

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group  
Tuesday 10 February 2015  
9:00-10:45 SGT  
Part 1**

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

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

Keith Drazek: Okay let's go ahead and get started. So if we could begin the recording.

Cherie Stubbs: Good morning everyone. I'm just checking before we start to see if anybody is on the teleconference bridge. If so would you please announce yourself?  
Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, hearing no one. Let's go ahead and get started. So good morning everybody. This is Keith Drazek. Welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting from ICANN 52. Welcome back to Singapore. Tuesday the 10th of February, 2015. We have a very busy agenda this morning as we always do it seems and we will be joined very shortly by ICANN staff, mostly GDD and compliance and we've got quite a busy agenda as you'll see on the screen or on the agenda in front of you on your screen.

We may at some point need to prioritize this list so if you would begin thinking about the key issues and key topics for discussion with GDD that would be helpful. We had I think a constructive session again on Sunday evening with Akram and his team and (Alan Grogan) and his team with the joint registry

and registrar x-coms. So I think we've had some constructive and preliminary discussions about many of the topics including importantly the contractual interpretation and compliance questions and also discussed a little bit about universal acceptance.

If there are other really hot topics that folks would like to raise with GDD staff this morning please think of them and be prepared to raise your hand as we get to that session. I want to take a moment to welcome one of our ICANN fellows who is here with us today. I'm going to try to make sure I get it right. It is (Abdomanim Osman) from Sudan I think is sitting right over here. Yes (Sheri)? And (Samur Kalil) from Lebanon also I think are two fellows. So I'd like to welcome them please.

Thanks for being with us and please if you have any questions feel free to jump in and we'll try to answer them. All right, thank you. Okay with that let's see if - are there any suggested edits or additions to the agenda for today? We have a lot to add then. All right well give me a second here. All right well I'll run through the agenda at a high level. So at 9 o'clock we've begun a little bit late. We have another five minutes before we're joined by GDD staff.

We are with GDD and compliance from 9:15 to 10:45. We will then break to adjourn to the registrar meeting room which is the Sophia room which is that direction over in that corner and so we'll have the joint registry registrar meeting from 11:00 to noon. Then we will come back to this room for a working lunch from 12:00 to 1:00 and we have quite a bit of stuff going on with the registrars and then also in the working lunch.

From 1:00 to 2:00 we'll have a discussion of ICANN accountability and the IANA stewardship transition, updates from the participants in those groups. And then at 2:00 pm we'll adjourn to go to the meeting with the ICANN board which will take place in the board room from 2:15 to 3:15. And then we will come back here again to finish up our Registry Stakeholder Group business for the day. Yes Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Keith. Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. I wanted to call everybody's attention to the agenda item at 1 o'clock. It's not just an information session where we're going to view updates on the CWG IANA Working Group and the Accountability Working Group. It's really important that we get some feedback from you in that hour or so. If you can all come then Donna is going to be leading a session then where we will give you a brief overview -- she will give you a brief overview -- but there are some questions that are in the discussion paper that was posted for the CWG that we want feedback on.

So please try and be here for that and give us your feedback so that we can then take that feedback and (unintelligible) the CWG work as it's ongoing.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much Chuck. This is Keith. So just to build on what Chuck said at a very high level a teaser for that session is that there is a tremendous amount of work going on in the community right now on both the ICANN accountability track and the IANA stewardship transition track so CCWG and CWG respectively.

At some point these two tracks are going to sync up or converge and it is incredibly important that we as a stakeholder group and certainly as contracted parties that care about ICANN accountability and registries that are the direct customers of IANA that it is incredibly important that we are informed, that we consider the various topics and issues on the table and that we provide as a stakeholder group feedback to our representatives.

And I think to Chuck's point this is an important opportunity for us to make sure everybody is aware of the developments and the challenges that we face working in this group. I will just note that particularly I think in the CWG there are a lot of participants in that working group and in the multi-stakeholder process it's perfectly legitimate but there are many participants and contributors to that group that are not direct customers of the IANA functions and we are.

So it is incumbent upon us I believe to make sure that we are informed and leading that discussion and making sure that when we're talking about operational accountability to the customers from IANA that we are leading that discussion and making sure that our interests are protected. So please, please be there at 1 o' clock for that session. Okay, any questions or comments or other suggested edits to the agenda at this point? Donna yes, thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Keith, Donna Austin. I just want to make - I guess just want to make a statement about our participant in the CWG. We've just come out of the (unintelligible) breakfast where Fadi said that - well he made some criticisms to the way the CWG has been operating and it's not paying attention to the stuff that it should be paying attention to.

We have as you know a smaller working group that is focused on the transition discussion. We've been actively participating. I don't want anyone to think that we haven't. It's a process that we're working through and we will get to the end of where we need to get to so I just wanted to - if I sound defensive it's because I've heard over the last two days that we're not doing our job. I believe we are. I believe we are representing your interests well and if there's anything else that we can do to do that better please let us know. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks Donna and I think this is a really important point to note is that - and I think it's fair to say that the group that Donna just referenced plus myself and (John Nevit) had a session with Larry Strickling and (unintelligible) from NCA a couple of days ago talking specifically about the IANA transition and the accountability process and all that. And I think what Donna heard from Fadi earlier and what we're starting to hear in the community discussions that's been percolating out through conversations that they've had with the GAC and other places is that the CWG is not enough focused on

operational accountability and too much focused on bigger picture accountability issues that belong in the accountability track.

And so I think what Fadi was saying maybe indelicately or inaccurately to the DNA this morning was that the registries aren't doing enough and that has nothing to do with the participant and the input of our representatives and our group frankly. It's more I think a meta issue that they believe people have taken their eye off the ball on this and that it's been lost that the CWG should be mostly about the operation accountability of IANA to its customers, the registries, and that too much has been thrown into that working group and not enough has been put into the accountability track.

So I want to absolutely commend Donna and Chuck and (Stephanie) and everybody that's been participating in that CWG group. And Sarah. Sorry. It's been an incredible amount of work that has gone into this so please Donna don't worry. We got your back.

Tim McGinnis: Keith, Tim McGinnis, NIPB. For the record can you clarify for me when we're going to talk about the category one safeguards that is - the GAC has been focused on in the last few days? Not necessarily really Spec 11. The GAC is reiterating their advice from previous meetings and I think that they may come up with either new specs or new Spec 11 requirements or enforcement details or new category one safeguard implementation details so that's something that I think we should talk about at some point.

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks Tim. This is Keith. I agree. It is something that's important to talk about. There's actually been recent discussions on this that we all need to talk about as a stakeholder group and we need to probably put that in stakeholder group business this afternoon at 3:30, sometime in that time frame. Any other suggested edits to the agenda before we move to the discussion with Akram and his team?

Okay very good. So Akram welcome. Welcome to Cyrus, Krista and team. Appreciate you being with us as always and we have I think you'll see on the agenda a very long list of bullet points that I don't think we're going to necessarily get to. So if you could identify any particular topics that you would like to raise with us we'll do the same. We'll prioritize and get to what we can. I noted for the group that we had I thought a very constructive discussion on Sunday night with the joint X-coms and GDD staff and compliance and that we touched on the issue of contract interpretation, implications for compliance actions and then a little bit about universal acceptance.

But I think at this point welcome and feel free to make some remarks if you have any introductory remarks and then we'll get down to business.

Akram Atallah: Thank you Keith and thanks everybody for taking the time and inviting us here. I really don't have any specific topics unless Cyrus and Krista have specific ones that they want to go over but we're welcome to discuss anything that you have in mind including any prioritization on our work that we're doing so that we make sure that we don't spend a lot of energy on things that for you are not an important priority has lessened or the priority has changed.

So if there is any input that you can provide us we'd be more than happy to take it and reassess and realign our resources to meet your needs better.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Akram. Cyrus or Krista, anything?

Krista Papac: Just supporting what Akram said. Krista Papac for the record. And at the end of the session I just have a few almost operational updates for you guys that are minor things that we can just add at the end. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Krista. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. I'd like to start this off on a couple positive notes for the GDD. I know we're going to talk about concerns and we

should and that's going to be constructive but I'd like to point out because a lot of you probably aren't aware of a couple really positive things that the GDD has done in the last few months.

One of them is supporting the Policy and Implementation Working Group that we'll talk about later today. The GDD Team helped us with a critical piece of that report and you don't need to be shy back there (Karen). I can see you. And (Karen) was a big part of that and her team, great help in that report with regard to an implementation framework and you'll see that as one of the annexes in that report.

