

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
GDD Update
Sunday 08 February 2015**

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.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Volker Greimann: Good morning, everyone. I hope you have a wonderful Sunday morning.

Rested for a long day. And I would like to start right away. The first order of business today is the update from the GDD division. And we have Cyrus, Kristine and, as I heard, the entire team of the GDD division here. So it will probably be a very interesting update for us.

During yesterday's discussion we've arrived at the short list of topics of interest that we would like to hear an update about. And these are the status update on the gTLD program, the update on the statement of review and studies related to the new gTLD program, an update on the status of the implementation of the adopted GNSO policy recommendations, an update on the Whois conflicts with local law implementation advisory group and the plan to release two character names with regards to the latest GAC comments.

So with that I would like to hand the word and microphone to Cyrus for a few introductory words and leading into the topic.

Cyrus Namazzi: Thank you, Volker. Good morning, everyone. As always thanks for the opportunity to be here with the Council and provide an update. I have the

staff here actually who will provide the update for the topics that you sent to me yesterday. Maybe we'll start with Kaitlin and then we'll go to Karen.

Kaitlin Tubergen: Thank you, Cyrus. This is Kaitlin Tubergen with GDD for the transcript. And I'll give an update on policy implementation. The first update is IRTP Working Group B Recommendation 9 and that deals with the locking and unlocking of domain names. This has been incorporated into Section 5 of the IRTP and is effective for all ICANN-accredited registrars by January 31, 2015.

Next is IRTP Working Group B Recommendation 8 which is the standardization of EPP status codes. This has been incorporated into the additional Whois information policy which was announced in July and the effective date was originally set for February for both the additional Whois information policy and the Whois clarification advisory.

But because the date for the Whois advisory was postponed the AWIP will be synced with that effective date when it is published. I don't have more information than that however, there will be a session on this on the Whois advisory on Wednesday from 5:00 to 6:15 pm local time in (More).

UDRP locking, the updated UDRP rules went through public comment and were announced to the ICANN Website in November. All ICANN accredited registrars will be required to comply with the updated UDRP rules by July 31, 2015.

IRTP Working Group C Recommendation 1, which is the change of registrant policy. The draft policy language is still under review by the implementation review team which has been meeting regularly. The draft is expected to go through public comment shortly after this meeting.

Recommendation 2 from IRTP Working Group C is the time limiting of FOAs. The draft text has been reviewed and approved by the implementation review team and the updated text will be included in the updated inter registrar

transfer policy when it goes out for public comment along with Recommendation 1.

Thick Whois, implementation of thick Whois is still ongoing. As a reminder, there are three components of the policy recommendations. First, all gTLDs are required to have thick Whois. Secondly, all gTLD registries are required to have consistent labeling and display of Whois output using the Whois specification from the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And, lastly, there should be a legal review of laws applicable to the transition from thin to thick.

Update on the transition from thin to thick. Twelve experts representing 10 registrars among parties most affected by the transition from thin to thick Whois have joined the implementation review team to form a group that will assist in developing the implementation details for Com, Net and Jobs to transition to thick Whois.

Update on the consistent labeling and display for all gTLD registries. The IPT is making progress toward releasing the implementation plan for the consistent labeling and display of (unintelligible) for all gTLD registries. A revised impact assessment, including IRT input and proposed implementation timelines, will be discussed with the implementation review team on Thursday.

Update on the legal review. Due to the complexities of this topic, the legal review is taking longer than originally anticipated. Although significant progress has been made and feedback from the IRT has been considered regarding the preliminary conclusions shared in December. Further information following the December update will be discussed with the implementation review team in this Thursday's meeting. There will also be an in depth discussion on the status and progress on Thursday.

Lastly, for IGO INGO, progress has been made on building lists of all the identifiers to be protected in all the recommended languages. Solutions to address the most complex protection such as claims notification including in legacy gTLDs are being actively sought.

In the implementation project team is currently considering the appropriate timing to call for implementation review team volunteers before the next ICANN meeting. Thank you.

