ICANN
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe
GNSO – RrSG Membership Meeting Part 3
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 12:45 JST

Note: 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.
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

(Graham): All right. This is - are we recording again?

((Crosstalk))

Woman 1: (Unintelligible)

(Graham): Okay. Hey everybody, welcome back. I hope everybody enjoyed their interestingly-colored sandwiches.

So most of us were in with compliance -- or many of us at least -- when the TSG was giving their - having their session the other day. So we've invited them to talk to us, and I think we've got an hour on the schedule for this…

Woman 1: Up to an hour.

(Graham): …up to an hour. Because I think we all care a lot about this - the Technical Study Group and its output and so I think we want to hear about that and do a bit of a dive. Because these are all problems that we're solving on a day-to-day basis as well.

So I won't belabor the intro. Thank you for joining us, take it away.

(Rahm):   Thanks (Graham). I'm (Rahm) for those of you who don't know me. I'm the coordinator of the Technical Study Group, on access to non-public registration data.

We have just a few slides to go through. (Graham) you had said that what you'd wanted was for us to get as deep into the tech as possible. So with that in mind, I'm actually wondering (Diana) if you'd get the slide deck from yesterday's community session up rather than the shorter slide deck? Because the community session slide deck has the deeper technical details. I'm not sure which one has been loaded here - I think this is the shorter deck that has been loaded. And I'm - because I only see 11 slides in here. So I'm wondering if you could take a moment (Diana) and get the - okay, wonderful. Thank you for that.

While that gets loaded I can cover the first couple of slides that are in there which really has to do with the - how we got started, what the initial intent and purpose was. (Graham) you and folks from the Registry Stakeholder Group had kindly invited me to come and speak to the CPH - I forget, December, was it? Or January? It's all so far away, so long ago. But I think we had a good conversation there.

But the origin of this came about when Goeran asked me at the end of the Barcelona meeting to convene a group of technical experts to go look into what the feasibility would be of a technical model that could be used for the access to non-public registration data.

So yes, if you shift down a couple of slides - yes, there you go. So our charter is - you can access it on the URL that's up there and you see the motivation in the background. And the purpose of the group was to explore technical solutions rather than policy solutions so they make no recommendations on policy question. We make no recommendations on things like "Who gets access?" "What is access, is access the right word?" "Which data fields?

"Under what conditions?" "What is a legitimate interest?" None of that stuff. That's not in our remit.

To go to the next slide you'll get a sense of who we are. There's a bunch of folks I had asked to come on and join me as the Study Group Team. (Benedict) from - I think (Benedict) is here. Almost everybody is actually here in Kobe. There's (Benedict), (Gavin), (Jorge), (Crocker), Scott, (Jody), (Murray), (Andy) and (Tomofumi) - (Murray) is the only guy who's actually not here in this Kobe meeting. And we have excellent support from the ICANN org support team as well.

Next slide. We'll talk about how we went about doing our work. Our model from the get go. Hey (Jody), there's a speech right here at the table for you, and you have a speaking slot too, so come right over. We've been trying to get (Jody) to speak at these things and he's been therefore trying to keep as far away from me as possible.

So the engagement model for the TSG has been consensus-driven inside the group, iterative, and with a clear focus on the technology and the technical aspects. Here is what we did. We began by defining the key questions and the considerations. Once we did that - and those you will find -- if you go to the URL you'll find the charter document -- you'll find us listing what the key questions and considerations were.

Then we identified the main assumptions. Following that we identified use cases and also defined the user journey. And then that led us to define system requirements which included the functional -- the operational -- as well as the management requirements. Then we mapped our design plan with the functional requirements. That led us to identify some actor models. We then - as we went along we were also able to see that there were some considerations or implementations, so we've made those observations and we have determined what those are.

And that led us to arrive at a proposed solution which we're calling the technical model. And that has been a completely iterative process. What's in front of you in the community, and if you go to that URL you'll see that the technical model, you know, we published that as a draft document for input. And so that model is in draft form. We're looking for input, we're looking for what we got right, what we got wrong.

