

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
Registrars Stakeholder Group
Tuesday 10 February 2015
13:00-14:15 SGT
Part III**

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

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

Michele Neylon: ...more closed meetings if we want to. ICANN staff have said to us - and we actually - Paul and I were getting emails from them about this earlier today, in terms of the scheduling, I mean, ultimately the further away from the meeting that we decide we want to do things in a particular fashion, in terms of timings, rooms, setting up remote participation, and everything else, I mean, they've done a fantastic job when we've moved stuff around over the last couple of days.

But if we decide well in advance that we want to do things in a different fashion be that using part of Sunday, part of Monday and of course the Tuesday, all of these things can be done. I mean, there's absolutely no issue with that.

But obviously, you know, we need to do is change how we actually plan the meetings themselves. We get a lot of requests from various groups who come to us looking to present things that they feel they want us to, I don't know, provide input in - on or whatever.

Volker, (Kelly), Rob.

Volker Greimann: Yeah, you want to - you usually don't hear me saying that very often but I wholeheartedly agree with what Rob was saying. And the way that we've been organizing and structuring the meeting for a long time is not optimal in my view. We should be talking a lot more about what the status of certain working groups is. We should be talking about what's going on in the GNSO Council, what votes are coming up, how we should vote what on that.

While we discuss it there's usually not enough time for the substantive discussion going on. We lose our opportunity to nip certain developments in certain working groups in the bud by saying that there's a problem going on here, this is how the discussion is going. We need some more input on this. And we need to coordinate our public statements or public comments to certain issues that are coming up. And all the presentations going on take away that opportunity that we have for this.

If somebody wants to present to us then invite them to give a webinar and everybody who is interested can show up. But don't use our valuable time that we have here one day per week at ICANN that we can really use for substantive discussion that will help us as a stakeholder group and as a business to move ahead for things that are maybe of interest for other groups to show to us but of less interest to us as a group.

So I fully agree with what you're saying, we should have more free form discussion and planned out discussion of what's going on in the ICANN community strategizing about what we need to do. And looking at the other houses, they've been this like this for a long, long time. They've been having strategic discussion and a lot less presentations to them.

Some of them only have half a day to discuss their topics and they make very good use of that time. They are much more organized than we are. We are as professional as we are, very disorganized in the way that we approach policy and policy development. And that could use a lot of improvement. And

this day here Tuesday every ICANN meeting is the best time that we have for that available.

(Kelly): This is (Kelly) again. I'm pretty much in agreement with everything that's been said on this topic thus far particularly to the items that are being presented to us or want to be pitched to us. Is there any way for us to participate in potentially voting or, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Totally, I mean, the thing is just being really blunt and honest, I mean, sometimes I put stuff out on the list, I get absolutely nothing back; it's crickets, which isn't particularly helpful.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: But in terms of say organizing the meeting, I mean, if it's a case of us kind of voting up and voting down particular things, I mean, the problem is, you know, do we want to say to some groups okay look, we have no interest in talking to you, which in some cases might not be the worst thing to do, or, you know, how do you want to do this?

I mean, do you want to have a situation where part of Monday becomes stakeholder group meetings bearing in mind that doing so means you don't get to participate in things like, say, the All Things Whois stuff or other sessions that are run on Monday because the Monday schedule will continue with or without us. So we have to be - we have to bear that in mind.

We can use Sunday - it's always open because we have done so in the past. You know, it's just something just to bear in mind because everything else will continue based around the Tuesday is the Constituency Day thing so...

(Kelly): Sure. And I think Volker's idea of potentially webinars and maybe we have a standing webinar day like once a month or once a quarter or something like that.

Man: So let me tell you what happened at this meeting, because we saw what happened at the last meeting. We had overwhelming interest from the registries to present to us so we had two sessions at the last meeting. So I booked Monday from noon to 7:00 in this room and all day Wednesday.

So we had this room booked from noon on Monday until the end of the day Wednesday and we didn't have the interest this time because a lot of registries didn't come here so we gave Wednesday back to them. So this room we had for all day tomorrow.

I've already booked the same room as the Tuesday room for Monday from noon to six for this type of thing in Buenos Aires. I can go and tell them we want Wednesday too but it's kind of shitty of us to keep saying we want it and then giving it back.

But I've also told them don't you dare schedule a Whois or something on the Monday to conflict with it because what they were upset with us yesterday was we broke for the hour and a half that the Whois was on and didn't use the room and so we've gone back and said, well, it was your stupid scheduling that did that. So don't do it.

So I think there will be some agreement that they'll try and push to Wednesday the stuff the registrars are interested in because we are meeting on the Mondays now. And I think what you want to do is push to Monday presentations. The DNA presented yesterday rather than in our meeting today and it was perfect.

And to your point, I don't know that we really need to vote on which ones we want or not until we have too many. I think you vote by just showing up for the

ones you want and not for the other ones. And, you know, if - we can put it out to the list to kind of get a sense of it. We did a Doodle poll last time which registries did you want to hear from and that that guided us and, frankly, we scheduled the ones that didn't have as much appeal at the end of the day but you could still show up for them.

So I think if we just agree that unless Tuesday is for substantive discussions of us because we used to do that, Volker, back in the old days. We ran like the other constituencies where this was all about updates on working groups and debate, not presentation.

So if we move presentations to the Monday, come if you want. I'd encourage you to come because yesterday was a little sparse and, to be quite honest. But, you know, put the compliance stuff, put the people that want to speak to us and give us presentations on the Monday afternoon. We'll give them all 15 or 20 minutes or half an hour and that's all they get. And we can show up. We can still ask questions, we can still debate and then have Tuesday as our day for let's get our shit together.

(Kelly): Agreed. Yoav.

Yoav Keren: Yeah, sorry, I just want to - just correct me if I'm wrong but for those of us that heard the ICANN meeting group talking during the GNSO weekend, this whole discussion about the structure of the meetings is maybe relevant for this to 2015, it's going to change dramatically from 2016 and on. So especially, for example, the second meeting is going to be four days. So I'm just saying we're spending a lot of time on this and it's - there's a whole different structure coming in.

Volker Greimann: One brief comment, yes. The thing is all session for the last three or four meetings already has been changed, this - the Council session so that the Sunday afternoon is free after I think four o'clock for stakeholder group

meetings at the request of the BC, IPC and others of the Non Contracted Parties House. So we've not been using that time as registrars.

However, that may be an alternative time instead of the Monday because on Sunday there is less conflict with public sessions. So that may be an alternative slot that we might want to look at as long as it's available on the ICANN meeting schedule.

(Kelly): Okay, can I just speak? I also believe that we - as a stakeholder group we should get together prior to the ICANN meeting ,and I mean not a week prior to the ICANN meeting with all the rush up to it but a month before the ICANN meeting and clearly work together in collaboration and put forth an agenda. And I agree that we need to have more free time and I've expressed that already.

But definitely be looking for the stakeholders to provide us input as the subjects that are currently the hot topics and things like that so we can make sure that the agenda is set so that that all people are - majority of the people are satisfied.

Michele Neylon: Okay then, we have to close this session. And the SSAC are here and I believe they need to run somewhere else straight after this. So Patrik and your merry band of SSAC people. So while Patrik is seating himself this is the SSAC who are going to be talking to us about all sorts of exciting things to do with registrant stuff I believe.

Patrik Fältström: Yeah, I will actually make it really easy for me. My name is Patrik Fältström. I'm chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. To my right I have Jim Galvin, the vice chair. You have got a slide deck of various things that informs you about what we are doing.

But we do - I already know, by talking to Michele, that there is specifically one work item that we are working on which has to do with, among other things,

credential management, that we know that you are interested in. So because of that I also have Ben and Merike that is working on this topic so I wanted to directly dive into the middle of this slide deck and have them present where we currently are. So can we get the slides up?

Michele Neylon: Oh is this running on Adobe? Okay, Adobe Connect is dead.

Patrik Fältström: Do we have any way of - do we have a cord or anything?

Michele Neylon: Yes, during the middle of ICANN the Adobe Connect is not available.

Man: Proper planning prevents poor performance.

Michele Neylon: Also (Paul Goldstone) who's not in with us here just sent the slide deck to the members list so you also have it in your email.

Ben Butler: Okay so (unintelligible) are co chairing a work party to discuss registrant data protection and credential management. And we overheard some of the previous discussions that indicate that slide decks are not the most popular thing at the moment so we will keep this extremely brief and to the point. Hopefully we can just focus on the content.

We do want to go over what the charter is, what we're trying to do with this work party. There has been some confusion on this so far; we want to try and set the record straight. We have, as we all know, seen many and many types of security related compromises throughout our ecosystem that have to do with compromised credentials for either a registrant or a registrar or a registry and the problem that can ensue as a result of it.

What we want to do here is to try and identify the best common practices. The target audience that we are looking to bring in with this document is the wider ICANN community but specifically registrars, registries and registrants as well as software developers and application and tool developers. Web

hosting and email service providers will have a stake in this as well but to a somewhat lesser degree.

What we want to address is the lifecycle best practices for these credentials; creating them, distributing them, storing them, regulating, transferring, revoking, all of these things come into play with the proper handling of credentials.

We want to talk about all credentials that are - all the different types of credentials that are used in order to authenticate our customers whether that's the registrant or authorized administrators for the registrars and registries. And we also want to talk about relevant policy issues that can support or hinder this credential management lifecycle.

So the rough structure of the document that's far is to identify the problem, to talk about some of the recent attack issues. We don't want to call any particular people out and throw them under the bus as having messed up on a particular way but rather to point out to the wider community that there are problems that are occurring. And if you are not careful you can find yourself the unwitting victim of one of these (unintelligible) public compromises.