But also (Paul) and I and Ken Stubbs last night had the opportunity to participate in a finance session with (Savea) and other people from the community where we're looking at revenue projections for fiscal year 2016 in a lot of detail and I can honestly tell you I was very, very impressed with the work that Krista and Mike Zupky and Cyrus did with regard to revenue projections.

We all know that last year it was a problem because of the new gTLD rollout and we had to make some adjustments but they spent I suspect weeks. And Krista I know you were a big part of that so thank you very much. And Cyrus too. And of course I'll say the same thing to Mike when I see him.

So they're doing a lot more than just dealing with our problems and that is very much appreciated.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Chuck. Would anybody else like to get in the queue at this point? Okay. I suggest we move to the list of topics that we had compiled. I'm just going to run through them and call them out and if anybody would like to speak to any of these topics raise your hand and if not that's fine. We don't have to cover every single one of these if it's not a priority.

So the first item on the agenda is engagement with staff on compliance and interpretation issues and concerns. As I said that was discussed both at our last Registry Stakeholder Group call, we had a follow-on session with a small group from each registry and registrar stakeholder groups and GDD and compliance staff two Fridays ago. We again talked about it and I think my recap is that there I think is a recognition that there's a challenge that we face. And I think this is a recognition on both sides.

That there's a challenge that we face in having compliance actions initiated based on one party's interpretation of contractual terms and that I believe we have a commitment from both Alan and his team and Akram and his team to engage with us better and engage with us more deeply in discussions where we have concerns and that some of the concerns that we discussed were having an escalation path to discuss issues where there appears to be a misinterpretation or a misunderstanding or a disagreement between the two parties about what a particular contract clause might mean.

And that breach notices - there might need to be a period where something could be paused before escalating to ensure that both parties are in agreement about certain contractual language. So I'm going to pause there. There were many others involved in this discussion and have been so John or if anybody else would like to jump in and give your views on this I'd appreciate it.

Chuck Gomes: I think you captured it great.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. Any questions or comments or Cyrus if you'd like to respond or Akram, your assessments of the conversations on contract interpretation and compliance.

Akram Atallah: Actually since we can talk about compliance I would like to say that since Alan is not in the room I can talk about him (unintelligible). No actually like we said we can - you have an escalation path within GDD with your account

management team. We are here to assist you and help you. If there is a compliance issue compliance also affords you the help that you need but also from your account management we can help you get through that issue and then see how we can collaborate to get you to resolve the issue as well.

So I think there is now enough for the (unintelligible) to resolve issues with compliance but on the particular issue of interpretation what I think (unintelligible) and I don't know if Alan has finalized in his mind how we would do this or what is the process to do this. I think we've talked about the issue of having the notices be the period where we put this issue on the table, where there is a misinterpretation use the notice period where they can provide you extensions to address the different interpretations of the contract so that you don't get to a breach notice and then have this be a public issue. Is that correct Maguy?

Maguy Sared: Good morning everyone, Maguy Sared, contractual compliance. Thank you Akram and Keith. Both summaries are very straight on from many conversations and one as recent as a couple of nights ago. In addition just want to remind the audience in this room to join us on Thursday morning for the registry outreach session because we do prepare slides on what is the approach and how we (unintelligible) what we request for the different contract obligations.

So join us Thursday. Let's get the dialog going but we are always available as Akram mentioned to address any concerns and issues you have. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Maguy. Yes Krista.

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. Krista Papac. So as one of the people and a member of the team that works with you guys through your issues I'm going to take it down a level from where Akram and Maguy were just talking about. So one of the things we discussed on the call a couple weeks ago and the other night was also that there are some recurring themes or issues, places where you feel

you're running into interpretation issues with us and we've talked about this before about you guys providing us with a list of contract provisions where you think that we have a different interpretation than you do.

And what was raised by I think it was (Brett Fawcett) was that maybe people don't want to stand up and say oh this is a provision where we're having an issue because you're doing it in front of your competitors for lack of a better word, and maybe it would be better if we could put together some use cases that were sanitized that could be used for the greater whole and we could talk through sanitized use cases.

So the call to action that we had following that conversation was that if some of you have those use cases or some examples that you could work with myself and the Registry Services Team to come up with something that's sanitized and that you feel comfortable sharing with the greater group. So I would put that out there for you to please reach out to us, me or your engagement manager and we'll help work on that with you and maybe that will also help inform this discussion. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks Krista and thanks for bringing that to a point of action items. And that's something that we agreed to take on. And again I think what we're trying to identify is if there are common issues that we're facing as registries or areas where we all are getting similar compliance notices, for example based on one particular clause or something in the agreement that has been interpreted in a way that we might not agree with but we don't want to necessarily share it on the registry stakeholder group list.

So I think what ICANN is offering is have your individual conversations, they'll collect everything, compile it into a document and sanitize it so it's not identified by registry but at least then we understand what the issues are that we're facing with. We can determine is it one issue, is it three, what are they and then we can figure out how to approach it. So I think that's actually a very

constructive suggestion and something that we agreed to the other night so please take advantage of that.

Okay any other questions on contract interpretation and compliance? Thank you. Next item we have on the agenda is Whois clarification on crossover relative to output. And I'm going to ask for some help on this because I'm not entirely sure what that means. Anyone? Anything on whois. Anybody want to talk about whois? I know there was a whois session yesterday. Go ahead Cyrus. Thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: Good morning. Cyrus Namazi from ICANN staff. But before I get into the whois part I wanted to thank Chuck actually for acknowledging some of the positive developments here as well. It's immensely important to us actually to hear the positive feedback about the things that you actually find useful to you in terms of how we spend our time and resources.

Goes a long way in employee retention which is I think a topic that (Brett Fawcett) brought up and just making sure that the whole picture is presented. Doubtless there are times that what we do does not meet your expectations and we'll continue to seek your feedback to fix that but thank you, thank you very much Chuck.

On the whois clarification this is a topic that's been going back and forth between staff and for the most part the stakeholder group here since summer of last year. And just to recap we posted an advisory on it in September of last year shortly after which it turned out that the advisory board that was supposed to have clarification needed more clarification. So we put it on hold and since then -- and that was in December -- we've been going back and forth again on some of the issues that we did not seem to have mutual agreement on.

I think we've managed to boil that down depending on if you listened to Rubens or you listened to Francisco on our side down to about three to five

issues. And we have a session I believe tomorrow it is to discuss this so I invite all of you who have something to contribute to it to come join us and hopefully we can wrap this up and move forward with it. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Cyrus. And yes, thanks for your comments. It actually triggered my memory as to what this bullet item was all about so thanks. And this was something that was a pretty significant concern to many of us so very important that those who were focused on this attend that session and look to see if there's a - 5 o' clock. Great, 5 o' clock tomorrow, thank you Krista.

Okay next item on the agenda is two-character country names at the second level. Would anybody like to take the lead on this one from the stakeholder group?

Donna Austin: Donna Austin for the record. So I think we all know what the issue is here. I think we all understand that we do - we really do as registry operators have serious concerns about the way these things are handled. It does impact our business' (unintelligible) strategies to think that we've got past the line and then all of a sudden it's pulled out from under us again. It is a real challenge. One of the conversations in the DNA this morning is the importance of predictability to the business operations that we have.

And on a reasonably frequent basis that predictability steps away over time so this is a surprise to us. We thought we got past the post and now the posts and the goal line, they just keep moving all the time. So we're going to get upset. That's just the way life is. So the GAC has a mechanism which is protected under a bylaw which they use on a very frequent basis. That impacts us.

We don't have the benefit of that bylaw protection so we pick up the pen and we write a paper or we do that five-page communication because we need to ensure that while we have interactions with staff which we appreciate we need to be sure that the board understands our perspective as well, and the

GAC as well. So if we don't write these communications we've lost an opportunity. So that's why we do it.

I understand that it's hard for you guys. I've been there. I've been on the other side of the table. I've actually sat in the GAC for a long time too. So I understand the dynamic pretty well about what we're dealing with here but we're trying to set up businesses and we just don't like the rug being pulled out all the time. If we know it's coming we can deal with it but in a lot of cases we have absolutely no idea. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Donna. Yes and I think a couple points there is if we know it's coming typically it's okay that we know it's coming if it's part of a process and part of-if we have predictability of process then it's something that's anticipated and expected and something we can deal with. But when it's out-of-band is when we're really troubled because that's not the way things are designed to work here, particularly for us as contracted parties.