Cyrus Namazi: Thanks, Kaitlin. I also wanted to let you know that on our side, on the staff side, we're putting together a policy implementation calendar that I was actually hoping to share with you today but we're sort of putting the finishing touches on it so hopefully maybe even before this conference is over we can actually send it to the Council.

But this is, I think, based on the feedback you've been giving us that such a thing would actually make life a little easier for all of us. So just an update on that. Any questions for Kaitlin?

Volker Greimann: Yes, just - Heather, go ahead. Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Yeah, thank you very much for that - pardon me, Heather Forrest for the transcript - for that comprehensive update. We don't have slides or anything written. And it was a bit hard to follow all of that. Could we have something tangible that we could bring back to our constituencies and stakeholder groups?

Cyrus Namazi: Sure, we'll email that to the Council.

Heather Forrest: Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Yes, just one question from my end, with the legal review that's part of the thin thick recommendations I think that's first that the recommendations

include the requirement for legal review prior to the implementation. What has been your experience? Is this helpful for you in the implementation to have a legal review prior to this - the implementation work going on or how do you review this particular recommendation as has been part of the entire work of the working group?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Volker. That's a very good question actually. This is something that I think we've been promising to the community for the past couple of months. But the more that we dig into it the more issues sort of surface that we've had to go dig deeper to get details on.

I didn't want to speculate but at the direction that this is going maybe for us to actually come back to GNSO and ask for direction on this - in light of the fact that, you know, there is, you know, the new RFC from IETF on RDAP imminently being published, there are some privacy issues involved in the transition from thin to thick and various legal implications of it.

So we're still actually debating whether that approach is in terms of what to come back and recommend the Council to take a look at. Hopefully also before the end of the conference we'll have that wrapped up at least from our side so that we can present it to you.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, that's helpful. Do you want to go on with the next topic? Sorry, James, I keep forgetting about you, you must be my blind spot there.

James Bladel: Clearly, I have to make, you know, myself a little more memorable.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay, so just a quick question and I'm not sure if it goes to Cyrus or to Akram or to Kaitlin. But - and thanks for the update. But I'm thinking specifically of the thick to thin - sorry, thin to thick transition.

Is it your expectation this point that there will be some migration to a thick model all at once or is this something that's going to be caught up phased in, for example, when domain names expire, renew or new creates will be in a different model? How do you see this as a cut-in or as an immediate migration from a thin model to a thick model or have we even crossed those bridges yet? Where are we with those?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, James. I don't think I have a good answer for that question. There's still discussions going on with the working group to sort of determine the various steps and milestones that we have to take.

But like I was saying earlier, I think - I wouldn't be surprised actually if we were to take a step back and relook at the whole thing again in light of the work that we've done and the legal analysis that's done, I think the imminent publication of RDAP by IETF - obviously we don't want to do something that, you know, becomes obsolete in, you know, too short of a time or something that may end up having legal implications when it goes to implementation.

I know I'm being a little cryptic about it but that's part of the reason is because I don't have clear answers for it. But we've actually come up with more questions in our quest for coming up with a good proposal. So hopefully before the end of the week we'll have more clarity on this. It's very fresh stuff.

James Bladel: That's fair. Can you give any hints at what some of the legal issues that you're running into that you need further analysis or are there any show stoppers out there?

Cyrus Namazi: I don't know if I would call them show stoppers but a lot of them have to do with, you know, new privacy laws that are going into effect in various jurisdictions and things like that.

James Bladel: And I'm sorry, Volker, I don't mean to belabor this. But then - but that would apply to other TLDs that are currently thick that are the incumbent TLDs - I

guess I'm - if we have these legal issues now wouldn't we - would we have to call all those other TLDs as a result of this analysis, would we have to revisit how those other TLDs store their data as well that are already thick?

Akram Atallah: So this is Akram. It's just - there is no clear answers right now for your questions. But I think the way we're looking at this is that it's a very important issue to do - to deal with the right way then to rush into. So we want to make sure that we look at all of the different aspects and make the right decision so we don't go forward and then retract and then, you know, keep changing our mind because we keep discovering new things.