We're meeting here tomorrow face-to-face -- the Technical Study Group -- to reflect upon the feedback that we receive, to go through iterations again, to modify as necessary. And then when we're done with that we'll publish the final document. As we went along the way of creating the proposed solution -- the technical model -- what became apparent was that there were considerations for other entities and organizations, you know, ICANN org, contracted parties, etc.

Now we don't get to say what should be done there. But as we saw that there were issues or there were topics that, you know, should be looked at, we've made the observation - we are documenting them and those are in the document. We will continue to make those observations without actually making any recommendations about them necessarily on that area. Where the community feedback part - we're going to review all of the feedback, we'll revise the technical model.

So that's the overall - our process and the engagement model that we've gone about. All of our calls have been recorded, have been made public. The actual mailing list is public, the archive is public. So, you know, we've tried to operate as much as possible being clear that what we're doing is and remains in the public eye.

Next slide, please. So what you'll find on this next slide are the key questions and considerations. You'll find what the major categories of questions that we looked at and what those might be. We ended up coming to something like eight or nine -- thanks (Gavin) -- eight or nine of these key questions and

considerations. Again you'll find a listing of those if you go to the URL and you look at the charter document. You will see what those categories are.

So that actually was the - was what primed the pump. That's what led us to get to - okay, there are 17, 18 questions, and out of those 17 or 18 questions that led us to say "What should be the assumptions?" So we then, you know, came to - we started up with a set of I think it was maybe seven or eight assumptions at the start, and as we've gone through our work in November, December into January and February we've revised those assumptions and we've made them far more explicit.

If you could advance the slide to two slides further -- I think to Slide Number 8 -- and perhaps there's a technical problem. Oh there is not. One more. There we go. So this shares with you the assumptions that we have made. Now I want to just state something. When you see the slides here that talk about assumptions and you see what's listed there - these are really assertions that have been made by various parties that we've heard and that we've taken as, you know, these are all true. Or these are all the expectations.

So with those assumptions - if you have to evaluate the technical model that we're proposing, you have to keep in mind that the way we looked at it is - the technical model is based upon a foundation of all of these assumptions. And we've been very clear to list these assumptions so that all of you in the community understand that this is how we've gone about doing it.

So with that I'll ask Steve to walk us through what the assumptions are.

Steve Crocker: I'll start with a poll. Is there anybody who didn't understand that those assumptions are not our fault? Those are (unintelligible). So the basic scheme that - conceptual scheme is that ICANN gateway - is the pathway into non-public GTLD data, and that queries for them come through the ICANN gateway. And that the whole venture is to reduce the risks attendant on the registrars and registries with respect to GDPR liability.

There are 12 assumptions laid out in the report. I've summarized half of them and the numbers in parenthesis are keyed to the numbers in the report. And then on the next slide -- and we do have a next slide this time, right -- the other six show up as well.

So the basic working assumptions are that RDAP is the answer, and that Port 43 access will be deprecated over time, that as I said access to the GTLD non-public data is only via this mechanism -- this process -- and that queries from unauthenticated sources will be handled per policy, as opposed to not being taken care of at all. And that ICANN oversees the credential protection and validity processes.

Next slide please. So those same assumptions are on the top and then the other six relate basically to the evolution and adjustments that have to be made over a period of time. So there may be changes in datasets and rules and those have to be accommodated. They'll have to match RDAP usage and existing RDAP practices. And there'll be the usual learning process as one goes through the implementation and shake-down of operational things. You have a pilot and deal with implementation practicalities.

And that this is all subject to whatever policy choices are in fact made by the people who make policy decisions. Which is -- to emphasize over and over again -- not us. Thank you.

(Rahm): Thanks Steve. Next slide please. Thank you. So as we've mentioned earlier we went through listing the assumptions and then went through talking about use-cases. (Andy) can you take these slides?

(Andy): Yes. So we started with a set of use-cases about - of course, the first one is "What about a user who actually is authorized to see this data?" And this first use-case kind of drove a lot of what we thought about. But then we had to consider the other users in the system.