And the other phrase she used was happens all the time or this is not an isolated incident and as I said in a meeting last night this is not even an isolated incident this week. If you start looking at the discussions around highly-regulated strings and things like that this is a constant battle that we seem to be fighting as contracted parties is to ensure that we have predictability of process and that there isn't a continual loop of political posturing and maneuvers from various other groups in the community trying to impact our contracts out-of-band.

And so it's just a general statement but I think a very important one that needs to be reinforced. Yes, Cyrus thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Keith. Thank you Donna. Cyrus Namazi here. Donna I just wanted to really re-emphasize this point that on the staff site we're also extremely sympathetic to the fact that a business cannot really operate successfully without having the visibility and the assurance of the rules of the game.

Hopefully the speed at which and the efficiency by which we actually initiate in this process after Las Angeles should be an indication of our commitment to move these things out of the way so you can go on about doing your business.

We don't particularly enjoy the stuff that (unintelligible) really blindside us which end us impacting us, the staff side and of course you on the business side. And I know we've been discussing this issue at every opportunity every time there is a microphone somewhere and I know I personally probably upset you yesterday and for which I apologize. Rest assured we continue to push the ball forward. I think there were some lessons learned in this process. For me it was really communicating more in real-time to you that something may be coming and we'll commit to do that so that it doesn't get to a point that you're totally surprised.

All I ask for is give us a bit of the benefit of the doubt that we're not just insensitive to the impact of issues like this to you. (Unintelligible) ecosystem is an under-construction kind of a project and there's going to be unknowns and surprises (unintelligible). Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Cyrus. (Unintelligible) in the queue. Anyone else? Sarah go ahead.

Sarah Falvey: This is Sarah Falvey. So I just really want to highlight what you just said Cyrus and I think it's important - it doesn't take care of the fact that sometimes these things happen out of process and various sides get (unintelligible) I think (unintelligible) more that we can communicate if you see something coming and I (unintelligible) on your side to determine what's a conversation (unintelligible) something that's escalating and going to impact. I understand that's difficult do I do think to the extent that we can communicate better when you think something might be coming down. I think that's going to be really helpful.

And it's obviously not perfect and it's not okay but I do think understanding that I think it caught a lot of us off guard and I think that was probably what had the most impact whereas if I think we had known that maybe it was coming you probably still would have been upset but it would have allowed us I think to think through who to approach (unintelligible) versus feeling like we're a bit backed into the corner.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Sarah. I've got Chuck, Tim and then Stacey.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Keith. Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. I'm going to put Jonathan on the spot because Jonathan has been very active as chair of the GNSO council in working with the GAC to try and improve the working together between the GAC and the GNSO and I know some good progress has been made there but I guess my question is Jonathan has that group dealt with issues like this one where the GAC is coming in after decisions have already been made and there's not a consensus of the GAC and you have to expect - or at least some in the GAC seem to expect responsiveness from staff and putting you guys on the spot.

And then of course they answer to the board. We all know their advice goes to the board. We're all intimately familiar with those things. But if that group hasn't-I think it would be a very good idea at some point when your group thinks it's appropriate if you talk about things like this (unintelligible) it's a critical piece of what that group is trying to accomplish and I'll stop there and see if you want to respond.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. That's a very good question. I think the answer is explicitly no we haven't dealt with it but implicitly it's part of the objectives of the group to head off this kind of issue so the group has been very much focused on in some ways deliberately focused not on current problems but on heading off future issues so that these kind of things don't happen in the future.

So the question is that doesn't remove the fact that we've got this kind of problem now. Keith made reference to the meeting last night which I think we will touch on at some point which was delved into the much more current issue of the category one strings. My feeling is that I'd still rather keep this kind of issue out of the Consultation Group for the moment and I think that should be dealt with via probably a discussion between GNSO chairs and GAC chairs.

So I think we need a get-together but it certainly needs - what we're trying to achieve is to avoid this kind of thing happening and so that feels like the right forum to do it. Unfortunately what's happened through working the consultation group, all of the regular business plus this massive overlay of the transition work there hasn't really been the space it feels to just get in the huddle and have some sort of time to talk informally with the new GAC vice-chairs and the chair and really - because it feels to me like that's the time to talk about it, say we're doing all this work over the future stuff but by the way you're causing us a lot of headaches still right now, what can we do about that.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jonathan. Thanks Chuck. So let's go to Tim and then Stacey.

Tim McGinnis: Thank you Keith. I want to echo what Chuck was saying. It is to me an accountability issue. I have worked for the secretary of the policy making community in the internet governance field before and those secretary of staff are meant to follow what their boards and what the community tell them to do and that is not happening. We get a letter from the GAC and a process stops and to me that's an accountability issue. It's the central accountability issue in my mind.

So in the big picture I'm not willing personally to support an ICANN floating free from any oversight if we continue to have this kind of behavior.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Tim. Stacey?

Stacey King            So I would agree with that to a degree. I think there are two issues here. I agree that we need to have as much of a heads-up as possible before these things happen along what Donna and a few others said but I think there's the separate issue of (unintelligible) actually (unintelligible) and we went through the process and it was resolved and then action was taken based on the letter from one stakeholder.

And that goes outside of the process. And so we've got the two issues. One is yes we have to have discussion; but two, action was taken outside of that process and I think that's one of the things that you're seeing people get very upset about. That type of thing just should not be happening.

Keith Drazek:        Okay thanks Stacey. I've got Reg and then I'll put myself in the queue and see if anybody else has a hand up.

Reg Levy:             Thanks Keith. This is Reg Levy from (unintelligible) and looking at the timeline for example it was clear that it was known by staff that things were going to be delayed on the 5th of January and I know that I'm not alone in going through the official procedures of submitting something through the GDD portal, submitting something else through the GDD portal, contacting my engagement manager and I was either completely ignored or finally the day before the meeting told you'll find something out at the meeting.

Of course at the meeting we didn't find a whole lot more out than what we already knew or suspected because by that time we'd seen the 24th of January letter. So there's a gap there between the 5th and the 24th where staff new that something was going on and could have said hey, you are scheduled for this to be implemented on the 5th but unfortunately there's things going on behind the scenes. Maybe I can't tell you that at this point but there's things going on behind the scenes and so we're just going to prepare you that this isn't going to go forward as expected.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Reg. We have a question in Adobe Chat from Ken that (Paul) is going to read for us. Then I'll jump in and then Akram.

Paul Diaz: Okay thanks Keith. So on behalf of Ken Stubbs let me ask this question. Could the action that we're talking about right now, could this action be viewed as discriminatory because gTLDs already delegated aren't being hamstrung like the ones that are executory (sic). They have been executed I guess he meant. So the question is could this action legally be viewed as discriminatory because we have TLDs that have not been delegated yet we have some that are and will impact (unintelligible) both if we're creating an un-level playing field for ones that are in the market, ones that are not.

Keith Drazek: All right so we'll come back to that. So just a couple of comments. So I think what we're seeing and what I'm hearing is that we really have two issues. One is a communications issue and the other is the bigger issue, the procedural issue that we are extremely unhappy with out-of-band decisions. And we understand that those out-of-band decisions are not necessarily at the feet of staff, that a lot of this is coming from the board. But as our advocates within the organization in a sense we're bringing this up so you understand within ICANN in your engagements with the board how serious this is to us.

So we recognize that some of this is not necessarily your fault but that it is something that is troubling and that needs to be addressed and that we need to take advantage of every opportunity to make our serious concerns known. So Akram?

Akram Atallah: Thank you Keith and thanks to everyone. I think that it's important to say that this is not unnoticed. So this has not gone unnoticed. I'm committed to actually bringing that to the board and make sure that we don't address only this issue on Wednesday but we also have a process that addresses it for when it happens the next time around as well, that we have a process or the clarity that we can ignore these kind of correspondences until the board

actually gives us a formal direction and not to have to change things and wait for the formal direction.

So I'm committed to actually bringing that to the board on Wednesday and make sure we get some clarity on that so we don't have to (unintelligible) every time that we get a letter from somewhere and says we need to stop and then the board members say well let's wait to decide on the next meeting and therefore (unintelligible) so we'll take care of it and like Keith said we are your advocates and we understand the importance of being able to have predictability and have SLAs that are met and not be frozen for indefinite periods of time and not knowing what's going on.