We want to talk about the credential types and how they're used. We also want to talk about what the lifecycle is today as well as what it maybe should be, and create some best current practices and a checklist of things that people, that registrars in particular, can do two more properly manage their credentials.

Now we are working on a very abbreviated, relatively speaking, timeline for this document. We are hoping to have a final document to deliver by the next ICANN meeting. But we don't want to rush something through without getting proper input which is the main reason for us to be here with you today.

We want to make sure that we're not publishing something that is going to be onerous on registrars have any particular size whether your small or large. We want to make sure that we get your input as to what are the challenges that you're facing with regards to credentials? What are the things you're doing that are working? What are the things you're doing that are not working?

And we want to stress that this feedback that we're looking for from you can be completely confidentials - or confidential, pardon me. We do not want to cite anybody's information if they don't want to be cited. If you want it to be public we can certainly accommodate that but that is not our current intention.

Patrik Fältström: And let me clarify that a little bit and emphasize this because SSAC, compared to the other groups in ICANN, to have a disclosure policy so we actually formally do have the ability to keep information that we receive contained. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: So just a quick question. Can you go back when slide Ben? Consult with the community at ICANN 52, you're doing that now? Do you have an initial report that we're supposed to have read before this or do you mean ICANN 53? I'm confused on the timeline I guess. Was there something we should have read?

((Crosstalk))

Ben Butler: Yeah, you missed the memo, James.

James Bladel: I wouldn't be the first time this week.

Ben Butler: I intentionally wanted you to be the last to know. No, no...

James Bladel: You see why it's so hard for me to...

((Crosstalk))

Ben Butler: We do not have a draft that anyone should have read at this point. In fact if you have read it I would really like to talk to you to figure out how you manage to that because we have another credential problem to deal with apparently.

No, this is - what we're talking about at ICANN 52 is specifically consulting with the community. Before we start putting down the best common practices we want to understand from you what are the common struggles that you're having? What are your concerns? What are the things you would like to be discussed in this work party?

So we are here to solicit direct feedback from you.

Merike Kaeo: Hi, this is Merike Kaeo. So I'm Ben's co chair on this. Specifically I want to clarify also that SSAC draft documents are never circulated because they're used for us in the work party to come up with a document that we feel could be relevant to the constituency.

So this timeline shows what we have internally done within the work party. It's a very aggressive timeline. Because we have a first draft that we felt was pretty decent for us internally we thought this ICANN meeting would be great to solicit more input where we realize that we need to know what people are practically doing.

And if Ben goes through the last slide again, one of the things that we really want to be more aware of is where are there credential compromises that are happening? This is, you know, very sensitive information. We realize that maybe we can only talk to people one on one with this.

Within the SSAC work party we have also discussed that even if we have one-on-one conversations we will not even relate to the work party who may have relayed what kind of compromise they have seen or have been subjected to that fortunately has not been widely publicized.

Because what we're trying to ascertain is what are the real issues, and specifically also for smaller registries and registrars because a lot of the best current practices are sometimes written for people that have more resources at their disposal. And so we came here specifically to solicit input. And, you know, we realize that you may not want to do so in a large audience here but to at least know who Ben and I are and some of the other work party members, if you could stand up from the SSAC. So Mark Seiden, Julie, Rod.

And so, you know, pick whoever you want to talk to and who you want to trust, you know, just by looking at them.

Michele Neylon: What if you are saying none of them, I mean...

Merike Kaeo: Yeah, I really know what the acronym is and, you know, I'm not going to use it here. But anyway so we did want to make you aware that this work is ongoing and, you know, in so much as we can have conversations on where there are compromises or what are the issues that you have seen in your own environments by utilizing credentials and issues, we would love to hear about it.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Merike, Michele. Just one question that was monitored in my ear. Are you talking about logins from - for end-user/customer/registrant to the registrar? Or are you talking about registrar to registry? Or are you interested in looking at both? For registrars to ICANN which, I guess, is a very valid...

James Bladel: Or resellers to...

Michele Neylon: Yeah.

Ben Butler: The answer is yes to all of them. Because we have seen compromises, to use a generic term, we have seen compromises at all of those levels in various press articles over the past few years. So we want to try and identify best practices in every area.

Merike Kaeo: And one thing I'll add is one of the things that we try to do also as we try to enumerate where the credentials are utilized, we actually have a table where we're talking about, you know, where our credentials used in registry environments, registrar environments, registry to registrar interactions, registrar to registrar environments so trying to actually really enumerate where all these credentials are used so that there is an awareness of how many there are. And each one of these credentials require attention to the entire credential lifecycle.

Michele Neylon: Michele, just I question, what's the easiest way for those of us who do not have time to sit down and spend quality time with any of you at this meeting to provide you with input? I mean, do you have a questionnaire, a form we can fill out, and email address we can use? I mean, how do we move this forward?

Is there something you can send me to distribute to the members that - and then they can follow up with you separately? You know, what are the next steps on this?

Merike Kaeo: From my perspective if we can't get enough of the details from one-on-one conversations here, I think having some of these details written down may be useful. We can maybe create some kind of a questionnaire. But we don't want to make it too much of a burden in terms of time. So it really depends on how many people would like to speak to us.

And one of the recommendations I would have, if Ben concurs, if just to kind of have an email interaction may be week you can see what the next steps

could be depending on how many people relate they would like to give information.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Anybody have...

Patrik Fältström: Let me say directly, we take on the action of writing a memo to you on how to contact us. We will make sure that you get it, Michele, and you can distribute to your members.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Anybody else have any questions or comments on this?

Man: In general about the SSAC or just this topic?

Michele Neylon: This one topic. If you want to beat up on them SSAC, that's okay but we'll let them move off this topic first. Okay we've moved on, you can now go on to the SSAC in general.

Man: I have a general question for the SSAC. That were put into place years ago, is very mechanism for you to review them, you know, every five years or every 10 years? One I'm specifically interested in, interesting enough, is the wildcard provision.

So if you remember it was site finder years ago, the SSAC came out with a wildcard as a stability and security risk and should never be used. And all of a sudden we now see wildcards being introduced to solve this contention problem. Does that mean the SSAC has changed its position on it or review that and said it's not a security and stability problem or what's the - can you give us a brief update?

Patrik Fältström: Okay. There are a couple of different things to say there. The first is that old policies - there are two different things here. First of all you might have old policies that ICANN or someone else have provided and we can always come

up with recommendations that those policies should change. That's the first thing.

Secondly, SSAC can always change our mind by coming up with a new document that sort of say okay, the world has changed, the earth is rotating in another direction or whatever so now this other thing, okay.

So this specific thing we did reevaluate the wildcard issue. And there is a very big difference between the way the wildcard very specifically used in that closed environment with the use of the wildcard as it is described in our regional advisory.

We came to the conclusion that in the specific way that is used during the namespace collision avoidance like the startup phase, that is one very specific contained use where the calculation of balance between benefit and harm, it was okay to use it in a specific case.

So we did reevaluate that we came to the conclusion that we do not change our position at that specific point in time.

Man: So was there a document published then by the SSAC saying here's our reevaluation or - I don't mean to be naïve, I'm just curious.

Patrik Fältström: There is a document specifying that talks about that. It's not the full evaluation but I think - I don't remember the wording, we actually did refer to that. Jim.

Jim Galvin: What we said in the name collision report was just that if the wildcard is an option that's going to be used that they need to consider this issue of the fact that it's an exception to the general case that have been published earlier. So in fact we left it to the staff and the community to decide what they wanted to do; we simply called out the fact that they had this question. And the exact question that you're asking would be asked and...

Man: Okay, thank you.

Patrik Fältström: Yeah, because let me just follow up to talk about this specifically because what we also have to remember is that for the specific name space collision it was also the case that ICANN launched independent studies by JAS Advisors that we're the ones that actually draw the final conclusions of how to move forward. And that's why our wording was like it was.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann speaking for the record. Just one question, a follow up - I don't have a horse in this race but if there is one exception might there be others where wildcarding would also be permissible or with less risk than the original report suggested?

Patrik Fältström: That is - at the moment the view that SSAC have is that general use of wildcard, as we described in our original advisory, is not something that we recommend.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. Is there anything else SSAC want to share with us now? I mean, any - beyond this particular topic that we felt was of high interest to registrars, is there anything on your radar that we need to be aware of that could end up costing us money? Because ultimately that's all we care about.

Patrik Fältström: Oh yes, of course. Well let me mention that it's also in this slide deck, but of course no one has time to look at, I would like to...

Michele Neylon: Now, now, Patrik, don't be nasty.

Patrik Fältström: Well I don't...

Michele Neylon: Haven't got a chance to look at yet.

Patrik Fältström: Michele, I don't look at all slide decks you send to me so.

((Crosstalk))

Patrik Fältström: Actually Michele says, he not send me any slide decks in eight years so it's - okay anyway. Order - what order? I'm sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Patrik Fältström: Yeah. So another work item that we have taken up is that we have - we are looking at the potential next round of new TLDs - new gTLDs. And one of the things that we have been doing there is we have gone through all our old advice and trying to - it sort of related to this wildcard issue of course.

We have been categorizing all the old advice that we have given and looked at the action that has been taken on that advice. And the action could be that, for example, the ICANN Board or someone is ignoring us but that's still an action.