So we want to look at the entire picture, look at the best way to move forward and then make a decision with the community on the best way forward on this. And I would - I don't want to say that it is legal issues as much as it is the questions that we have on the table require - are so hard to answer, not necessarily that they are issues, it's so hard to answer therefore we are - we want to take our time to come up with the right answers. Thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: There is actually a session dedicated to this on Thursday, Krista, I believe?

Krista Papac: Yeah thanks. Krista Papac for the transcript, ICANN staff. There is a meeting with the implementation review team scheduled for Thursday - that I'm getting the time for you guys here in just a second. So some of the questions you had, James, about timeline and all of that will be discussed in that meeting as well as a proposed timeline in talking through some of these questions you have about the legal review as well. The session is - here we go, 11:30 to 12:30 in Moor - M-O-O-R.

James Bladel: Thank you, Krista. I'm sorry if it wasn't on my calendar two weeks ago, I can't go. I'm sure everybody's in the same vote.

Krista Papac: I'm sure it's there, James. Thanks.

Volker Greimann: Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria. Just a curiosity, since there are a set of issues is it possible to see a list of those set of issues so that we could have a better understanding? And I guess the other question I would have that occurred to me while James was asking his is are the issues to do with thick itself or with the transition from thin to thick? And so I'm wondering though whether we can have some sort of listing of what issues are being explored because I think that would be very interesting for us to know. Thank you.

Cyrus Namazi: Hi, Avri. Yes, there is a list of issues and this is what the session on Thursday is going to discuss.

Volker Greimann: Amr then Steve.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. It's Amr. Well I for one am grateful that you're taking the time to really hash out the issues with the legal review. If I'm not mistaken, the legal review was originally scheduled to be concluded last November and so it's taken considerably longer now and I thought it was - it would have been quite challenging to finish it by November. But I'm glad you're taking your time in doing it and trying to get it done right.

I know that there are a few outstanding questions on this topic even amongst IRT and implementation review team members. The session on Thursday is going to partly conflict with the GNSO wrap up session here. So most - at least the GNSO councilors won't be able to attend most of that session.

So if you do have any updates you could give at this point maybe on - if there's even a rough estimate of when you predict a legal review will be done and there are a few questions on what the issues are regarding the problematic issues on the legal review and the transfer and the transition from thin to thick as well as I was personally very curious about the actual

legal experts you reached out to try to figure out what some of the issues are.
Thanks.

Krista Papac: So, thanks, Amr. Krista Papac again. So I don't have the list of the issue with me at this time. And just maybe a little reminder about the legal review recommendation - the policy recommendation is to look at issues - to see if there are any other issues that were not already identified in the expert working group on this topic.

So I want to make sure and - make sure that everybody's expectations understand that there's something - a piece that's related to the EWG. As far as the timing of the session I know we did get some feedback from a number of people that have different conflicts. I think someone has an ALAC conflict; there's the GNSO wrap up session.

We do just - I think you guys all know this and appreciate it; we work very hard to try not to have conflicts. It was the least-worst conflict. And the thing that - it's like all of the sessions, it will be recorded. The slides will be shared. So for those of you that might miss the first bit of it there will be an opportunity to catch up.

And I know Fabien and myself and others on the ICANN implementation team are happy to talk to you after the session or some other time if you have questions that you weren't able to ask because you missed that first 30 minutes. So we do apologize for the conflict though.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Steve Metalitz with the Intellectual Property Constituency. Thank you. I just wanted to - I had to react to the statement that we don't want to rush this. I think it's been five years since the PDP was launched on this topic, four or five years. It certainly, I mean, this issue was very live before the VeriSign

contract was renewed. Our position was that it should have been dealt with then.

But in any case there's not - we're not rushing. This is taking an extremely long time. Of course we do want to get it right. All these issues were discussed, Amr, as you recall, in the PDP working group. So hopefully we can get this focused on just those issues that arise in bringing the three remaining registries into the world that all the other registries have lived with for many years including with all of the different privacy laws. So I hope we can move that forward quickly and without undue delay. Thank you.