We understand the gravity of that so thank you and you have our commitment to resolve this. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Akram. I should just note for the benefit of the Stakeholder Group members that this week in (unintelligible) there was a stakeholder group (unintelligible) chair's meeting with the board a couple of days ago, meetings with senior staff. So on multiple occasions this week I have taken the opportunity to underscore the importance of predictability of process, and not just for contracted parties although that's critical to us but for the whole community and that until we have agreed to practices that everybody adheres to or behaves under we're going to have a continual battle and fight for political gamesmanship and the political weathervane and we simply as community can't live like that.

So I've taken the opportunity on multiple occasions this week already to underscore the importance of predictability of process and I think to the extent we can continue to use that language or at least convey that sentiment to everybody in the community I think it's really important. It will benefit us all in the long run. Okay any other comments or questions on the two-character issue?

Next item on the agenda then is the GAC's communiqué from Las Angeles. Any outstanding issues for resolution? I know one of the issues - John if you think this is an appropriate time to discuss the highly-regulated strings or something or anything else. Let me just ask is there anything from the ICANN Las Angeles communiqué that we need to address, anything specific that we feel we need clarification or clarity on or that remains unresolved. Okay. So I am going to now at this point talk about the highly-regulated strings issue.

We had a meeting last night that was held under Chatham House rules. So I'm going to be cautious about what I say and how detailed I get but I think it's important that we convey to the membership that the meeting took place and give a high level as to what was discussed. There is still - and I'm going to ask John and others to jump in on this to back me up but there is still dissatisfaction among the GAC, the ALAC and the DC about the implementation of highly-regulated string safeguards and pick specs.

Fadi invited members from the various groups including the registries and the registrars to come together for a conversation. There was an almost three-hour conversation that took place last night until almost midnight and it was I think the first opportunity where all of the interested parties including board members and GPC sat around the table to talk through this issue. And I think it was a good discussion. I wouldn't call it an airing of grievances quite but it was putting cards on the table.

And I think there's an interest in having a follow-on conversation among the people that participated but I think it's safe to say that this issue is not dead. The board is still-the NGPC is still I guess considering the feedback that it continues to receive from ALAC, GAC and DC and this is an issue that we're going to have to deal with. So why don't I pause there and ask John if there's any further flavor you can provide.

Johnathan Robinson: Thanks Keith. So as a condition to participating in the meeting which we were invited to that morning I guess it was or the day before we wanted to

meet with the NGPC first. The NGPC had met with ALAC and met with folks who were concerned about the implementation and the safeguards and I think that meeting went very well. I think they heard our concerns and when we got together with the larger group they were very much more prepared to counter any discussions and then any concerns that were raised.

So overall I think the meeting went very well and we're talking about a follow-up meeting in maybe a month or so, so I don't envision any immediate action but it's good to have the dialog and to the extent there are legitimate concerns that are raised and we want to deal with those as a group or individually we should do so.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks John. And obviously we have the GDD staff here with us but I think it's important that we all keep very much in touch on this topic and in sync and make sure that no surprises come out of this in any way, shape or form which is the reason that I added it to this part of the agenda. Yes.

Akram Atallah: So maybe it's important - this is Akram. Maybe it's important also to - for us to share with you where we are on the entire communiqués and the GAC advice on the new gTLD program. Of course you know what the communiqué says but what are the hot topics right now that we're going over. As mentioned category one highly-sensitive strings, safeguards are a big issue that we're still debating on and discussing not among ourselves but with the GAC and how we're going to deal with that and the NGPC.

In addition I think that there is another topic that is also very critical that we as staff don't know how to even deal with but it's a hot topic for the GAC in their communiqués. It's the non-discrimination issue. So we're still figuring out what we want to do about that. We understand that non-discrimination is a very subjective topic. It's not a very objective thing that we could deal with in a contract but that is another topic that remains on the table right now as well as the acronyms for (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) as well as the list of IGO acronyms as well.

So these are the ones that we're still going back and forth on and that the most - that are having the most discussions right now. And we don't have any outcomes or any plans yet on any one of them but they are the hot topics so that you are aware and we give you as much of a heads up on these issues. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much Akram and yes, in the spirit of communication and early communication we very much welcome that heads up so thanks. Comments or questions before we move on? All right next item on the agenda is the GDD scorecard. So (Jasmine) I'll get to you in a moment just a heads up. Yes, we discussed the GDD scorecard at the joint session on Sunday evening.

Actually it was the registry's X-com with GDD staff before the registrars joined us. I think we had a good discussion and sort of looking (unintelligible) how we continue with the scorecard or whether we continue with the scorecard and I think it was a constructive discussion and nobody wants to do tracking and reporting work if it's not necessarily. If it becomes a burden in of itself and not delivering on the reason it was originally started or maybe has become obsolete because things have progressed then there's no point in continuing to go through that effort.

And I think there is general agreement that at some point it might be helpful to phase out or slim down in a very dramatic fashion the scorecard when the time is right. So I think there's a general sense that it has been an excellent communication tool. I think it has been very effective in helping us align the work and expectations and service delivery and all of that. There's still some more work to be done. It's probably not like we can put it to bed now but I think the goal - I think our common goal would be to get to the point where it's no longer a tracking requirement that things are dealt with in a much more timely and efficient way sort of as they're identified.

So maybe, I don't know, I could hand it over to (Jasmine) or to Krista, either one. Go ahead Krista, thanks.

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. I just want to add one thing to what Keith said and then defer to (Jasmine). One piece of the scorecard -- it's actually a very large piece -- revolves around or deals with the portal, the GDD portal and the tools that you guys use and that we use to support you for communications, requests, operational requests.

And that bit would continue to go - you know, there's the contracting that goes on there so you - there's a user's group many of you participate in or are aware of where you provide feedback to us on how the tools are working as new things are required of you or new things pop up like for instance the recent exclusive registration period.

We have to retrofit those tools to support you and so we use that user group as a mechanism for you guys to test the tools, to tell us what's working and what's not working. So that piece would continue to go on and be tracked and that engagement would continue. And just to add to what Keith said even if we don't have a scorecard that's some formal tracking mechanism what we're doing here would continue. And from my perspective it seems to be working very well where we get lots of feedback from you guys both in these meetings and the Executive Committee meeting and a number of other places.

And as topics pop up that require more work than just this interaction, then we could form a small group that would go off and work on that particular issue or topic and come back to the registry. So there's still a number of mechanisms in place when we get to the point where we do phase out the scorecard. But again, I defer that to the Yasmin. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Krista and yes, I mean I think conceptually I think we agree that at some point the sun setting of the scorecard might be, you know, might

be the right thing to do. And we'll let you know when we're ready to do that.  
Yasmin.

Yasmin Omer: Right. Thanks Keith. Yasmin Omer from ARR Registry Services for the transcript. Okay. So I'll just provide a brief background. Next slide please. Okay. So just by way of background, the working groups were initiated in April of 2014 and they were to address a request from the ICANN CEO to provide feedback on the GDD.

We conducted a survey of NTAG, Registry Stakeholder Group and Brand Registry Group members. That was done in May 2014. And finally we sent a letter to ICANN containing key recommendations in June of 2014. After that, a scorecard was developed and that was developed to really track and monitor the implementation of the somewhat 40 recommendations that were contained in the letter. Next slide please.

So we found early on that there was disagreement regarding whether a particular recommendation was marked as closed. So we developed a process where each recommendation I guess starts off with the assessment phase. And then it's scoped, goes to the implementation phase and it's finally closed.

Now it's an iterative process and the key here is that there are prerequisites to transitioning to any subsequent phase. So before a recommendation goes from assessment to scoping GDD staff need to provide us with confirmation of what it is that they will be scoping and similarly with transitioning to implementation. They provide us with confirmation of what exactly will be implemented.

And the intention here is to ensure that time isn't wasted in implementing something that just wasn't in line with the recommendation that we put forward. Next slide please.

Okay. So we've done some of the work over the last six or so months. There's been some good progress made. Out of the 40 recommendations, 16 have been marked as closed. And closed is defined by us as fully implemented from the point of view of the users; so applicants and registry operators.

So for example, if the recommendation related to functionality of the GDD portal, it's only closed where the users are actually able to use and see that functionality.

Some of the key recommendations that have been implemented as being the designation of account managers and that happened just before the ICANN LA meeting and definition and publication of SLTs, so customer service operations and the new gTLD program.