And what we're now going to do is look through all of those and see what made sense, what did not make sense and try to come up with ultimately a list of things that we might believe should happen before even considering doing next round. So that's one thing I want you to know.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: Thanks Patrik. You know, one of the things I always liked about SSAC was it was more of a data-driven rational arm - clear thinking segment of the ICANN community. And I'm saying that as to compliment you guys and now ask for your help a little bit. Do you, you know, looking at individual reports and advice that was issued previously, I think it's a good idea in reviewing that against anything measurable particularly if you have any kind of before and after statistics that were captured on any specific issue, I think is incredibly important.

Right now what we're hearing, you know, we're hearing a lot of horror stories about not only what's happening with new gTLDs but also what could happen, what might happen. There could be a monster under the bed and if you check and there is no monster well then you didn't check the right way and you should look under a different bed.

And I think that if there's anything that SSAC can do to help bring this - these conversations out of the hypothetical and speculative nature of security and stability risks and put them back into what's actually happening in the TLD space, I think that would be welcome. And I think registrars and registries, that were here earlier, I think they would, you know, gladly share of whatever metrics you would need to conduct that review.

Patrik Fältström: We would like to do exactly the same thing for exactly the same reasons. And one of the things that we are doing, or let me phrase it differently, this is one of the reasons why we are going through our old advice. And it might be the case that we're going to publish this even in two steps; that we first are distributing to the community these are the advice that we believe, can you please give feedback on like what kind of implications this advice gave like in one direction or the other.

But another more important thing is that we have got some questions this week regarding oh but how did it go with the new gTLDs just like you are saying. And we are not responding to that question simply because other groups like the APWG and anti-phishing working group, they are not release their report of the data that they have collected during this release.

So we are intentionally waiting to do that kind of evaluation, just exactly for the reasons that you are saying, that now when we do get data it's very important that we base our conclusions as much as possible on the data even though we sometimes might still have to extrapolate, we are to make sure that we extrapolate on the things that we do not have any data.

So I think we in SSAC completely agree with you that we should of course base the conclusion on as much data as possible. The big problem of course with the previous round of gTLDs was that there were so many things that were sort of unknowns, so many unknowns and it's very very hard to do that kind of extrapolation from no data.

Michele Neylon: I think he's talking about no unknowns and unknown knowns.

James Bladel: Well I think one of the challenges - thank you, Patrik, and just to follow up very quickly, I think one of the challenges is is that so many things would be asked to be proving a negative. You know, and it puts - I think even those armed with data in a very difficult situation.

Just because, you know, it hasn't happened yet, you know, or we don't have any data demonstrating that doesn't mean that the risks are not - not only real but existential.

Patrik Fältström: That is absolutely true, and that's also why many of our reports, for example, specifically one of them did not really, from SSAC perspective, prescribed any kind of result of a risk calculation; instead we encourage the community to do a risk calculation of benefits versus harm because we saw from SSAC perspective that there were too many entities that draw a conclusion without doing any real risk calculation at all. And that was one of the big problems that we saw that there were a lot of miscommunication.

So we tried to encourage, first of all, people to do a risk calculation that people then could discuss whether the former was correct, whether the actual values they were putting the former was correct, etcetera. So even though we might have failed, we really tried to sort of - if you understand the difference between encouraging having an algorithm and doing the calculation.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. So SSAC will follow up with us, and that's with the contact details if anybody wants to share any information with them. On the SSAC, you have Ben from GoDaddy who may or may not be communicating with James, but that's a...

James Bladel: You know, we should probably say that, you know, that there is not a lot of back channel communication on these things. I'm not giving sneak previews of these reports. I'm not influencing Ben. I mean, there's a pretty good Chinese firewall here between...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: No it's more to the point of, I mean, there is at least - there are registrar representatives on the SSAC is what I'm getting at.

James Bladel: Yes, yes. And actually to be honest, if it were anyone else but Ben up there that came to ask me what our experience was as a registrar, I would hand them Ben's card. So I'm very pleased that Ben is actually participating in this effort.

Michele Neylon: Patrik, just before you go, who else from the registrars is on the SSAC at this stage, or is it just you, Ben? Okay so officially, as a member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, the only one who's represented is GoDaddy via Ben. Patrik is a sort of registrar of sorts though his chosen specialty would be weird and wonderful ccTLDs in Scandinavia. Anyway, okay thanks SSAC...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Patrik Fältström: No, one last thing. Yes it's ccTLD registrar that I'm doing but at least I implemented that whole 9 yards for thousands and thousands of lines of code that you have to write as a registrar and got no so much EPP code I written.

Anyways, if it is - the easiest way for you to influence what SSAC is doing is to ask us questions. So if it is the case that you in the registrar, for example, reads consensus that there is one specific issue you want us to look at or revisit or whatever please let us know, Thank you.

Jennifer Standiford: I have a question. Jennifer Standiford. Appreciate you coming into the registries and registrars to collect information around credentials and vulnerabilities. Given the recent announcements of ICANN and their challenges, have you engaged with them as well and ask them the same information?

Patrik Fältström: I presume that you think about the attack on ICANN in November 2014, right?

Jennifer Standiford: The DDoS - or the attack as well as the issue with Radar.

Patrik Fältström: Oh okay, yeah. So let me say that first of all we in SSAC do have really good cooperation with ICANN both security and IT team. And the security team of ICANN is actually part of the disclosure procedure that we have implemented ourselves in SSAC. And you saw that be used in dealing with our report regarding date certificate management and name collisions that we issued.

Now, we in SSAC do look at - our charters say that we are overlooking the security and stability for the parameters domain names of the Internet as large like for the community. So we are not responsible for ICANN as a corporate, okay.

So we are looking at ICANN corporate just so like we look at other organizations in the world because we have - we do have good cooperation and also non-overlapping between us and the ICANN security and IT team.

That said, we are of course keeping ourselves informed over what has happened. And our communication with them is of course - with ICANN is of

course relatively easy. But we in some cases, we have similar communication with other organizations.

With the specific - the specific issue we have not found any reason for SSAC to intervene because it's simply not anything to do with sort of the general management of parameters that we are responsible for under our charter. It's ICANN IT and security issue.

Jennifer Standiford: Understood. The area of responsibility doesn't include you intervening there. But the collection around the experience in the data of the vulnerabilities and the corruption is based upon the questions that you're asking of us, is that correct?

Patrik Fältström: One could say that it's similar. And let me - you actually asked a secondary question which is are you informed? And let me ensure you that we are very well informed.

Jennifer Standiford: Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you, Patrik. Thank you to the SSAC. And next up we have Tanzanica from the meetings team who's also brought her - lots of her colleagues including her boss. The Adobe Connect is back up on - is back up working again so we should be able to project slides again. But if there's any challenges the - Tanzanica's slides have been distributed to the members list so they are in your inbox.

You're not Tanzanica. Okay I'll hand over to you.

James Bladel: Can we just make a request that whatever you need to same that Nancy says all of that? Because whenever her voice comes across the microphone everybody just stops and listens.

Nick Tomasso: This is Nick Tomasso. I'm sorry, but I'll speak first.

Michele Neylon: Actually - hold on one second Nick before you go any further because the Adobe system imploded due to their maintenance window. The monitor is both in the room and - I think are they all out over there as well? Everything is dead. Nathalie and colleagues, can you do anything about the monitors? They're all out.

Man: Adobe is up remotely.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I didn't realize you were sitting beside me, I thought that was a registrar. Do you have hold music that you can play for us? Yeah, sorry, we don't (unintelligible). But if you want to just kick off and introduce your team anyway whilst we're waiting for the slides and everything else. Sorry, just - with no slides it's a bit kind of confusing. So please, Nick, go ahead.

Nick Tomasso: Yeah, this is Nick Tomasso. I'm VP of Meetings for ICANN. I want to thank you for giving us the opportunity to come speak with you today about the community developed new meeting strategy which we are going to implement beginning with the first meeting of calendar year 2016.

With me to my last are Tanzanica King who works on meeting strategies. She's a senior manager of strategy for ICANN meetings as well as Nancy Lupiano, who you all know as the voice of God, who is the director of meeting operations to my right to (Johnny Avengema), who, again, is no stranger to this organization who was a key member of the meeting strategy working group that developed the strategy that went to the ICANN Board of Directors for approval and implementation.

And of course Sebastien Bachollet, former ICANN Board member who was the meeting strategy working group chair and led the two-year effort - almost two-year effort to develop this strategy.

With that I'm going to turn the meeting over to Tanzanica King and hopefully we'll get some graphics up rather shortly.

Tanzanica King: So hopefully some of you are able to look at the graphics. I agree, it will be somewhat confusing without them. I'm going to hand a copy of the first one to Sebastien so that he can talk to you about the guiding principles that we used in developing a new strategy, and also want to offer to let you ask questions throughout so we don't need to get (unintelligible) presentation, you can stop us, ask your questions.

With that I'm going to hand a piece of paper (unintelligible) over to Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. New technology. Yeah we - first of all I want to stress that the group who developed the proposal was a multistakeholder group and we tried to have a geographical balance and as much as possible agenda balance and any other balance possible.

It was important to try to find the best way to do the work. Of course we had different public forum, discussion, possibility to have comments. And if you remember last time we were here in this building we had posters and hash tags to allow people to make comments on the proposal.

Now the proposal was accepted by the Board and the small job we still had of this staff is to the implementation. It's a very small job but I think it's good to have this discussion with you know that they are working on the implementation.

Then we started work with some guiding principles. The first one was ensure sufficient time for face-to-face for SO and AC policy development. We also tried to develop in some ways the possibility to have cross constituency interaction end to the silicate sufficient time for people to network, to meet, to discuss not in their own silos.

