the language and for a joint statement so just a brief update on that.

(Sarah Falvey): And I won't mention it. I was just going to make two points. One, obviously our group supports the multi-stakeholder model. We obviously we all participate in it and we are a key part of ICANN moving forward and making sure that our interests are represented appropriately.

But that given how a lot of this has been rolled out particularly with globalization of ICANN pre- IANA announcement the board resolution that was passed in things like that we have concerns about sort of how our group is going to continue to play a role in this discussion and to (Jonathan)'s point comment, making sure that ICANN still remains accountable to contracted parties in this new environment. So that would be sort of my two cents.

(Keith Drazek): Okay that sounds great. Any other comments or thoughts for (Sara)? Okay very good so we have ten minutes until we're supposed to be with the board in the (Panam) Room which is the large room. So let's go ahead and break right now.

We'll reconvene here at 2:15. And we've got some additional business from the morning session that we'll need to get back including the GNSO Council motions and issues in discussions. So let's see each other in ten minutes and then back here at 2:15. Thank you.

END