Now these two recommendations were prioritized early on. And they were prioritized because they addressed two key concerns that we had back in June of 2014. And those concerns related to opening up communication channels with ICANN. And that was addressed by designating account managers and also having that level of operational predictability with respect to our interactions with ICANN and the SLTs are intended to address that.

So the - we've done (some of the work) with - and the GDD has been great in defining these SLTs. It did take some time but they're up on the Web site now. And I mean from my point of view I can certainly say that they do provide that level of operational predictability.

We can say the - we can hold the - if we were to, you know, submit a case in the portal, we know that it will be responded to within a certain timeframe because that commitment is there. And we respect certain processes that choose (RA) assignments and as you'll see later on.

And the publication of correspondence, which is also up there, we now know that it - there is that level of transparency there and that's really intended to address the let's call it the black hole issue that a number of registry operators and applicants raised in the survey. Next slide please.

So here I just - I won't go through these in detail but here are some other recommendations that have been marked as closed since we started this effort. Next slide please.

Okay. Open recommendations. There are 23 recommendations out of the total of 40 that still remain open. Some of these recommendations include the contact information in the GDD portal not being used by other ICANN departments, the SLAs for account managers, documentation to improve the asset process and that relates to a how to guide being developed to the asset process to assist registry operators in going through that process and performance metrics for the GDD portal, the (CFDS) portal and a number of other systems that ICANN operates. Next slide please.

Again, I won't go through these open recommendations in detail. But there are just some other issues that do remain outstanding. Next slide please.

Okay. So in terms of what our objectives - the objectives of the working group are in the next quarter, we want to collaborate with the GDD to ensure that the 22 out of the 40 remaining recommendations are implemented. And so we see them through that iterative process that I touched on earlier.

And more importantly, we want to provide context for the recommendations in light of the evolving landscape. Key here is that we're not adding new recommendations. This relates to the recommendations that were provided in the June letter.

In terms of new gTLD operations, a lot has happened since then with the many other registry operators being delegated and in operation. And it's

important to note that the - whilst the recommendations - we're not adding new recommendations. They are evolving.

And the - they're evolving in that the - they're evolving because of the technical changes. They're evolving because of the policy changes, which result in changes to the operations.

And some examples here. The - I've got two open recommendations here. So the recommendations ensure that the contract information provided in the GDD portal is being used by other departments. Recently we're seeing ICANN compliance notices being issued for invoices that were sent to the wrong - to the wrong billing or finance contact.

Now that's something that's come about recently. And our experience there and the experience of registry operators there is able to shed light on that recommendation and the manner in which it should be best implemented and addressed.

Similarly with the - there was a recommendation to allow and nominate a party to provide technical information in the GDD portal. This is information such as the keys that are used by registry operators to assign certain information and certificates used by registry operators as we've progressed with the delegation and operation of a number of TLDs.

The need for that recommendation to be implemented has become more pressing. So this - it's allowed us to raise the need for this recommendation to be prioritized and that's reached the point that Akram made earlier that notifying the GDD of what needs to be prioritized to ensure the operations of the GDD are in line with the evolving landscape and the need for registry operators because I mean it's - this is all new territory for us as well.

And what we considered to be relevant six months ago may require some tweaking now. So that really speaks to the need to ensure that the

collaboration between the working group and GDD staff continues at least for the next few quarters. And that is all. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Yasmin and thanks very much for you and the GDD scorecard team for all the work that you've done on this to get us to this point and for all the work that you will continue to do. So thanks.

So why don't we pause there. If there are any questions - if anybody else would like to jump in, feel free. And then - I don't know, Krista, would you like to respond in any way to anything about the scorecard? Anything - any further discussion on that? Okay. Yes. Reg, go ahead.

Reg Levy: I just want to thank Yasmin for all the work done on this because I know too although I am technically on the team, she's been really doing the most part of it. And I'd also like to thank ICANN staff for interacting with us on this as well.

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thanks Reg. Thanks Yasmin of course. Okay. Let's move on. The next item on the agenda is Spec 11, technical analysis framework. This was also something that I think (Ken) suggested we get to or prioritize in Adobe chat. So please, let's have a conversation about the Spec 11. If anybody else would like to jump in and take the lead on this one, please do. Anyone? We can wait. Yes. Thank you Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for (unintelligible) for the record. Actually (improving) Spec 11 from technical point of view will increase cost of operations. We have to be sure that this improvement won't make the cost of operations more than we get from the business. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Maxim. Anyone else? Yes. Jordyn, thank you.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes. And so I'll just I guess rehash I think a comment I made last time we talked on the phone about this topic as well as I think some comments that

were captured in - you also mentioned, which is basically I think we view this as being - we're sort of asking the wrong questions at this point.

There's a bunch of sort of I think higher level discussion that needs to happen about, you know, what's the role of, you know, what's the role of BNS intermediaries in the, you know, if phishing or farming or something like that like in - with our - what are our obligations to try to solve those problems as well as what are the right tools to do so?

And there's a bunch of other I think more, you know, how can, you know, what's ICANN's role in the midst of that? Is it to help coordinate? For example, like one of the things that we've been looking at with regards to our implementation of Spec 11 is we actually have great internal systems that are good at identifying things like malware because we have a group of - you know, we do malware scanning on the Internet already.

And so we can actually go through our domain and do a great job of saying aha, these ones are malware and then - and then what, right. And there's issues like okay, we're doing great most of the time. Most of that time that's not intentional. Like hackers break into these registrants' Web sites and they put up stuff.

So it's really a matter of notifying the registrant. Like it's not like - like spending a domain is probably not the right thing. You don't want to punish these people because they got hacked. So how do we do that? Do we just - does the registry do that? Does the registrar do that?

You know, that would be a new obligation potentially that the - you know, we - you - we have Spec 11 in our contract. The registrars don't have Spec 11 in their accreditation agreement so there's not necessarily an obligation. Right.

So there's all these issues where I think we need to sort of think through like who's doing what in this ecosystem before we get to questions like what does the monitoring look like and how often do we pay reports about it.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Jordyn. Krista, you want to respond and if anybody else would like to get in the queue?

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. Krista Papac. So I want to make sure it's clear what the work effort is - what the framework is because some of the comments that were made in the call we had with you all a couple weeks ago as well as, you know, some of the things you've said. I think Jordyn you're clear on this but I want to make sure for the room because not everybody's as engaged on this topic as others.

So the contract - the registry agreement, Spec 11, Section 3B has some specific language about periodic technical analysis and reporting and things like that. That is what your contract says.

There's also an NGPC resolution from last year - no, the year before that says, you know, ICANN staff go work with the community to develop a framework that talks about the technical analysis but also talks about other things that go beyond what's in the contract.

The purpose of the framework, which we are working on as directed by the NGPC is to develop this additional information. It is additional framework. That would be a best practice document. It's not meant to amend the contract. We can't do that with the framework. It is meant to again address the things that the NGPC has asked us to address.

We're also being directed to work with the community on this. However, prior to doing that, it made sense to us to engage with the parties that are most affected by the framework first so we don't just put out some document that you guys have never seen or heard of that people - the entire community's

going to consult on and that we've missed a whole bunch of stuff that we didn't think of.

So the engagement we're having with you right now and the other party, which is the GAC, which, you know, they bring in their friends from law enforcement, is to say hey registries, hey GAC, you know, what are we getting wrong, what are we getting right here so that we can then put out a framework that the entire community can consult on through public comment and that we can work towards a best practices document.

One of the things we want to do with the framework is position it for you guys also as a safe harbor. So when we get to the point where we have a finalized framework that the community has consulted on, if you're a registry that's using that framework to the key or to the letter, then it's assumed that you're also in compliance with Spec 11.3B.

It doesn't mean that if you don't follow that framework to a T that you're not in compliance with Spec 11.3B. It's sort of just something that's there for people who want to - maybe not like, you know, Jordyn, you just talked about some very specific things that Google does.

What you do may go way beyond what the framework says. That doesn't mean you're out of compliance with Spec 11.3B. But there may be another registry who says I don't really know how to address this. I'm a small registry. I'm a, you know, I don't have a lot of registrations. I'm going to follow the framework.