So we talked about the differences between a user who needs a one-time request versus somebody who needs a little more permanent access to the data. And then we also have users who may not be authenticated or authorized to see the data at all. What do you do with them? And finally, what do you do with the registrants -- the data subjects -- of the data? And so those are - that's the use-case we have to deal with as well.

Can we have the next slide, please? So from there we came up with some system requirements. And these also evolved as we went through the iterative process. So we basically have broken some of the requirements down into what the requirements are for each individual component of the system, and some of them are overall requirements.

Overall requirements are things like "Must be, you know, V4 and V6," "Must be distributed," and "Use secure protocols such as TLS and other security measures where appropriate." One of the things for dealing with some of the use-cases of people who need one-time or immediate escalation of access is a browser-based Web portal so a user can get that done through ICANN. So we have system requirements based on that.   And then we also have system requirements where we break apart the authentication from the authorization, and have those maybe delegated if policy dictates that.

As in the previous slide we talked about the ICANN RDAP gateway, so we have requirements about how that must be able to authenticate the requestors using this distributed system if that's what policy decides. Must be able to have granular access to data, support passing information about the requestor to the contracted parties if necessary, and also redirect unauthorized users. We have requirements on the contracted parties so their RDAP servers - mostly they have to receive and respond to the queries that ICANN sends them.

Next slide, please? And overall requirements, we have things like logging and auditing - that's mostly for transparency of the system. Being able to log the queries, being able to reconcile the queries, understanding data retention around these logs, so forth. Then we thought about performance and service-level agreements. The system does have to perform - what type of SLAs are necessary upon all parties in the system in order for it to function properly?

Then we went into information security requirements about security controls. What is required of an identity provider, such as doing an audit? Basically we came down to - in order for us to have a proper security posture, there needs to be a risk assessment done first -- a proper risk assessment done -- and from there we can drive a lot of the guidelines for what the requirements are going to be.

And then finally we had other information security requirements, such as business continuity plans, and the use of cryptographic techniques in order to secure the data. And I think that's it? Next slide? Yes.

(Rahm): Thanks. So that gets us to the proposed model, and Scott will you take this?

Scott Hollenbeck: Sure, thank you (Rahm). So when you put all this together -- after looking at the requirements, looking at all the assumptions -- we debated appropriate technologies that would allow us to meet as many of these requirements as possible. The matrix that we came up with -- you'll find it in the report should you want to look at it -- identified a series of technologies based on two Internet standards-based Web services -- OpenID Connect and OAuth 2.0.

I don't necessarily want to talk to this slide in great detail right yet, okay? A lot of technobabble here. In a moment I want to jump ahead one slide and show you what this looks like graphically, and then it's easier to talk to that.

But these technologies - yes, if you could flip ahead while I'm running my yap here, thank you - if you're familiar with how single sign-on services work

today, you know, you go to visit a Web site and you see a little box there, like, you log in with Google, log in with Twitter, what-not. It's the same underlying technology. Right?

The difference, though, is that those companies who are - they're performing a service - they're acting in the form of something called an identity provider, right? And in the context of what they do there - they're set up to vouch for your identity, to vouch for your credentials, and to collect some information about you that you are willing to share with the resource that you're trying to access. And typically that'll be something like your name, your email address, you know, maybe your age - none of which is really relevant for the context of this. But as I said this is what the technology is based on.

And so if you look at the model here, this looks a little bit different from what you've got in the traditional WHOIS-like service, where there is a client and there is a server. Right? We have a couple of additional actors. We have the ICANN RDAP access service that we've already described. And if you look kind of like in the southwest corner there, there's this entity called an authentication provider, and another entity or actor called an authorization service.

Now, these technologies allow those two functions to be performed by the same actor -- sometimes collectively called an identity provider -- but, you know, based on the assumptions and requirements that we came up with, we thought that they could be separated. And that there would be one entity that deals with the management of credentials, identification and authentication, and then another entity that would deal with, you know, questions about authorization. All right?

At a high level, the way this works is when a client application is, you know, dealing with a request or a person who wants to make a query, they send this query to the ICANN RDAP access service, who immediately needs to know if

this person is who they claim to be. And, you know, what that person is authorized to see.