We want to - to try to have your time used as much efficiency as possible to help you also not to have too much session in conflict when you have to decide to go to Room B, A, C, D or - and to try then to reduce this possibility of conflict.

We really want to find a solution who is available for the future, that means that we don't want to have a solution for the next two years but something who will run even if there are more participants, if there are more constituency or more whatever SO ACs are - or maybe last but...

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Sebastien. I'm conscious of the little time that we have week you because we've got a ridiculous schedule. I think the key thing from our perspective is looking at the three different types of meetings. I know the Adobe stuff and the displays isn't working but everybody should have the email. So if you want to speak to that - or if one of the ICANN staffers can speak to that just to walk us through that. We all have - most of us have the slides in our email anyways so we can look at the slides.

Sebastien Bachollet: Okay then, Tanzania, the floor is yours.

Tanzanica King: Okay. I think I'll just quickly run through the A, B and C for you. I have a feeling your questions are going to be about Meeting B so we'll do A, C and then B. Okay?

Meeting A is really similar to the current structure that we have right now. So we're going to be here for six days. The big difference is the split public forum, so the recommendation was that we have everybody come and give some feedback to the Board early in the week so that we could come back together at the end hopefully with some answers and some conclusions so we're not waiting until the end to do that.

Meeting C is a seven-day meeting. It's longer with the addition of the annual general meeting. We're doing more high-interest topics. We're doing what you see there, I won't waste time reading it out. But a couple days of intercommunity work, a day of intercommunity work, SO, AC work and interaction and all of the things I said before and wrap up.

Michele Neylon: Sorry just - and I just interrupt you very quickly?

Tanzanica King: Yes.

Michele Neylon: Tanzanica, Michele for the record. Could you explain in simple language the difference between intercommunity and intra-community? I know you've been asked this several times this week but could you please explain the difference?

Tanzanica King: Yes. Intra-community work is when you guys are in here working amongst yourselves doing your work together, when you're spending all day long in this room is a good example. Intercommunity work is when you are working with the other groups so you've got registrars meeting with registries and ALAC meeting with the Board and GNSO, all that craft interaction.

Michele Neylon: So for example, a PDP working group, what would that be, inter or intra?

Tanzanica King: That would be - I feel like I'm being tested now.

Michele Neylon: You are.

Tanzanica King: Yeah, I know. That would be inter. Did I win? Do they get the right multiple-choice? Okay.

Michele Neylon: We think so. Yeah, we have to...

((Crosstalk))

Tanzanica King: I'm pretty sure.

Michele Neylon: ...justify that massive paycheck of yours.

Tanzanica King: Right. I'll write a paper for you...

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Bachollet: It's the place where it could be some flexibility because it's inside when a PDP it's done within the GNSO it's inside the GNSO, then an inter. But if you want to discuss with other SO and ACs then it's intra. Then it's maybe other way around, yeah, it's inter. But it could be a way to, under the different days, and to be sure that we have enough to do and not too much to do in each day.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. Please continue.

Nick Tomasso: Just two comments. After so many questions on inter and intra-, we will change that so that it's more obvious and clear. I think it's - we've had enough feedback now that we know it's very confusing. The other thing that I want to point out is this Meeting C that's longer is going to be designed so that people could choose to come late or leave early depending on what their interest is in the meeting itself.

And we'll work the schedule in such a way that we'll give people the choice as to which days to attend. So even though it appears a day longer it doesn't necessarily mean it's a day longer for everyone.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks. And the last meeting you wanted to speak about, Tanzanica, or do you want one of your colleagues to do so because you do look a little bit afraid to raise it. And having known Tanzanica for several years, this is the first time I've seen her look that nervous.

Tanzanica King: I'm not nervous, just apprehensive to some degree. You'll have questions and I'll make them answer your questions so I'll just do what I know. So meeting B, the first thing you will notice is it is four days long. We've got three days of - I'm sorry to use that but intra and inter community interaction going on, a full day of outreach, should you choose to use it as a full-day.

We've had a lot of questions about the outreach aspect and that's something that needs to be further developed. We are creating the skeleton of this but we're working with all the different groups to figure out what you want to do with this time that we are providing you.

So this is not just you have to only do these meetings or this type of work, we're giving you the blocks of time to say what do you need to get done during these full-day meetings?

Meeting B does not have a welcome ceremony. It does not have a public forum. It does not have a lot of the other distractions of high interest topics and things happening throughout the day that prevents you from being able to just focus on your work.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Tanazanica King: It also allows us - I'm just waiting to see if Nick wanted to jump in on that part of it. It also allows us to go to some of the regions where we haven't been able to find meeting space that we can fit into because we've grown so large, as most of you know, that we can't always fit into a place in Africa; we can't always fit into a place in Latin America, even Europe.

There's different issues there so by creating a meeting where we need less resources, not necessarily a meeting that has fewer attendants or lower participation just less resources, smaller rooms, we can fit into some of those locations more easily.

Michele Neylon: And I have one comment from one of our members on remote. I think his comment was something along the lines of, oh my God this is over engineered, but I don't know if he has anything more specific. Does anybody in the room here in Singapore have any questions or queries? Ollie.

Oliver Hope: Thank you. I'm just curious, if the Meeting B is in a smaller venue what are you going to do is everybody that's turned up here turns up there?

Tanzanica King: Well, if you don't know by now, we just work miracles. We do that everywhere we go. We are not going to plan for no space to handle attendance at an ICANN meeting, it's merely to say we don't have to bring everybody into one gigantic room and we don't have to have 20 rooms available at the same time throughout the day.

So if you think about how many rooms we have going on and things running concurrently here, and that every ICANN meeting, it means a very very large venue. You add all the work rooms, meeting rooms, it's really about the size of the venue we can still hold as many people that come to ICANN meetings at a much smaller venue if we're not running the meetings themselves that way. I hope that made sense.

((Crosstalk))

Nick Tomasso: May I - it's the - what drives the meeting venue size today is as simple as the number of concurrent sessions that are happening and the need for other space for support staff etcetera. It is not necessarily - most venues in the world can accommodate 1500 people. It's our 12 concurrent sessions or our 14 concurrent sessions that take place on a regular basis throughout the time.

So we're doing a big piece of work and we're going to need some input from you all to help us understand how many people you think will come from your

constituency. And then we're going to aggregate all of that, put a stake in the ground as to what we think the attendance will be, and then ensure that the facility that we have can accommodate that number of people spread over the number of concurrent sessions that are going to be happening at any given point in time.

Michele Neylon: Volker.

Volker Greimann: The first time this was asked a couple of sessions back this was announced as a pilot test program, is that still foreseen as such or is this now definitely the way that we will be going forward after the upcoming year as well, i.e. if we find out that some things don't work out as foreseen in the planning, I mean, the best battle plan lasts only as long as he encounters the - until he encounters the battlefield, i.e. if you see that something doesn't work how quick would you be to fix that problem or maybe move back to the old schedule if that is required?

Nick Tomasso: We're not viewing this as a temporary or test pilot. However, if we get to a point where something just doesn't work for the community than we are actually - are going to obviously have to regroup and look at it. But this is not a test; this is going live in March of 2016 and hopefully it will work well for the community.

Tom Keller: As you look for attendance and ask for feedback what would it mean for our constituency, I think the fair answer is basically nothing. I think people will still fly in Friday and fly out on Friday. So in terms of (unintelligible) I understand where you're going to and that's understandable, that we would need our day and all of us are here basically for business, right, it's not only ICANN that drives it.

So for us it doesn't matter if it's four day or seven days, you know, we come here, we do our shit and then we fly out again.

Michele Neylon: And that was Tom Keller who's forgotten his name. It seems to be a recurring thing. Mr. Greimann, who has delivered his name.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann speaking again. Just one question, I'm channeling James Bladel here who is currently not here but he used to say that for some of us it's kind of almost an insult, but in a humorous way he usually says that that the opening ceremony is on Monday when - some people have already been here for three days, full days and working. As a GNSO councilmember that is my experience as well.

How will Council sessions be placed in, for example, the four-day meeting? Will they be eliminated from that meeting or are they just not part of the official four-day schedule?

Nick Tomasso: We would look to you to tell us what your requirements are for the four days. We're not going to dictate to you whether or not you should have a Council session. But what we will say it has to fit within the parameters of the four meeting days.

The outreach day is the big unknown at this moment. We know we are going to have outreach. As Tanzania mentioned the idea - the concept and the meeting strategy working group was very clear that we should take advantage of the fact that we have smaller meetings to go to locations where we have not necessarily been before, which is the perfect opportunity for outreach into those communities.

So what happens with the remaining let's say 3 1/2 days is your call. And we'll work with you to make sure that we set aside the space that you need to accomplish that.

Michele Neylon: Okay I'm conscious of the fact that yet again we are up against the time. Registrars, you all have the slides from this, and thanks to Nick and

Tanzanica, and everybody else. We will probably follow up with you with questions I suspect. Thank you.

Nick Tomasso: Thank you all.

Michele Neylon: Okay then, as per hour scheduled, which I'm just bringing up, we were made to have a closed session now between 1420 and 1515 but I think we covered most of the topics we wanted to discuss earlier. So I'm not sure if we really need to use that as a closed session.

Marika was meant to give us a presentation earlier but, you know, I can't ever move the SSAC because the schedule is a disaster. So if nobody is opposed to it I would suggest that we do - we get Marika to do her thing and it will be interactive, basically you get to grill her, in the nicest possible way of course. Yes, Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Hi, Graeme for the transcript. I think it would be good to get Marika in and that might be a good segue for some closed door discussion about the policy working groups that a number of us are in and probably updates from people working on those and a bit of discussion.