So all of the feedback and the points that you're sharing - and I know you guys submitted comments and thank you - many of you submitted comments and thank you very much for that. But that's what we're looking for at this point is exactly what you're talking about right now and the things that you've put in the comments you submitted. So I hope that helps.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Krista. I've got a queue. I've got Tim, Joe Waldron and Jordyn. Jordyn, did you want to respond directly to that first?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes. I just - I appreciate all that. I do understand that's where you guys are driving the work right now. I guess my point is like you guys seem to have an idea in mind of what sort of framework we're looking for.

For me a framework that would be useful is like how do we respond recognizing that there's this chain of participants in the process, not just - not, you know, it's not just on the registries to do all this. We don't necessarily have relationships with the registrants directly for example.

And so thinking about what the role of the registry versus the registrar and so on, that's the sort of framework that I think would be really useful and would be a great place for ICANN to be helping. Whereas sort of these details about like, you know, here's the type of scanning system that you want to use. For us at least, I know we're not everyone, that's what's useful. So I think it's just taking a step back and sort of think about what we mean by framework.

Krista Papac: Thanks Jordyn. I appreciate that. And thanks for the vote of confidence that we have some idea of exactly what this should look like. We really - we don't. I mean we have some ideas that we get from our security team, our - from our CTO and our technical team, from technical services.

But it's one of those efforts where, you know, again, the NGPC over a year ago said go do this. It's - I would have preferred for you guys to give us the framework first or for the GAC to give us the framework first but that really wasn't going to happen.

And what we were really trying to do is just put something down on paper to spur the conversation. It may not have been right. It may have missed some things. But we don't necessarily have a vision. We're really asking you guys to help us figure this out.

Akram Atallah: I think - and then Jordyn. And I understand exactly what you're looking for. I think we need to engage our legal team to do the framework and look at how things will flow, what are the expectations from you, when will you put the framework in place and how it's going to work, what are you supposed to do with these, you know, malwares that you identify and is it you bring it back to us and we have to deal with it? I don't know but we should get engaged on that as - I think. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you Akram. I've got a queue. As I said, I've got Tim, Joe Waldron, Jordyn, you're taken care of. Okay. And then Liz. So Tim. And if I could just ask everybody for the transcripts to state your name before speaking. Just a reminder. Thank you.

Tim McGinnis: Thanks Keith. Tim McGinnis (NAVP). I'm looking at a memo from Stephanie from the 7th of February. Scheduled a meeting from noon to 1:00 tomorrow. Is that correct? In Indiana? If you look at the full schedule, the Noncom's in Indiana tomorrow. So I would suggest that we - yes. Okay.

No. They're supposed vacate at noon. And I'm - my question really is the GAC going to be there? No. So they're going to come - get their second bite at the apple on this after we come up with the framework. Is that correct?

Krista Papac: So the framework will eventually be put out for public comment. We're meeting with you guys - if you want to meet with the GAC, we can do that or we can certainly try and set that up. We thought that you guys would want to talk to us directly first. And that was the purpose that we're - Jordyn's giving me a thumbs up. I'll let you guys confer amongst yourselves.

But our interpretation of the communication we had from you is you wanted to sit down with us and talk through your comments. Just to confirm it is from 12:00 to 1:00 tomorrow in Indiana.

Tim McGinnis: (Unintelligible). Thanks.

Krista Papac: It's in Indiana, so. Thank you.

Tim McGinnis: Sorry. I've got it wrong. I don't mind if we meet alone but then we'll be setting up the same kind of situation that we complained about previously when we don't bring the GAC in for discussions. And then they say no to something that's already been agreed. But I understand that we want to meet with you first privately without them. That's fine.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Tim. Joe.

Joe Waldron: Thanks. Joe Waldron from VeriSign. First I want to support the comments that Jordyn made. I think that mirrors a lot of the same thoughts that I have. And I do appreciate the clarifications from Krista. But I think it's important to note that the documents that we have right now that are kind of the foundation for this is the GAC communique and what's in Spec 11 today.

Anything that we put in place as a framework is supplemental to that. But I think when it comes back to enforcement compliance, what's appropriate for registries to do and what registries have built into their plans and their costs is based on what's in Spec 11 in the registry agreement.

So that's the fundamental document that should be pointed to, not the framework. The framework is a guidance document and should be providing guidelines, not adding new requirements that registry operators are compelled or compelled to meet in order to not be receiving compliance notices.

And I do think that the feedback loop is especially important in this case so that we don't get to the point where we have an implementation that isn't consistent with what's in the agreement today or what the GAC had originally requested.

So I do think that some of the discussions and the feedback and ensuring that the implementation of this is consistent with what has already been directed. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Joe. Liz.

Liz Finberg: Hi. Liz Finberg, Public Interest Registry. Just want to again support Jordyn and Joe's comments. I'm not saying anything new. But each registry does in fact I believe have protocols and procedures for addressing abuse, phishing, farming, malware. We do it.

So there's nothing particularly troubling in Spec 11 for us. But my - I guess my question and my concern is that developing a framework for addressing abuse and what's referred to in Section 11 as security threat - I mean I think we really have to have a going in of a fundamental respect in reference to what's in our agreements in Spec 11.

And the danger with the potential quagmire we can get mired in is, you know, how do we define what a security threat is and are we really talking about content related things? Are we talking about concerns from foreign governments or special interest groups? Or are we talking about what I think is the appropriate focus, which is threats to the security and stability of the Internet. So that's - that would be my concern.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Liz. Akram.

Akram Atallah: Sure. So I think I just want to put some clarity on the goal of this framework. We were asked by some in the Registry Stakeholder Group to provide clarity on what is it that we're expecting from them to do in order for them to meet this clause.

Now I think that's very important that this framework does not become a runaway train here. So the idea is to come to a baseline of minimum set of

requirements that if we all agree on them become the base standard of what needs to be done, which is - let me put it in very plain language.

Twice a year do scanning, you know, or something or six times a year do so or every month scan you zone and, you know, or, you know, reports that give you this kind of information. Then what you find out, you know, you do this with it and then the third step would be that.

I mean we're talking about baseline. Not to dictate to every registry to do the same thing. That's not what we're trying to do here. It's just to set some baselines of clarity of what is expected so that everybody knows if we do these steps then we've met our obligations.

That was the original intent of the framework. I think if we start specifying you have to do this and you have to do that, it goes way beyond what the initial intention was.

So let's make sure that we don't let it become much more than it is. It should be very simple. This is the minimum set. Because there are a lot of registries that are going to differentiate themselves by being much more secure than others.

So that's not our goal to dictate what is your business plans and how to do things. It is just to give you clarity and process predictability that Keith like to say that if you follow these steps, you've actually met your obligations on the contract. That's really the intention. So I hope that clarifies.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you Akram. I've got - all right, sorry. I've got a queue building. We're going to need to draw a line under this because we've only got 20 minutes left and several other items. I've got Rubens, Reg and Donna and then let's draw a line. Thanks.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks Keith. Rubens Kuhl, NIC.BR for the record. I wish to comment from the use of the term baseline and minimum requirements. This is actually creating new compliance (unintelligible). So what I think we should do is to try to define something that is not a baseline, is not a minimum requirement. It's something that is enough. The difference that if you think that something is enough has been asked, you are not saying that this is minimal.

It could - something that is below that could be enough in some use cases. Mostly (closed) registries (unintelligible) is that aren't that subject to security threats. So if we move out from the baseline from the (unintelligible) idea and move to something that says, this would be - this would suffice but these are not requirements.

So you can meet your obligations, which may be less or may be more but if you meet clarity say, hey this is enough but it's not minimal. So that way we don't get into new requirements. The other comment I have is I saw many things on the framework that have focus on numbers. In security we can't actually go there yet because there is no clear definitions in computer science for what's secure, what's not secure, what is (unintelligible), what's that, what's that.

So every number we show that it's actually only usable for (unintelligible) graphics but not for actual enforcement and actually making people's life better. So we should try lesson to be to the focus on graphic that only make us look good.

It's like point your head at the boss by pushing type of graphics is actually not that useful.

Keith Drasek Thanks Rubens and I should just not that since the word compliance came up just now that Allen Grogan has joined us. So Allen welcome.

Allen Grogan: Thank you, sorry I was a few minutes late getting here.

Keith Drasek No problem thank you, I just wanted to acknowledge you and that in case folks who are here for the first time and haven't met you can put a face to a name but thank you.

Okay so in the queue I have Reg and then Donna and then we need to move on.

Reg Levy: Thanks Keith, this is Reg Levy. I want to sort of reiterate what Rubens said that, you know, we're not looking for a minimum but this will suffice. He said earlier that if you follow these you will have met your obligations.