But the ICANN RDAP access service knows nothing about these credentials. They didn't issue them, they can't authenticate or verify them. So they send a little redirect off to this authentication provider who interacts with the human. And again, if you're familiar with the single sign-on services, usually when you click that little "Authenticate with Google" button, what do you see? A Google Web page, where you're prompted to provide your username and password and to select the information that you're willing to share. Works the same way here. Okay?

When that process is finished there's some bits of information that are given back to the ICANN RDAP access service in the form of codes -- opaque data structures called codes and tokens. Right? Those contain information about the person that was authenticated and identified. Okay?

Next question though is "I have a query, and I have some information about this person. Are they authorized to see what they're asking for?" And so there's an interaction that takes place with the authorization service, where the information is sent over there and based on policies, you know -- which are TBD of course -- the ICANN RDAP access service gets back an answer. Yea or nay.

This person is authorized to see what they're asking for. And if they are authorized to see what they're asking for, there is a series of - potentially a series of queries -- RDAP queries -- sent to registry and registrar RDAP services to collect, you know, the non-public data, to form a full RDAP response, and to return that to the client. So let's take a step back just on the one slide here, see if I missed anything. The prerequisites, yes.

So this is important. I mean, I'm sure you're looking at this and you're saying, "Well, wait a minute. You know, none of this stuff exists right now." Absolutely

correct, right? RDAP services (unintelligible) contracted parties are all on the hook to get that deployed by sometime later this year. But these identity providers -- these authorization services -- they don't exist right now. And someone eventually has to step up and assume these responsibilities.

In other contexts, people have spoken about the need to accredit actors to perform these functions. All right? I'm not going to talk about what accreditation means. Let's just throw that out there. But they have to exist. And some kind of relationships have to be established between the actors here. Because this is all based on web services, there needs to be -- for example -- an exchange of configuration information in the form of URLs.

So there are end points that the identity provider needs to publish. There are end points that ICANN RDAP access service has to publish. And that's all, you know, based on static configuration information that takes place when some type of a service relationship is established. All right, and then the next big change here is that the requestors -- the people who are looking to submit queries -- have to have credentials, all right? And they typically get that credentials from an entity that's performing this identity provider role.

And if you're wondering, "Well, what's an identity provider?" I like to describe it as, you know, some type of an actor or entity that has a relationship or they're of a community of interest with these requestors. They need to be able to know who they are. And they need to be able to assign certain identity attributes to the requestor.

And what I mean when I say identity attributes, in the context of this work, it would be things like the role they're performing. Are they a law enforcement officer? What's the purpose of their query? "Well, I'm doing an investigation and I have a warrant." The legal jurisdiction from which they are submitting their query. These are all the types of attributes that need to be fed into an authorization decision later on.

But it's also important to note that what these attributes actually are, also a matter of policy. So we describe the technology and how it uses it here, but our model does not make any statements about what those attributes are, what they need to be, or where they're coming from. All right, and then the rest of this pretty much as I described on the flow diagram. So could we step forward two slides, please? (Gavin)?

(Gavin): Yes, thank you, Scott. So as we went through the process of designing the system we came across issues that we felt needed to be addressed but which we didn't feel we were qualified to address ourselves. And they've primarily things that kind of bubbled up into the policy area rather than purely items of technology. So you the report does outline this in more detail, but I'll run through here on the next couple of slides.

The first item is data retention. We don't envisage that the ICANN access service would hold any data. It's a reverse proxy but it's not a caching reverse proxy. So it doesn't keep copies of the registration data. But it sees, just passes them through, then forgets it. However, it would store logs, and this looks to be (unintelligible) requestors. And that does have some implications for confidentiality of those things.

And say things like data retention policies, we feel it would be appropriate for those policies to be established and put in place prior to the to the standing up of the system. Second item is service level agreements. Contracted policies are already subject to SLAs on the (unintelligible) service. We also recommended and identified that the other potential actors in the system such as the identity providers, the authorization services, and (unintelligible) itself should be subject to a service level agreement that should be enforced and monitored.