Michele Neylon: But do we need to be closed for that? I mean, personally I couldn't give a damn. I mean, you guys tell me, do you want it to be closed or open? I mean, are you going to say something absolutely crazy that you wouldn't...

Graeme Bunton: Scandalous and...

Michele Neylon: Yeah, exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: If not impossible. I would think that some of our perspectives on policy development might and should possibly remain just within the registrars.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: But also if other people disagree, I don't feel strongly.

Michele Neylon: Okay well - okay thank you. I'm not sure how we are with all the remotes so I've been getting messages from Paul who obviously is drinking lots of very strong coffee or something and keeping himself awake. So, Marika, where are you? Oh your way over my left. She's way over my left so I can't see her because I've got a Volker in the middle.

You have - you probably have a couple of things you want to talk to us about. But I think from our perspective it's probably better to have that kind of a conversation about it rather than just a simple here's a load of slides with nice funny clipart.

Marika Konings: Hi, this is Marika. For those of you that don't know me, policy staff, team leader for the GNSO based in the ICANN office in Brussels. I've only brought 30 slides today but I'm not going to talk through all of those, those are mostly to - I'm presuming these will be circulated or may have already been circulated to you so you have those as a reference.

Maybe just go to the next slide. Because it's probably more useful that you tell me what you would like to hear about or talk about. As you know there are quite a few issues that are on the active consideration in the GNSO, I heard you already talking this morning about translation and transliteration.

There are bunch of other things that are being discussed. I think several of you may have participated as well in the GNSO weekend session where updates have been provided on several of these issues so maybe I'll just look around the room and see what you'd like to talk about.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: That's easy.

Michele Neylon: Okay I suppose I'll put myself in here. At one point going back maybe two years ago your team were able to average out, you know, the amount of time it took for a PDP to go end to end and that the average was - was 18 months?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. It depends a bit where you draw the line for starting and finishing, because basically they're really starting point is of course request for an issue report, staff does work, comment period. So I think that whole process I think we've looked at it was I think 2 to 3 years.

And of course you also have implementation, what comes even after that that we haven't really tracked but it's something we may want to do as well so people do get a complete picture of what it takes for an issue to be raised to final implementation noting that of course there are differences depending on, you know, what kind of issue you're working at and the complexity of it.

Because in certain cases, you know, the policy may be - the policy phase may be shorter than the implementation phase because of the complexities that may be involved or may as well be the other way around. That we did some statistics on that and I think on the working group phase to get to initial report typically like a year more or less for a working group to produce an initial report for public comments.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Marika. This is Michele again for the record. One of the things that a couple of us have been trying to raise in various venues is the - how do I phrase this - the barrier to entry to kind of kick off a PDP. I mean, in many respects it's a little bit too easy to start a PDP on something which could have

a massive negative fact and very little real benefit. I don't know if there are - are there any plans within any of these many processes to change that?

I mean, at the moment there's no economic or other kind of impact assessment done before something is kicked off. And then by the time the goes through an entire - very much a policy driven set of processes with little or no consideration for the operation and financial impact.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. So just to note even though you see quite a few items here on the list we actually only have, you know, three PDPs that are currently in the working group phase. I mean, there are a couple that are planned to kick off later this year.

But to your point, I mean, it is something that is encouraged in the PDP manual. And I think it's probably an area where, you know, everyone can do maybe a little bit better to try and, as much as possible, to discuss issues at the outset before an issue report is requested.

And as part of that try to gather as much data as possible to assess the impact of the issue which parties are involved and what is expected to be needed to conduct a PDP, to take that into account as part of the planning.

And of course as part of the policy development process itself at the point that a working group has recommendations it is also expected to look at, you know, what are the implications of those recommendations on the parties that are affected by it.

So I think that is something that, you know, throughout the process is being considered. But I think specifically to your question that, you know, it's easy to start, I don't think we've necessarily seen that it has resulted in a, you know, huge amount of PDPs that are being requested. It seems to be that on, you know, the issues that we're working on translation and transliteration, I think that came out of one of the recommendations of, if I remember

correctly, I think the IRD working group which I think was a joint effort between I think that GNSO, SSAC, some other groups that highlighted that it would be important to look at that issue.

Privacy proxy that basically comes out of the...

Michele Neylon: Two thousand thirteen RAA.

Marika Konings: Yes, the RAA negotiations. And then curative rights, that is actually something that has come out of another PDP that was done on the IGO INGO protections which, you know, is one of the issues that have been on the table for a while, as well as the results of GAC advice.

So I think, you know, those are three that have been specifically initiated as a result of other processes and not, you know, just because someone thought we should be working on those.

Michele Neylon: I have Graeme and then Volker.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Graeme for the transcript. I think the point here we're making, Michele, is somewhat being addressed hopefully in that data metrics and policymaking working group where we're pushing there - at least I've been trying to push in there that data and the questions that are driving, you know, PDPs and policy development need to be looked that up front, ensure that there's actually, for real, a concrete problem to be solved before we ever get, you know, further down the line and two years into a policy development process.

Michele Neylon: Yeah.

Graeme Bunton: So hopefully the outcome of that group will be helpful in eliminating some of the spurious stuff is there is spurious stuff that happens. And in theory in that it should help identify cost as well as the outcome.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks, that's kind of helpful. I mean, my comment on that is that, you know, some of the stuff that we were discussing in the meeting yesterday with law enforcement was a prime example of a complete void of metrics. You know, there's absolutely nothing measurable yet the implications of the change is miserable, as you know well because, you know, statistics and the number of domains you have to suspend is not a zero amount.

Volker and I think James wants to jump in because he's got that look on his face. Eventually, yes, eventually.

Volker Greimann: One thing that I the missing on this - and of course this is due to the fact that these are no longer being discussed in the GNSO but beyond that stage is the former working groups that are currently in the implementation stage, which in some cases may also cause impact that was not foreseen by the members that were working in the working group stage by implementations going beyond or in the different directions than what was originally conceived or agreed upon or even just different perspective on the same recommendations.

So that would also be something that we would like to see discussed where the implementations of working groups that have concluded, have Board approval, is standing and where it is going, not with respect to a timeline but maybe just looking at the recommendations and how they are going to be implemented.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. So I think that's actually a question as well maybe more specifically for my GDD colleagues, and I know that they are working on further, you know, public information on the status of all of the implementation projects. And, you know, Kaitlin already provided an oral overview I'm not.

But I think as a general point and that, you know, helps me as well to get to one of the efforts I did want to mention is on policy and implementation. That

working group currently has an initial report out with a number of recommendations that relate to policy and implementation related aspects.

And that specifically goes as well to the detail of requiring implementation review teams that work with ICANN staff on the implementation of policy recommendations to make sure that they're implemented in accordance with the intent of the recommendations.

And those implementation review teams would also be the kind of sounding Board, or at the same time as well flagging mechanisms should at the time of implementation issues emerge that, you know, either weren't considered or foreseen at the time of the policy development stage that they have a way to flag (unintelligible) for further consideration and addressing as one of the aspects that that report is looking at.

In addition it's proposing three new additional GNSO Council processes so that - and I think that maybe goes partly as well to Michele's point or question that currently the only formal processes that the GNSO Council has as its availability is a PDP which is, you know, a big hammer to, you know, maybe sometimes it's a very small nail.

So that may allow - those additional processes may allow for the Council to actually develop guidance or input on those issues that, you know, are not intended to resolve a contractual obligation so that do not require a PDP. But at the same time would have a binding impact when those are recommended to the Board.

And that I think specifically relates then as well two implementation related issues for example or questions that sometimes come back from the Board to the GNSO on how to deal with a certain issue.

One more point, to Graeme's point on the data metrics and policymaking, maybe just to make a plug that - and I think I've done that in previous

meetings as well - I think that group can really do with some more participation.

And I think as at every meeting I think you're raising the point on how important it is to have, you know, data and focus on metrics because, you know, one of the other aspects that group is looking at, you know, how can you make sure that metrics are determined at the time of policy development so you can actually measure whether the policy recommendations you've put forward and implemented are doing what you thought they would do.

And if they're not doing that, how can you course correct or make sure that there's a, you know, a benchmark in place. So that's I think one of the other aspects but that group is looking at. So really would like to encourage anyone interested in that topic to get involved in that group.

And I think their objective is to have an initial report out before Buenos Aires I believe? So again we hopefully can discuss it further at that stage.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: Thanks. So, you know, the idea of an economic impact assessment for PDP sounded really familiar and I realized it's because we talked about it when we reformed the PDP manual a few years ago and it's actually in there as part of the request for the issues report that an economic impact - I think it's lumped in with competition and privacy and things like that so maybe it needs to be teased out.

But I think that what we're saying is that it's too easy to start a PDP based on speculation that there could be a problem versus the burden of demonstrating there's a problem.

And, you know, I think that we're seeing that across the board, whether we're seeing that in calls for more security, more safeguards, better Whois, you

know, more checks, identity, licensed to be on the Internet. I mean, you know, you can hear these things because it's just - it's this idea that until we get to this absolute zero of any kind of abuse then that means our work must continue.

And I think particularly when you look at that EWG, for those of you who weren't here this weekend, that's going to be a five-year deal, and it's going to be another 10 years to implement it side by side with Whois. And, you know, so just let's be aware of what we're signing on for with just a little line item in a bullet point here, that's a pretty heavy lift I think for this community.