Cyrus Namazi: Thanks, Steve.

Volker Greimann: Okay, seeing that there's no further request for comment on this section I would ask that we move onto the next topic which should be the update on the new gTLDs.

Christine Willett: This is Christine Willett. I'll give you an update on the new gTLD program and a few items of GDD operations and then Karen Lentz can provide you an update on the new gTLD program reviews.

Since ICANN 51 we've signed 258 registry agreements for new gTLDs bringing us up to nearly 800 signed registry agreements. We've resolved 46 contention sets, which is about 70% of all contentions have been resolved.

The team implemented a number of interim milestones and procedures for guiding applicants through the contracting process as well as the process from contracting to delegation, a series of interim milestones that are helping us and the applicants move forward through the program on a timely basis. We've delegated nearly 90 TLDs and we are now over 500 delegated new gTLDs.

From an operations perspective we processed over 300 registrar applications since ICANN 51 and executed the 2013 RAA with over 300 registrars. We completed 24 registry contract assignments. We've also made significant progress in customer service. We have laid the groundwork in the last three months to develop a true global customer service capability that includes deploying technology and solutions to enable global phone support for capabilities.

Right now, as many of you know, the customer service team has been supporting the new gTLD applicants and registries. And that will be the case for FY '15. We'll be looking to expand to registrars and (unintelligible) FY '16.

We have been working in the last month to hire staff in Singapore. We'll be expanding the global footprint of our customer service team so by March we will have staff up and running and able to answer phones in Singapore. And I expect that by ICANN 53 I'll be able to report that we also have our center in Istanbul up and running. So we'll have a follow the sun type of support, a 24/5 type of business support for phones as well as online communications.

That leads me to a new role that I've taken on this - since ICANN 51. At ICANN 51 Chris Gift was here, he was speaking about some of the technology and solutions and systems for - to support GDD and contracted parties. I have since taken on that role for GDD. So you can point all of your Salesforce requests for me now.

We have - since ICANN 51 we've implemented a handful of enhancements to the GDD portal. I recognize we still have a long way to go. I am working with IT to develop a systems roadmap not just for Salesforce but all of the systems that support GDD and our contracted parties, RADAR, as well and extending into compliance, the Kayako system, etcetera, so really all of the touch points into our operations.

I expect in the next two months to be able to publish a roadmap for those systems that takes us out through FY '16. On that note I mentioned that customer service in FY '16 will be taking on capabilities to support registrars as well as compliance requests. And likewise we will have a systems roadmap that reflects both registrars moving - migrating to Salesforce and compliance migrating to Salesforce so I expect to have more on that at our next meeting. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Christine. Interesting update. Any questions? Maybe just to start things off, the staff ramp-up in Singapore, we are well aware that the new program and the gTLD registries and registrars will need better support and this is taken care of by the staff ramp up than had been possible prior to the new gTLD program.

However, this of course also a budget impact, is the budget sufficiently large for the GDD that this staff ramp up will be taken care of without a problem, without a hitch? What is the impact of the budget of the GDD team in general?

Christine Willett: Thank you. This is Christine. Yeah, the FY '15 budget did anticipate this plan to hire the staff both in Singapore as well as Istanbul so, yes the current FY '15 budget anticipated this. And we have minimal additional growth anticipated in FY '16 to support the registrars and compliance. So we're laying a lot of the foundation this year.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. If there is no further questions then I would move along to the next topic which will be review of the study program for the new gTLD program. What's the update and status on this? As we know the next round will not be able to start on this as studies have been taken place. I know that a lot of councilors are eager to hear when these studies will be taking place and what the status is.

Karen Lentz: Thank you, Volker. This is Karen Lentz. So I'll speak a bit about the reviews of the new gTLD program. There are several of them and there is a session tomorrow afternoon where we will go through all of those in greater detail. So I'll just in this update I'll just touch on the highlights of what's happened since the last meeting in Los Angeles.