What we want to make sure of is that we don't end up with you may only meet your obligations by following this. And you guys are nodding but I also want a nod from Mr. Grogan because it's compliance that we're going to be fighting this with.

Keith Drasek Okay thanks Reg and Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Keith, Donna Austin. So Akram I think your explanation of the intent of the document is good, it's good to have that understanding and it really would be good to make sure that the GAC has a clear understanding of what this framework is too because I think as you know we have consensus about predictability and I will be the one to throw this banner in the works on this.

So I think we need to be really clear with him about what the intent of this is and how you intend to trace any input that you receive from this.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks Donna, Krista.

Krista Papac: Thanks to everybody for the comments and Donna thank you for that as well. We are working very hard to make that clear to them. You know how they are.

We reinforced this with them consistently. I can't - we can't force them to understand our words but we are certainly reiterating it again and again. So the point is very well taken.

And I just want to actually I want to thank all of you we did get a number of substantive comments from the registries. That is a very important piece of this framework.

When you guys are engaged it gives them the warm fuzzy feeling and I know your goal is not give them a warm fuzzy feeling but they know that you guys are engaged on this, that this is an important topic.

It really sends a very good message and it helps us help you and anyway thank you very much for that and I would encourage everybody to come to the session tomorrow because we want to get into the more substantive stuff that Rubens and some others were touching on, so thank you.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks Krista. All right let's move onto the next item on the agenda, which is an update on the registry agreement amendment process. John would you like to take the lead on this one?

Jonathan Robinson: Sure thanks Keith. So for those of you who were in the NTAG meeting yesterday this is just a repeat but we sent over the red line before the meeting. We met with them on Saturday and had a good meeting.

Had a followup meeting on the technical issues so some of the specs, some of our more technically savvy folks met with Francisco and Krista and others. And so I think we've getting, we're in a good spot, you know, we'll get a draft back hopefully from them relatively soon and narrow it down to, you know, three, four issues.

Kind of like the Whois issue where, you know, we'll go through a funnel and get it out and then we'll probably have some more aggressive discussions over those last few issues. But other than that I think we're in a good spot, thanks.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks Jon. Cyrus would you like to respond in any way to the - or cover anything there?

Cyrus Namazi: No nothing to add I think we just received a red line. We had a good discussion and I think a day or two after we got the red line here in Singapore. On the technical side as John mentioned we've already engaged with your technical leadership and I think Ruben's and others on the sort of business side.

We still have some homework to do on our side before we can get back to you.

Keith Drasek: Great, very good. Any questions or comments on the RA amendment process? Okay, next item on the agenda is RPM review draft report. Anybody want to take the lead on this one or shall we skip it?

Moving on in the interest of time.

Cyrus Namazi: Yes it's open for public.

Keith Drasek: Okay so Cyrus just said it's open for public comment, thank you. Okay Krista over to you for an update on the GDD intercessional meetings that are planned.

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. So many of you have probably heard about this in one of the other sessions. I know I think Akram covered it in his session yesterday. We are going to be hosting an intercessional - a number of them two to three a year I believe is the vision.

The thinking behind this is that the ICANN meetings there is - they're really focused on policy work and Internet governance work. And there is a lot of operational work that is also conducted here and operational conversations.

But we hear from you guys and many others but there's so many things to cover between Internet governance, policy and operational. You're struggling with how do you, you know, cover all of this.

So we're trying to peel off the operational discussions and create a special forum for those, for the contracted parties to get together with the GDD staff, the people that support you to have these types of discussions and others.

So the first intercessional, our pilot intercessional if you will is targeted to occur in April, which is just a couple months from now. I know that's short notice but it is the pilot.

We're envisioning that 22nd to the 24th of April right now in Los Angeles. They would go to different parts of the world. So what we like to do the first one is near home office or the hub where we have a lot of our support staff because we can make all the mistakes with people down the street instead of, you know, thousands of miles away.

We want to do - again it's contracted parties so registries and registrars. It's an opportunity for you to come get together with us but also with each other both in the registries but also with the registrars.

We're going to be looking to you to help us set the agenda much like we did with the road show. So we'll be sending out a survey again to contracted parties and applicants actually who are contracting parties to be.

To help you - to ask you to please tell us the types of things that would be useful to discuss and that you'd like to see. The goal also is not to have a

presentation, you know, a bunch of presentations where you guys sit and listen to us talk but more to have an interactive workshop.

There probably will be some presentations as well but it's really meant to be a collaborative effort. So we're excited to do it. I think well, we'll see how it goes but we really hope that this is an opportunity for us all to work together and really focus on the business side of this industry. So, thank you and I'm happy to take questions.

Keith Drasek: Okay I got a queue, go ahead.

Andrew Merriam: Andrew Merriam, Krista are you confirming the 22nd to the 24th of April or to be confirmed the 22nd to the 24th? Okay.

Krista Papac: That's the target but we will confirm that. We'll also - sorry, we'll send out a save - two things. A save the date will be coming out and a survey for agenda and topics.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks very much Andrew. John.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes just a quick question. Many attended the road show in LA and just want to make sure that senior ICANN staff will be participating in this one. No offense to anyone who was in the road show but, you know, it's a bit different audience, thanks.

Man: I guess Jon, who do you want attending?

Jonathan Robinson: Well we missed you two.

Man: We'll be there the whole time.

Keith Drasek: Okay.

Man: I didn't know Jon loved us so much actually.

Keith Drasek: All right very good, any other questions on the GDD road - sorry, intercessional? Brett.

Brett Fausett: Sorry, I love the idea of the intercessional and I welcome the opportunity to meet with the contracted parties, you know, outside the hubbub of the ICANN meetings.

I understood there might be three of these a year and at that point I worry that asking us to attend six ICANN meetings a year is going to be hugely burdensome on our already busy schedules.

Krista Papac: Brett we really love you guys and we want to have all of this quality time together. So it's kind of why we say two to three. Again it's a pilot I think we're going to do again much like the road show.

We're going to look to you guys at the end of this to hear your feedback what worked, what didn't work, what frequency. And yes thank you Akram an excellent point.

But to get your feedback on what may be the right and I can't say the word periodicity, I did say it, periodicity is or frequency. And then just to Akram's point this would also include compliance staff so it's really going to be a good opportunity for you guys to interact with them as well.

So don't get too scared yet Brett and we will definitely be looking to hear from you guys on what the frequency, what frequency makes sense.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks Krista. Donna and then we need to move to the last item on our agenda.

Donna Austin: Thanks Krista, Donna Austin. So my understanding is because you would do this in hub locations that it's not necessarily attend all three or two that you

have but by providing it in the regional locations it allows those in the regions to come to that hub.

So that's what I would take away from the hub location idea.

Krista Papac: Yes I think again we're still working through where, when et cetera. There will be remote participation. I know some people feel like they should go to every meeting as well.

So I completely agree and I think it would be up to the contracted parties on whether you want to go to every one or not. But there will be a rotation so that there's regional accessibility and again remote participation for those who can't travel or be there in person.

Akram Atallah: So it's important Donna to also look at it from when you need to attend right. I mean if you have an issue you might want to travel to another place and attend.

If you, you know, you could pass on one and attend mostly. It's up to you but we want to build it around your needs and figure out how to serve you better. So the pilot will be what it is, it will, you know, we'll gather your input, we'll put something together, we'll fine tune it, we'll do it again.

And then if that works then we'll decide on the frequency and stuff. So I'd say we're going to work on this with you. So you get to define it as much as we do so.

Keith Drasek: Very good, thank you. So I saw two hands, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Keith, Akram. Donna Austin, just a quick followup. So I guess the other thing that needs to be factored into the equation is whether we would have duplications that continue into these meetings or whether the intention

is to actually kind of take out that duplication. So I think that's something else you need to keep in mind as well.

Keith Drasek: Okay very good, thanks. Last item on our agenda before we have to break, before we move to - yes Krista.

Krista Papac: (Unintelligible).

Keith Drasek: Okay, all right so there will be a couple more pieces of information to add but right now we're going to move to Karen Lentz. Karen welcome, thank you for joining us for a discussion of the studies and metrics to inform the AOC reviews on the new gTLD program.

And I think important to note that these are critical for any possibility of moving forward with the next round so very important stuff. Karen thanks.