And for our industry it could translate into perhaps, you know, hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars in development deployment, maintenance and operational costs that we don't have today. Right now it's unknown. And that's why I kind of wanted to rally some registrar help in helping to perform that economic impact assessment and trying to figure that out.

But one final point, and this is to the data and metrics, I'm very attracted to the idea that there would be like a data and metrics like this, you know, this big data base and we can say well here's the problem and here's the data that shows that we have, you know, X and so therefore any policy must cost less than Y and, you know, and everything, I think that's very appealing to business types.

Be very careful with that. Okay? Because when it becomes mandatory for us to report statistics, when it becomes an obligation to open the kimono, as they say, and make sure that I can have all of your statistics, not only about your business but about your customers, but about your customer service and all the things that go wrong, and all the complaints you get and all the abuse reports, and what you've done with them and how long it took and it's just, I mean, just be careful where that might lead.

Particularly because I've spoken to a friend of mine who just casually happened to mention that data and metrics for US registrars in particular might, depending on the data that we were being asked to share, might be an antitrust violation if it kind of lead to any sort of ability to infer competitive information.

So I think the idea is very appealing but the devil is in the details, like everything in this business and, you know, be very very careful when we say to the - I guess that's an anti-plug or the data and metrics working group. But our legal folks are saying boy, you know, stay away from that one.

Marika Konings: Right. You can't have it all. You can't tell us we need data before starting policy development and then not work with the community to get those. So I think it's...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: No I think there are public data sources, Marika.

Marika Konings: Right, but I think what the group is talking about as well could there be a kind of third-party model, not and ICANN, but have a third party model where someone would gather, anonymize that data and be able to - and again that's why it's so important to have your perspectives in that group to make sure that we come up with something that's workable and, you know, you're willing to work.

James Bladel: Yeah and it was - I'm sorry, I should mention it was precisely the third-party model that cause the antitrust radar to go up. And I don't pretend to understand all of the nuances of that but just letting you know.

Graeme Bunton: If I may? This is Graeme for the transcript. I'm the only registrar in that working group. The only other contracted party is Pam Little. If anybody else feels like getting involved, the workload is pretty low, it's one hour call every

other week. It's also been on hiatus basically since LA. So there hasn't been a lot of movement there.

And a lot of it is just Pam and - all right so now it's the time I'm going to give a brief update on that working group I guess because this feels like a good time.

It's Pam and I same no and laying out all of the problems. And it is not - a it's a non-PDP working group so it can't mandate anything. It can make suggestions. And there are so many problems with mandatory data collection that it could never work. You know, a number of registrars that have the capacity to have someone go and provide data for every request that came in is extremely small and therefore the data is not represented in the first place.

Antitrust violations, there's a whole number of reasons why it could never be a mandatory data collection. There's lots of reasons why that data could never live within ICANN. And now quite possibly there's reasons why it could never live with a third-party. And all of those need to be explored.

So if anybody else feels like exploring those with me I'm more than welcome to have the company. But I'm certainly well aware of those concerns and try - I end up being the guy in that working group saying no constantly.

James Bladel: It's so weird that Sarah is over here trying to volunteer.

Graeme Bunton: Oh delightful. All right. Has she done a working group before?

James Bladel: Yeah. Sure.

Graeme Bunton: Great.

James Bladel: We'll say yes.

Graeme Bunton: Can't get enough. Thanks.

James Bladel: No, I think that we want to participate and if nothing else just to explain why this is not the cut and dried proposition that it sounds like. Give us data and then will only make policy based on data, is very tempting but not...

Graeme Bunton: I don't think anyone in a working group thinks that's the...

James Bladel: Okay, all right.

Graeme Bunton: ...the case. So there - at least from my perspective no one has that impression. Contracted parties, myself and Pam, have been pretty clear - at least as clear as possible that there is, you know, there could be no mandatory obligation; we need to be extremely careful. It's specific issue focused. The data is not permanently kept. The data is anonymized, stuff like that. If someone were to be willing to voluntarily contribute their data because it's an issue that they think is relevant, along those lines.

Michele Neylon: Okay, anybody else? Yeah, apart from Marika. I'm only joking. On the other working groups, the EWG - well, James, can you explain exactly where that's asked? Because - okay, Marika can.

Marika Konings: I see James looking very worried but...

James Bladel: No, take a swing at it. Take a swing at it. Just that, you know, the EWG produce this report and then kind of dropped it onto the GNSO and said here.

Michele Neylon: Having served on the GNSO...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...EWG, that's not exactly what happened.

James Bladel: I'm paraphrasing, Michele.

Michele Neylon: No, we were meant to send it back to the Board. The Board dropped it on the GNSO.

James Bladel: Well because it was actually - and that's when the GNSO said now what do we do with this, because this is actually a Board and initiated PDP. This is not a report. This is not a review team. This is not a drafting team or a cross community - this is actually a PDP that's been working, and what do we do with it?

And the good news is that the Board and the GNSO put together this team to kind of decide how to continue to proceed on this. And I think we've been studying - it's very process driven. We haven't really built into the material but process driven is we're trying to find a way to move this into a phased PDP, a very large, very complex, very lengthy phased PDP with multiple inputs and trying to define okay what sort of data cases do we need to get this thing off the ground.

The EWG report being one, other reports and studies and past reviews being other data sources that would help inform this PDP. And then at each point, I believe there are three key points for the issues report, which would be forthcoming I think after this meeting that before Buenos Aires, is that - yeah.

And then they have to do the issues report, that would be put up for comment, and then the GNSO would then decide to proceed with phase 1. And then based on the output of phase 1 then we proceed to phase 2.

That - to me that's how I see it. I'll let Marika tell me where I'm wrong, fill in the blanks. And then I'd like to come back and tell you what I think about the EWG effort after that.

Marika Konings: Okay, so this is Marika again. So I think James explained it very well, I mean, one point to note, I think this is one of those efforts where indeed a lot of information gathering happens before the actual PDP launched or went into the next phase. So I think this is an effort where, you know, an attempt was made to really try and get as much expertise around this area together and help, you know, use that as input to the policy development process.

So I said, you know, the process that's being put forward is the result of a joint Board GNSO working group or in formal process working group, I think it was called. As this is an issue that was requested by the Board to be worked on by the GNSO basically.

So I think we are currently stands, and indeed, you know, the group will review what feedback has been received during the ICANN meeting, there was a discussion on Saturday in the GNSO, there was a discussion on Monday with the broader community, so I think they will, you know, digest that input and see if based on that they need to make any changes to their proposed approach.

And then indeed if that is not needed the idea is that, you know, an issue report would be drafted and published around the April May time frame probably for public comments and further community considerations can be held around the Buenos Aires meeting most likely.

It's the expectation as well that the preliminary issue report would include a proposed charter again to, you know, along the lines of what the process group has outlined so it's really clear as well to everyone how the work is expected to be conducted in and what the scope of the group will be.

And maybe just one comment to - a comment that James earlier made in relation to impact assessment. I know some questions have been raised in this regard as well. But of course to a certain extent, you know, can you

already make an assessment of the impact if you don't know what you're recommending yet?

So it's definitely foreseen to be taking place later down the road when it becomes clear what the working group would be recommending. And of course, you know, any costs would also need to be measured against, you know, the current system, what are the costs for the broader community as well as, you know, directly affected parties of the current system versus a potential new system. So I think that's where we're currently at.

Michele Neylon: James.

James Bladel: So now for the color commentary on the EWG. This is actually a good process, I mean, given what we were handed and the tasks that we were asked to do and the problem and the things that are in front of us and the systems that we have to work with. I guess it's a good - it's as good as any and I think people have worked on it in good faith. I know I've try to contribute in good faith.

But, while we were I think putting a solid effort into the how we were going to do EWG, I still think there is an open question on whether or not or the why of EWG. And whether or not the gains realized, the benefits from completely throwing Whois out and rebuilding it, you know, according to everyone's wish list, is offset by the time, effort and money that's going to have to go into that effort.

And I don't know that, you know, we've ever really kind of had a frank and candid conversation about that. And I think I made a comment the last time we were in Singapore that it feels like this is just a boulder rolling down hill and we're just all supposed to salute it while it goes by.

You know, I don't know if that's a very good analogy but I do feel like we are going to get this EWG issues report because the EWG and is working group

put so much work into it. And then were going to get through phase 1 because we put so much work into it.

And then we're going to get through phase 2 because we put so much work into it, it just feels like we're just constantly doubling down on the sunk cost fallacy of well because we've worked on - so much on this effort we can't abandon it, we can't stop it, we can't say no, we can't say we don't want to proceed.

And I think that - I think we need to ask those questions. And I think that we need to - we need to have a dialogue about that. And I'm concerned that this thing is on autopilot.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Thanks. This is Marika again. Well I think the conversations have already been going for many many years. And I think, you know, probably many people can, you know, think of some reasons why the current system is maybe not...

James Bladel: The conversations have been going for years. We can put it to a GNSO Council vote.

Marika Konings: Right, it has been put to a GNSO Council vote. And the last time they tried it was voted down. So, I mean, I think it was before I came. But just to note as well like where this work started out and I think it's really going back to the basis, you know, what is the purpose of that data and why are we collecting it and who needs to have access?

I think it's really trying - or at least as I understand it, this effort is really trying to go back to let's start asking the basic questions and see if that means, you know, the model that we currently have or that requires a different approach.

And I think that's where as well, if I understand EWG conversations have started, what is actually, you know, the purpose of the data and does that match, you know, what we currently have or, you know, should we make adjustments? So I think that's where the conversations started, and how it's trying systematically to go through the questions that are associated with that, but starting from the purpose of it.