First review area that I'll talk about is the one foreseen in the Affirmation of Commitments that relates to competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. As you may recall there's been an effort within the GNSO and ALAC for some time on recommending metrics and trying to get some data as an input to that review that will help them assess what the program's impact has been in those areas.

And so one of the recommendations from the IAGCTT was to undertake a consumer survey that would get at some measurements or some perceptions around trust that's to establish a baseline where we would do a comparative survey at a later point to assess what's changed.

So that consumer survey has been designed and it's actually being fielded right now. So we should have a set of baseline data by the time we meet again the next ICANN meeting.

Secondly, on the - in the area of rights protection reviews, there is a draft paper that's now been published for public comment so that comment period is open now for feedback. It covers the trademark clearinghouse, sunrise, trademark claims, URS and post-delegation dispute resolution procedures.

So the path for that obviously once we see what the comments are we'll be updating the paper as to, you know, which areas are seen to be the most significant in terms of what we might want to consider going forward. But that paper will inform the issue report request from the GNSO which is now coming around October so that's what's intended to happen there.

Also, within this period we have as staff followed the work of the GNSO's discussion group that Bret is leading on subsequent procedures. So I think we asked at the last meeting whether it would be helpful to have any staff input into that.

So we took the mind map or the set of issues that the group had identified and provided some feedback mostly in the form of questions so that if policy work does go forward in these areas here some considerations from the execution or implementation perspective that you may want to take into account into scoping those issues. So we provided that input.

Also, you know, we were aware that we kind of lacked a place to go now that we've, you know, started undertaking all of these reviews, questions about, you know, where can I find this and what's the schedule, where do I go for updates. So we created a web resource that tracks all of the different reviews and where they are.

And finally as part of that we also created an updated work plan so that we had published a draft in September. And we published an updated version a few weeks ago and the updates are mostly in the form of either more detail where we've advanced the work sufficiently that we can provide more detail about what's encompassed in the various reviews, what are the factors or timeline updates to the extent that there are those.

So in terms of the work plan just one other comment about relating to the discussion in the GNSO yesterday about, you know, your work and where does it all fit in terms of all of the review activities.

So the work plan acknowledges or notes that the GNSO does have this discussion group going on and the intent is to sort of precede a PDP in terms of scoping and figuring out the issues. So, you know, in terms of our work plan that's, you know, acknowledge that that's going on.

We don't have, you know, a schedule or a timeline so that's, you know, we're trying to coordinate very closely with that work so that we can, you know, if there is a PDP we can have an understanding of the timeline and the scope of that which will help people - those who are involved in the review activities to be aware of and it'll help to sort of map out what are the interdependencies that we want to be aware of. So happy to take any questions.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. I think it would be the best idea to just yield to Bret for a moment to give a brief update on the status on the discussion group and then...

((Crosstalk))

Bret Fausett: Actually I had a quick question if I could ask it? First, Karen, thank you very much for the report that you sent to the discussion group in late January, that was I thought extremely helpful and thoughtful piece that you put together.

I have a question - I don't know if you were in yesterday's GNSO session but we had a discussion about what would happen if the GNSO did nothing. If we start a - if we either don't decide to start a policy process or we start a policy process and reach no consensus what happens with subsequent rounds of new TLDs? Does it require us to do something? Or is it going to go ahead without us if we do nothing?

Karen Lentz: Thanks, Bret. So, you know, first of all I think everyone's aware that the existing policy recommendations actually contemplate additional rounds. Right, so the policy is that new gTLDs should be introduced in rounds so that's kind of already, you know, provided for that there will be - that those will occur.

In terms of, you know, what - if there's no policy work undertaken we're still going to do the program reviews that we've committed to do. Some of them, you know, were sort of committed to as prerequisites to doing any future rounds so that, you know, those would occur in any case.

You know, if we get to a point it's kind of a community discussion I think, you know, if we do get to a point where we finished the reviews, they have recommendations, there's a, you know, a sentiment that, you know, we should move forward in this way or we should not, and we have no additional, you know, guidance from the GNSO I think that's a discussion that we would want to have at this point - or at that point, sorry. That's my thought, thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: And I would add actually the Board had the resolution before the start of the current round specifying that there will be a second round. So I think we have to start from that premise but it's, as Karen said, it's premature to actually, you know, hypothesize on what will happen if this situation occurs. I think it will remain the Board's - at the Board's discretion whether the - if the community says to move forward with a second round, to decide to move forward or not.