Karen Lentz: Thank you Keith and I'll just take a few minutes here. I was on one of the stakeholder group calls in December I think it was to kind of give you a heads up about this economic study and what it was and what the goals were.

As you may recall it comes from some community recommendations around metrics that focus on price, wholesale and retail prices in the market and other factors of competition and innovation.

So my purpose in raising this with you is to sort of explain what the exercise is and what the goals are before we're coming to you and asking you for data. And then I think on that call there was interest in from the stakeholder group members in possibly helping to shape some of the factors of the study.

And so I sent around a followup document that provides an overview of what kind of expected questions and data sources - this is something Cherie circulated I think about a week or so ago. And there are a few I think three or four specific questions in there that are opposed, you know.

Feedback is welcomed in general but to - sorry, specifically around if you're looking at a sample of TLD's or registrars what sort of category do you want to make sure to include to support getting a broad view of the marketplace across the regions, across different business models and things that exist. So that's, you know, those are a couple of questions that are in there.

And I think, you know, the - as I said I think there was interest from the group in possibility providing some input to that. I'm not sure whether it was sort of individually or something that you would want to do as a group but just to note that the document does ask for input by the end of February as we are trying to launch this effort in March.

So I wanted to kind of give you a reminder on that and answer any questions, thanks.

Keith Drasek: Thanks very much Karen. Any questions or comments? So again Karen remind us when is the next action item for us in terms of contribution or participation just so we're clear?

Karen Lentz: February 28.

Keith Drasek: Excellent thank you. Yes Statton.

Statton Hammock: With all the other things of importance this might not be the one that gets a lot of attention but the results of the study of the Statton Hammock with Rightside Registry for the record. The results of the study may be the basis by which we are judged as being successful or unsuccessful in what we have just done as registries.

So I think as a stakeholder group we need to have a little working group or yes a little group to really focus on helping frame what this survey looks like and what data they need and what data we can provide as registries because

if we let it - we know from Whois studies in the past that if we don't participate in how that's frame up we can get a survey result that makes this whole program look terrible and us too. And so it's - it shouldn't be unnoticed.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks Statton. Any further comments, questions or feedback or a response?

Krista Papac: I'm sorry I was trying to bite my tongue but excellent comment Statton. I know there's so much going on and this is a really - for those of you who do care about next round if you don't input into this process that information will never make it in and we can't - there's some things that we just can't get without getting input from registries.

And so thank you for making the comment because I really appreciate it and I think it's very important to you guys and if there's a way to find time to provide that, that would be really helpful.

Keith Drasek: Okay any further questions or comments on that? I do have one additional comment from Edmon that was submitted through chat. Is Edmon here in the room? Hey Edmon thank you, yes so a question on IDN Exhibit A.

Edmon Chung: No I guess it's AOB on the GDD. I just want to raise this briefly. It's come to my attention that it seems like there has been clauses, kind of standard clauses that are included in the registry services under Exhibit A.

I can't really find where the collection of those standard clauses are on the portal because the basic agreement doesn't include that portion it just says there are these.

So the issue that's come to my attention is that the standard clause seems to depending on the interpretation of which seems to disallow or prohibit the implementation of the Chinese domain name consortium policies to the

second level registrations and that raises a lot of concern for me and I guess our community.

So but the larger question is really those clauses seem perhaps those standard services if you will might be better served if it's developed a little more publicly and so people can respond to it as well.

So I guess there are two components of it. One, specific on the IDN and one on the larger issue on Exhibit A.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks very much Edmon. Cyrus you wanted to respond?

Cyrus Namazi: Thanks Edmon, this is Cyrus Namazi. I would suggest we take this offline after this session. I have your answer for you I'm sure we can resolve it, thanks.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks. So Krista has a few items just to run through fairly quickly then Cyrus has asked to make a comment and then we will wrap up the session with the GDD.

But I will ask everybody just to say for two minutes for a couple of housekeeping items before we move to the registrar meeting. So Krista then Cyrus then we wrap.

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith, Krista Papac. So and I was thinking even before this maybe we should have an item on the agenda going forward that's like registry services update or something.

So just a couple of things I think you guys care about. Many of you know a member of our team moved on at the beginning of this year. I mean a lot of you that was your engagement manner and I hear from you frequently when is the new person coming, when is the new person coming.

So the new person is coming. So we have actually two new members that will be joining us next month. Please give us a little bit of time to ramp them up but as soon as we get them ramped up, which we promise to do very quickly you'll receive an introduction letter to those of you and Yamashita is the one that left.

So those of you that had Ann as your engagement manager I sort of have been your point of contact - excuse me, in the interim so we don't flip flop you around but you will receive an introduction message sometime in - this is February, sometime in March with your new engagement manager. So very excited they are two really great people. I'm sure you guys are going to love them as much as you love the rest of the team.

So just one other quick think we mentioned this recently, Akram mentioned it in this session but I want to make sure everybody knows. We have a standing panel for the PIC-DRP.

It's a three member panel. We are recruiting additional panelists so that we have a deeper bench on that. I know this topic comes up in a lot of places and we're trying to just sort of supplement the panel that we have so that that issue is not on people's agenda.

So that's actively going on. We've received a number of great resume's or CV's, expressions of interest and we're going through that process. Actually Yasmin mentioned something earlier that I had on my list of updates that I wanted to provide you guys.

So it wasn't just the RSTEP but also registry assignments. We had committed to providing you guys with somehow to guides on how those work because the RSTEP is a policy and assignments is a really convoluted thing in the contract.

And it's never quite clear to people or not always quite clear how you navigate those processes. Those guides we were hoping to publish at the end of last year but they've fallen behind.

And we've got some good drafts that Ann put together before she left, but the new people that are starting will be taking those on. So the guides are delayed and being delivered but I don't have a new timeline because I need to again get these people on boarded and up to speed but they're definitely coming. So apologies for the delay but just know that they're coming.

And then one last thing that Yasmin mentioned but I want to make sure everybody knows. We are now publishing - yea, service level targets and metrics against those.

So I think I sent an email to you guys. If I didn't let me know and I will do that but they're definitely published on the registry. Pages are on icann.org. They will be published monthly or updated monthly and we'll continue to evolve those as we get new tools in place and as services develop.

So I'm so sorry I've taken so much time but thank you for the opportunity.

Keith Drasek: No thank you Krista and your point was well taken. We'll make sure that on a regular basis we have a registry services update for future meetings, very welcome. Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, thank you Keith and Paul for having us here and all of you for the constructive discussions that we have, we had as usual. It actually helps us really refocus or better focus our efforts.

I just wanted to make a very quick announcement that there is a new concerted effort focused on the issue of universal acceptance. This follows an informal workshop that we held in Washington, DC a few weeks ago.

As a result of which there is a baseline and a template of a proposed approach on how to resolve the issue. We presented this in an open session yesterday in case you missed it I would highly encourage you to at least look at what was posted publicly for it.

There is an email list you can subscribe to so that you can actually see what's going on and hopefully sign up to participate in it. It's extremely important for us all to be all hands on deck so to speak on this issue and really goes far beyond the ICANN community as a whole for progress to be made.

So along the same lines we've actually managed and fortunate to announce that we've hired Don Hollander who, if you can stand up Don, I think everybody knows Don, who is going to spearhead this effort for us from the staff side.

So from the ICANN side they're all up, the coordinator, convener, educator is what ICANN is going to assume and then we're really looking for the community to come together and help us move this over. Thank you very much.

Keith Drasek: Thanks very much Cyrus. And so I'd just like to take a moment to thank the entire (unintelligible) here at GDD compliance, everybody that's joined us today.

These engagements are incredibly important to us and I just want to thank you for supporting us in our business and helping us to ensure that we can do business because ultimately that's how we pay all of our bills. So thank you all very much for joining us, thanks.

Okay so before we get up and leave to go to the registrars I just wanted to note as soon as we finish with the registrar meeting the joint session, we come back here for a working lunch.

And it is a working lunch we have three or four individuals or presentations coming to join us. We will have the registration operation presentation from Scott Hollenbeck, a presentation from Kurt Pritz of the DNA.

The new gTLD registries interest group will join us. Peter will give us an overview and then Elise Gerich from IANA all within the hour of our working lunch.

So please come back as quickly as you can, get your box lunch and I'm sorry a buffet, thank you Cherie, even better. But we will be working over lunch so please come back for that after the session with the registrars.

And now we move to the Sophia Room over that way, thanks.

END