Yoav Keren: Well I said this in the past...

Michele Neylon: Name please.

Yoav Keren: So, Yoav Keren. I see the EWG as a certain bent of the bottom up GNSO multistakeholder model. I think it was created after - as you said, it was voted down by the GNSO Council. And this is where we should have had that discussion whether this is needed or not, what James was just talking about.

And there was no such discussion, and this is just, you know, happening in the working group that is not through the GNSO policymaking. And I think maybe, I'm just proposing down, for us maybe we should propose a motion and start policy in the GNSO discussing this, so we can - that might, you know, have that discussion if it's needed or not.

James Bladel: You know, I just want to say if somebody wants to do that that would be great to at least have that vote before we take on a 10-year project.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller for the record. You totally lost me, guys. I'm sure I'm not the only one. You always talk about the way you say it's close to a PDP, you say we should vote it down.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, let me may be clarified. Just when I, I mean, spoke about vote it down I spoke about the last effort which I think was (Chris) back in 2008 of the voting down.

Where we're currently as a Board-initiated PDP. So basically for a Board initiated PDP there is no intermediate vote of the GNSO Council on the issue report itself. There is a vote on the charter. But I said, I think we are a little bit new territory because we really haven't had many Board initiated PDPs. And as I at least understand it from I think the Board GNSO, you know, process working group the objective is to make it a collaborative effort, so not a top-down approach.

And I think as well the whole idea is that the EWG report helps inform the bottom up multistakeholder process. And we're now really after start of that. So basically the EWG report will feed into the preliminary issue report that if all goes well we would be publishing around April May time frame for public comment.

So there's an opportunity - a first opportunity for the community to say, well, you know, we don't think this should be done for these and these reasons or the questions you're asking are not right. The way you are, you know, proposing to do this work we don't agree with. So I think that's the first check point whereby the community can say well this is what we think of it.

Tom Keller: So will it be the first point but community - it's a community - the community can say stop that.

Marika Konings: I think the issue report phase. So we publish and issue reports and there you can say we don't think we should be taking on this work. But...

Tom Keller: But the main issue is if it is an issue report you will have the people that want it and to have the people that don't want it. And this is not very representative and it should come down to a vote at some point. Right, I mean, the Council

asked to take on the work and someone has to do it or someone has to make a decision that we're going to move forward with that.

James Bladel: Yeah, the Council will vote on the issues report.

Marika Konings: No.

Tom Keller: You will.

Marika Konings: No.

James Bladel: Yes. Yes.

Marika Konings: No.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Hold on, hold on, slow down.

Marika Konings: From a procedural - just to clarify, as it did Board initiated PDP there is no intermediate vote on the issue report. But...

James Bladel: There will be a motion...

Marika Konings: To make clear...

James Bladel: ...to vote on the issues report after the public comment is closed. There has to be otherwise it's just rolling downhill.

Marika Konings: Right but I think what has been discussed between the Board GNSO group is that at that point there would be a further conversation between the two groups to try and understand where are we at, are we still on the same page, do we need to course correct.

Tom Keller: Out what form? So who has this discussion? Who are we talking with?

Marika Konings: There is a Board GNSO process working group for which James...

Tom Keller: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...amongst others is a member.

Tom Keller: Yeah, okay.

Marika Konings: So that group is now having this conversation on what should be the process going forward. And that's what has been discussed on Saturday, on Monday. And what has been - the paper has also been shared with the GNSO Council I believe on what's proposed.

So again (unintelligible) there's no requirement and on a Board initiated PDP automatically proceeds. But I said I think there is a real desire here to make this a collaborative effort. And, you know, procedurally, I don't know, the GNSO will decide to have a vote or say we're not going to do the work. I mean, I don't think anything the Board can do to force it.

So, again, I think it's really about the conversation between the GNSO Alan the Council to understand what is it that we're trying to achieve, do we have the bandwidth to do it, do we have a plan in place to, you know, make sure we're set up for success. And if not let's talk about it. That's at least my understanding of where we're currently at.

James Bladel: So you see what I mean, autopilot. It's just going to happen.

Man: But shouldn't the Board be able to - at the Board level if it has an issue it once the GNSO to look in...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Absolutely, and they did.

Man: Right.

James Bladel: They can initiate the PDP and that's what's happened.

Man: Yeah but you're talking about trying to kill it before it gets there, right?

James Bladel: No, not at all. I think what we're saying is that we're trying to define the process since a Board initiated PDP has never really kind of existed to this level before on this particular issue that we're saying how does it work? How does a Board level PDP actually work? And we're figuring that out.

And I think what this group has done, the Board and the GNSO has put together a roadmap and said, okay, here are your checkpoints, and there are three; and here are the steps, here are the inputs and here are the three phases and all this stuff.

And I think what I'm saying is - and I think what a lot of people are saying is, at least in this room, is those checkpoints cannot just - what I'm saying is those checkpoints cannot be rubberstamp approvals. We have to say do we want to proceed? Look at the work that's in front of us. Look at the problem. Look who's going to benefit and look who's going to bear all the burden and all the costs. And do we want to proceed?

And if the answer is yes we go forward to the next phase. And if the answer is no then we don't. But the problem is is, I think, that people are - that some are building this roadmap with the impression that those are just mile markers that you blow by at 60 miles an hour and not stop and assess type, you know, decision points.

And I believe procedurally that there is - because we are building in these checkpoints that there is a viable outcome that the GNSO could say, we don't want to go forward with this.

Man: As opposed to going forward and producing a report that says do nothing. My fear is...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, but the Board will make policy in a vacuum; they'll just make it. Here at least they're shoving something down to the GNSO and saying please make policy. Maybe it would be better to go through and say the policy is don't, you know...

James Bladel: You know, I don't - I guess I maybe have a little more confidence in the Board that they won't just insert policy in a vacuum. They did that by initiating this process and they've been working with us collaboratively to get to this roadmap.

Man: Okay.

James Bladel: And that if the roadmap at some point says, the road ends here, that they would respect that - some of them.

Tom Keller: One more question would be if it becomes ever a regular PDP then the Council has to vote on it and it has to be carried to be part of our contracts, that is still the case even that.

James Bladel: And it is a regular PDP. It's not and if it becomes; it is today. Yes, absolutely.

Michele Neylon: Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. The only difference between the Board initiated PDP and, you know, one that would be initiated by the Council is basically at the request for initial report, so normally the Council votes on that but when it's requested by the Board, you know, staff will automatically prepare that.

And if at the time of the initiation, according to the PDP manual, at the time of initiation normally if the Council initiates it there would be a vote initiate. But again, you know, the voting threshold is pretty low I think as people have already remarked. In the case of a Board initiated PEP there is no intermediate vote. The only vote that would happen at the start is actually on the charter.

So again that would be another kind of checkpoint if, you know, Council votes down the charter because you don't agree with the approach or what the scope or - that's another point where you could say look that's, you know, we need to have a conversation because obviously there is no support for going forward as it is.

That PDP doesn't foresee currently any kind of formal mechanism around that. But I said I think the Board GNSO process working group is kind of trading new territory in trying to find that mechanism by which this collaboration can be established between the GNSO and the Board to make sure that, you know, everyone is on the same page and that, you know, the GNSO is not being asked to do work it doesn't want to do or it doesn't think the can do.

And the Board also has realistic expectations of what, you know, the direction the GNSO wants to go with this. So I think that's where we're currently at. But it's still relatively new territory and I think we're trying to make sure that, you know, we find the best way forward.

Michele Neylon: Okay thanks, Marika. Just I think we need to really step back there for a moment and just look at our engagement or lack of engagement in certain

PDPs, working groups and all that. And James and Volker, and I see a few other people, just looking down the list the translation and transliteration of registration data, Emily Taylor is in there. Who else is from the registrars?

Marika Konings: I think Yoav is in that as well now?

Michele Neylon: Well let's rephrase that. Who is actively in any of these working groups, currently actively in any of these working groups? The translation and transliteration, Emily is in there. Privacy and proxy, who's - privacy and proxy? I know there's loads of people - there's a load of people. Policy and implementation?

Rob Hall: How about our ExComm put a list out to the mailing list of every working group and who's in it and where we need people? Can we...

Michele Neylon: Well the thing - what I actually want to actually get to, Rob, is a very simple one is that there is some people who are doing a lot of these working groups; there's other people who aren't doing any. Just being blunt about.

Rob Hall: Okay so you're not going to solve that by discussing it for 10 minutes here. Get a list together of where we need people and ask for volunteers.

Michele Neylon: We've tried that.

Rob Hall: Okay so then status quo.

James Bladel: You know, what? Not status quo...

Michele Neylon: No.

James Bladel: ...because I have a different idea which is that we sit on a lot of unspent money at the end of each year, and I believe that we used to have an advocate, we used to have some assistance. And we talked about it at the

ExComm and I think we're almost ready to release an RFP for a secretariat. Because I think what we're saying, Rob, is that these are important.

We're all too busy to take more on but we're kind of absent from the conversations. And so let's hire it out. Let's get some - let's get some help. You know, and I think that that's where we're at.

Rob Hall: I'd support that with the exception of secretariat would seem to be more of an administrative type thing. What you're really looking for is a senior advocate...

James Bladel: Advocate, yeah.

Rob Hall: ...that is very different than a secretariat. So if you want to spend money - and it'll be expensive, I get it, I'd support that because we need to be on these. But I don't think that it's a junior or intermediate - I think it's got to be some senior...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: That's fair. And I think - we've got a RFP that we can circulate. I think the key thing here is that, you know, we're all business people and so we like to see, you know, like we took in X and we only spent Y so we're doing the right thing. But I think in the context of a stakeholder group the money left in the bank account at the end of the year is a failure. It's bullets left unfired. And we need to start being a little more, you know, assertive with those resources and get some folks engaged on this. The other constituencies certainly aren't shy.