Volker Greimann: Okay if there's no other request for comment or questions then why don't we move on to the next topic? Which one would you like to do first, the update of Whois conflicts with law implementation advisory group or the two character domain names? We only have five minutes left so you might be able to...

((Crosstalk))

Cyrus Namazi: ...maybe we could talk about the two character issue. So on that one, as you know, in Los Angeles this topic was also high on everybody's agenda. So following the GAC advice in Los Angeles actually the board issued a new resolution that essentially directed the staff to move forward with an efficient process which I was actually proud that we put in place in a fairly short period of time, kicked it into place.

Earlier in the year, this year, we received correspondence from that GAC that essentially was objecting to some of the elements of the process and had

asked that we stop essentially the process pending further dialogue with the GAC and input from the GAC.

So just so you know, because of that we have paused the processing of requests for two character domains. And this is now on the Board's agenda to be discussed I believe on Wednesday.

And beyond that I apologize really to all of you for the impact that this might have had on your business plans and such. But in this particular case we did try to move forward as quickly as we could but our hands are tied at the moment. So be a lot more patient I suppose until Wednesday when the Board discusses this and hopefully redirects the staff to continue with it.

Volker Greimann: Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the record. Cyrus, could you explain to us why the process has been stalled also for combinations that are not country codes? Because in the GAC letter that was published in the January GAC letter there were no mention (unintelligible) that are not country codes, they are only questioning whether some country codes could be released or not.

But the process has been stalled for all combinations, not only for country codes. Why is that?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Rubens. The correspondence that came from the GAC actually asked for the whole process to stop because it put into question the efficiency of the process for the GAC to be able to keep up with it. The GAC actually communicates with the Board, they don't communicate with the staff.

And when that happens we essentially stop and look to the Board to communicate back to us and give us the direction to move forward with it. And this is really the essence of what has transpired. But we had this discussion I think with you and I on the sideline and also with the Registry

Stakeholder Group where we explained what happens and why the process stopped.

Rubens Kuhl: Actually I think that would explain why - what the things that were mentioned GAC letter were stopped. I don't agree that they qualify for stopping all the others so we have to agree to disagree here.

Cyrus Namazi: I agree.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Rubens. Thank you, Cyrus. Next is Yoav in the queue.

Yoav Keren: Yeah, was that letter from the GAC the first time you've heard the GAC concerns about this?

Cyrus Namazi: No, Yoav, it wasn't the first time. We actually had heard this indication in a dialogue that had taken place with some members of the GAC earlier in January as well.

Yoav Keren: And so this is something that staff decided to do that was not ordered by the Board to stop the process; what you've said is that you were waiting for the Board to reply to that?

Cyrus Namazi: Yes, basically once the letter actually came to the Board then we have to await direction from the Board which we're seeking on Wednesday, it's on the Board's agenda.

Akram Atallah: Just to be clear, the sense of the Board - so there is no resolution but the sense of the Board was not to move forward until they get to meet and decide on it.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. All in all a bit of confusion caused by the communication around the GAC and the decision of the Board to move ahead and then stop again. So while unfortunate I think it's understandable that in the current situation it's

rather better to move forward with caution than to cause any irreparable harm. I see there's another question there.

Cyrus Namazi: I just wanted to add one thing, I'm sorry to interrupt you. You know, I feel like we're sitting in Los Angeles because we had the very same discussion in Los Angeles. And I asked all of you to also reach out to your GAC reps and make sure they understand the sensitivity of this issue to your business plan and, you know, the impact that it has in essentially asking to undo a process that we worked so hard to put in place.

Volker Greimann: Okay, thank you Cyrus. Keith.

Keith Drasek: Thank you, Volker. Keith Drasek, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. You know, and thank you, Cyrus for you and your team joining us on our stakeholder group call last week and having, you know, some of these conversations already.