((Crosstalk))

Tom Keller: I support that completely. One and One would support that the sooner the better actually.

Michele Neylon: Jennifer.

Jennifer Standiford: So I think the takeaway from that is the ExComm will take a look at the draft RFP that has not been submitted to the - sent out to the SG yet, take comments from Rob and incorporate in order to get input from the SG.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, we'll definitely take comments from the SG.

Jennifer Standiford: No, I know that but, I mean, there's a draft now that we now need to revise based upon this feedback and then we'll send it out to the SG.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Anything else around the policy stuff that you want to ask Marika or can we release her? Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. If I can just make one last comment, and again on the policy implementation, the public comment forum is open until 4 March. And as there's a lot of stuff in there specifically relating as well to implementation, which I think - I know you all care about deeply, you know, please have a look and, you know, provide your input.

You know, the traditional public comment forum is open that we also have a survey which may make it easier for you to, you know, agree, disagree, suggest these changes kind of format, and we also have a template that may make it easier to provide input. So - and if you want to hear more about that there's a session tomorrow afternoon, I believe that's from 3:30 to 5:00 to talk about the report and the recommendations. Of course you're more than welcome to join there as well.

Michele Neylon: Tom, go ahead.

Tom Keller: Yeah, just a last request and I was trying to get (unintelligible) what is ongoing at ICANN and I couldn't find a single page with an overview which is outlining - this is the name of it, this is the status, specific timeline, what's -

there are lots of documents, I'm aware of them, and I just don't want to look at all of them to understand where we are on the process. It's very, very complicated. It took me seriously two days to understand what all these points were about.

So this is another thing why we have so little participation because the people just don't understand what the whole things are about. So it took us half an hour to sort out what the specific EWG where most of the people don't even understand what acronym means. And so if we really want to have more people doing something, if you guys want to have more people doing something, we really have to be more transparent about that.

So where you say, oh that's my policy hat I'm wearing and so these are all the policy things, then again, implementation is someone else, right. So I have to look at other pages to see what's happening. Then we have the surveys and other shit that's going on. And for us it's not transparent because we are all affected by all of it and we have to put resources into it.

But we don't even know how much resource we need. So having one page that is really dedicated just to these are the line items we're looking at currently would be greatly appreciated.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. And that feedback is much appreciated. And I think there, you know, will be looking to the different groups to get more input on that. How can we make it easier for you to find and access information? You may have seen that, you know, prior to this meeting we actually did create a new GNSO page like a one-stop information page where, you know, people can hopefully more easily find information.

We also created a page specifically dedicated to preparing for ICANN meetings related to GNSO. We also have the policy briefings that are circulated rate before the meeting that are kind of one pagers trying to get people indeed the status update.

But again, you know, anything else we can do to make that easier, you know, we are really looking, you know, to hear from your groups with specific suggestions on how we can assist in that because, I mean, I think in all our interests to make sure that when people come they can find the things they need; they feel that they have the tools available to participate, so really looking forward to collaborate more on that as we go forward.

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks Marika. Thanks, Tom. Just on - damn that's really loud. Michele for the transcript. Hopefully before the next ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires there might be an update on some of this stuff around engagement and knowledge management and all this because, yeah, you're right, I mean, trying to find a document even if Marika says to you yes that document exists, you're not stupid, she's not stupid that you can't find it which isn't particularly helpful.

There is an ongoing discussion with in the senior - ICANN senior staff and the chairs of the various SOs, ACs and everything else to try to work on - well identify the issues that people are having and try to come up with fixes that can be made that will actually resolve it rather than some of the stuff that seems to have happened in the past where they spent lots of money on consultants and it didn't really get anything out of it so hopefully will have more of an update for you on that in Buenos Aires.

It's 10 past 3. according to our schedule we were meant to be in this room until a quarter past, and then we're meeting with the ICANN Board in the Padang room, which is - I think that's where the GAC was - or the Main room oh it's the one beside it. Okay.

We're meeting with the Board at half past 3:00 so I would suggest we close the session and give you another couple minutes to get over to the Board, and then so we have a meeting with the Board.

In terms of the meeting with the Board, we've put in a couple of topics so we have Whois-related initiatives, community workload, contract interpretation and universal acceptance. And I think we are fairly well teed up on that.

Whois related - sorry, go ahead, James.

James Bladel: Do we have a - do we have a spokesperson for each one?

Michele Neylon: That's what I was just going to go through very quickly. Whois related - what?

Jennifer Standiford: I didn't hear the unilateral interpretation.

Michele Neylon: Oh no, it was there. I'm just mumbling possibly. Whois related initiatives, does anybody particularly want to deal with that? I can't remember who we assigned it to originally or I can do it if you want, I don't mind, it's all the same to me. James put himself down for that.

Community workload, Mr. Keller had volunteered for. Contract interpretation is Bob. And universal acceptance - does anybody want to do that one? No, no, you can jump in...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Sorry, just so we - the way this - we've done this in the past is one person kind of leaked out and then obviously other people join.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Okay.

Man: Universal acceptance.

Michele Neylon: That's where I was trying to get an answer on. Okay look I'll put myself down for universal acceptance then. If we get there; if we get to it. Well I think the only thing I'm - the only thing I would say on universal acceptance is that ICANN needs to engage with people who can actually make a difference.

I mean, talking to us about universal acceptance is not particularly helpful because we're all going to go, yes we think it's a wonderful idea. And everybody walks away from the meeting going great, we had a wonderful meeting. We all thought it was wonderful.

James Bladel: How about spend some money.

Michele Neylon: Yeah but where?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jennifer Standiford: This is Jennifer Standiford for the record. Maybe regarding the suggestion that James put forward on spending money, we could link the proceeds from the private auction to investment in universal acceptance.

Michele Neylon: I don't think they're going to - a lot of people are going to go for that one to be honest.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I don't care. The question is was the process to get there and can we start it please?

Jennifer Standiford: Right.

Michele Neylon: On the private auctions or the universal acceptance?

Man: On what to do with the private auction money. These things need to be asked to the Board, we're at the Board level not the...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: We've already asked them about the private auctions but they won't give an answer until all of the private auctions are done.

Man: No what they said is they'll listen to the community.

Jennifer Standiford: Right.

Man: So...

Michele Neylon: But they won't start the conversation until all the private auctions are finished.

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: The private auctions are currently a topic at the GNSO level. The GNSO is trying to figure out how to initiate the process on that. The current thinking seems to be that a cross community working group either with the ccNSO or other affected groups outside the GNSO would be the ideal way to deal with this.

However, no concrete plans have been formulated yet. This has started at this meeting. Discussions are ongoing.

Man: Okay, that's a great update, Volker. Thank you. But what's our ask on universal acceptance? If you really just let's start spending some of this money because...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I think - personally I think asking for spending money is pointless and it's also...

Man: Right.

Michele Neylon: ...goes against what we've been advocating for in many other realms.

Man: So what is our ask with universal acceptance of the Board, not the staff? Like what are we asking the Board to do? We know what we're asking all the other topics...

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: Maybe we should look at this from a different perspective. Maybe we should look, present and ask to the Board but provide suggestions of what we think where - provide a status update from our perspective, provide a list of problems that we have seen. Inform the Board of what we see the problem as being and who would need to be informed, i.e. get a free flow discussion going instead of supplicating to the Board and asking them to provide an answer.

Michele Neylon: So I think, you know, going back to, you know, what the ask - I think that might be a way forward. But we solicited feedback from the members on the list. Those were the four topics that we got back were condensed down to those four, the ones where we got the most engagement, the most take up.

So I think that's what we need to - ultimately, based on past experience, we're lucky to get through all four topics anyway. Invariably we end up getting derailed on at least one - or let me rephrase that, we get a higher level of engagement on at least one.

Okay so everybody - sorry go ahead.

Jennifer Standiford: I'm sorry. Jennifer Standiford for the transcript. I realize that they already have the agenda items that we want to cover that we don't necessarily have to go in that particular order correct? So therefore I think it's worth at least discussing the order in which we want to broach the subjects as far as which ones are a higher priority...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: I would suggest contract, workload, Whois, universal.

Jennifer Standiford: Does anybody else have any other suggestions?

Michele Neylon: Sorry, just for those who didn't hear me, I suggested as an order - it's Michele for the record - contract interpretation is one that we - that we have the most interest in; the second one, community workload; third one, Whois; and the fourth universal acceptance.

Man: I wouldn't do the contract one - I think the contract one is the one where we get the most engagement and the most time spent. So if you put it first you may not get to anything else.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well let's...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay I understand what you're saying.

Man: And Whois is another big one. So if you want to bang off - you want to start with something light and get through the community engagement. I don't know what our ask is there at the moment, like are we saying we want a fixed number of PDPs or - like I get that we're burning out but I just - are we just informing them of that or - okay. So that should be an easy one so why don't

we start with that? And then it's either contract or Whois but both of those have the potential to derail. So maybe contract second and Whois third and...

Michele Neylon: Yeah, that's - yeah. I don't mind, I mean, okay so community workload is Number 1, contract, Number 2, Whois Number 3 and universal acceptance is Number 4 assuming we ever get to it. Yeah, okay.

So we are with the Board at - from half past 3:00 onwards in Padang. Okay, see you there.

Man: Thank you.

END