But I think it's worth noting the one of the real serious concerns that the registries and probably contracted parties in general have is the lack of predictability in this process and the fact that there was a Board resolution and that things were moving forward and then suddenly things stopped and there was not a Board resolution.

And it really raises concerns about, I think, generally speaking at a very high level the influence of the GAC in our business, in our businesses, in our community. And I think that, you know, if we as businesses have, you know, plans and it's impacting our ability to get things done in a predictable fashion that really raises some serious concerns.

And I appreciate the fact that the Board needed - or feels that it needs to have a conversation this week to discuss this to determine how it decides to move forward and I respect that. But at the same time, you know, when a resolution has passed and staff is working on implementing or has

implemented a process and then suddenly it stops and not necessarily a tremendous amount of communication with us about why it has stopped, that really raises serious concerns at a fairly high level. So thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: Thanks, Keith. Those are very valid points. I can't agree with you more.

Volker Greimann: I think next in the queue is Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Volker. Donna Austin. So the Registry Stakeholder Group has written to the Board - I'm sure you've seen the correspondence. We did - I'll just go to the bottom line that we did request that the process be reinstated immediately or if it's not that the letter and the concerns that we raised in the letter are actually responded to. And we would like that in writing.

I think some of the potential challenges that we have is that we have written to you on this before and we didn't receive an acknowledgement of the letter and we didn't receive - well Paul Diaz may have received acceptance that it had been received. But we didn't actually - we raised a number of points in the letter about, you know, whether this is a - we don't believe this is a national sovereignty issue.

And it would be useful, I think from the registry perspective, to get the sense of the Board about whether they agree with us or not. And we haven't had that return communication I suppose. So, you know, the GAC has the ability to stop a process. When we write to the Board we don't always get a response. And I think that would be really useful and it might assist a little bit in the communication - the dysfunction that we have around communication on some occasions. Thanks.

Akram Atallah: Thank you, Donna. This is Akram Atallah. Yeah, I mean, we do have different processes that we - when we deal with the GAC; it's actually much more formal than the way we deal with other constituencies especially with Registry

Stakeholder Group and the GNSO. We engage a lot more at a much more frequent level and we do have multiple ways of communications.

So I don't think it's fair to compare the two - the two engagement methods and compare them in the same way. But we sympathize with the issue. We believe that we're on the same page in this. And we're trying to resolve it as quickly as possible. And we will make sure that there is response to the Registry Stakeholder Group's letter as soon as we get the GAC - the Board sense on the issue. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. (Unintelligible).

Philip Sheppard: Thank you. It's Philip Sheppard from the Brand Registry Group. I'd like to underline certainly I think what you've heard earlier in terms of the concern with this issue and business certainty. I mean, that's a high level principle that comes out of it. And I think that should be a learning point in terms of this for future issues that may come up in the same context as to how we have a better process that allows us for that.

My point is more practical, in the GAC letter they asked for you as the GDD to do some more specific type of reporting for them, they mentioned this particular Excel file the way it might be sorted etcetera. Did you see any particular practicality and problems with that request in supplying that? And could that be done in very short order as a solution?

Krista Papac: Thanks, Philip. This is Krista Papac. And thank you for the easy questions. There are some things in there, yes, that are just really formatting issues for the - related to the page where we post the requests. And the team - our Web development team is already working on some of those things.

Between the time zone and the flights some of them may have already been implemented, I can't really remember where we're at. But a lot of those things that can easily just be implemented and have nothing really to do with the

processing of the request but just the reporting of them are already underway. So, yeah, absolutely.

Philip Sheppard: Okay, thank you.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Seeing that there's no further requests and we're through with the (origin) I would like to thank everyone from the GDD team for coming and taking the time to present to us and give us answers on the questions that we had and the topics that we wanted more information on. I see that our next topic already - our next presenter, Theresa Swinehart, has already entered the room so in the interest of time I would like to thank you and see you next time.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Volker and the Council. Thank you very much.

END