And that the performance status of that SLA should be published and available for the participants in the system to review. Obviously we identified that there was some significant issues that my fall on ICANN org if they

became the operator and coordinating party of the system. And we outlined those two items here. Obviously the feasibility of the system hasn't really been established.

We don't know if it's operational - or possible to operate at significant scale, depending on the outcome of the policy process that might say that the system might need to handle significant volumes, or potentially might not have - you know, need to handle that kind of volume. But we can't comment on that. But we would say that if it does need to operate at significant volume, then there may be operational issues that might need to be addressed ICANN org in terms of their ability to handle a system of that scale.

We also recommended that if ICANN did perform that exercise they should publish that review for review by technical experts. I'm happy to answer question now, if you have one.

(Elliott):   What scale would you say you start to worry about this at? So think about that as queries per day or queries per month. And what scale would you say, not even worth building this at?

(Gavin):   I can't answer those questions. They're not driven by - you know, they're not - they weren't things that we covered.

(Elliott):   But what would you think? I mean, you guys are a deep technical group.

(Gavin):   But we don't represent ICANN org, and I don't know what their resources and capabilities are. So I…

(Elliott):   If you built the system.

(Gavin):   Again, I haven't the - I haven't done the exercise and I couldn't give you an answer off the top of my head. I mean, people have been saying that this - we've presented this before. They said, "Oh, this looks great. This is going to

be a one-stop shop for all registration data, whether public or non-public." So then, okay, that's fine. Let's assume that's an operating model.

So let's take the number of whose queries that every registry and registrar in total receives during the course of a month. And then put all of that through this system. You know, that's the kind of upper limit on the amount of - the volume of queries that this system might have to sustain. And then…

(Elliott):   Why would you - I mean, you just went a totally different place. Somebody actually said that they wanted to put all of the whose queries that people make externally?

(Gavin):   Because if ICANN stands up an RDAP service, it'll essentially function as a bootstrap service. So naïve client implementers will say, "Right, there's this thing called ICANN - or RDAP dot ICANN dot org. I could implement the RFC and do the bootstrapping process, or I just hit that service."

(Elliott):   Yes, I think - I mean - that's just an absurdity that I don't think anybody in this room would allow on levels either commercial or legal. But we can put that aside (unintelligible)…

(Gavin):   We had to design a system that allowed for that possibility even if we couldn't comment on the feasibility or acceptability of that of that.

(Elliott):   Why?

(Gavin):   Because we don't do policy, we're just doing technology.

(Elliott):   No, I - I've heard that rap throughout the week. So I'm trying to avoid - I'm trying to ask only technical questions. But, like, who would say that?

(Gavin):   I can't remember who it was. It was someone in EPDP.

(Elliott):   (Rahm), you remembered.

(Rahm):   It was (Allen) from the (unintelligible).

(Elliott):   His deep commercial sense was brought to bear there. So let go to the other end of the spectrum. At what level would you say it's not worth building this service at all?

(Gavin):   The report outlines - most of the time we've spent here in in Kobe has been talking about the RDAP system. But we - actually, we have two systems that we describe. And they're documented in our report. There's the RDAP-based system that we're talking about here, but there's also a simple web-based interface that allows human beings to go in and type the request in and wait a day and get an email to say, "Your request has been responded to, and here's the answer." We, again, take no position on, you know any or all of that…

(Elliott):   I'm asking a technical question.

(Gavin):   But I could certainly imagine a situation where the outcome of the policy process is such that we don't envisage anything more than a trivial number of requests coming through at any given time.

(Elliott):   In your (unintelligible)…

(Gavin):   And therefore there's no point in automating anything, and we just - everything else collapses out. And it just - we just have this simple web-based system.

(Elliott):   Yes, but what would - you know, pick a number for trivial.

(Gavin):   Forty-two.

(Elliott):   That was glib, not trivial. (Rahm), trivial? What's a trivial number here?

(Rahm):   It depends on what your - I think it really depends on how big you are…

(Elliott):   Let me (unintelligible)…

(Rahm):   Let me finish, (Elliott). Hold on.

(Elliott):   Sure.

(Rahm):   Let me finish, okay? It really depends on how big a player or an actor you are. And where you are in the ecosystem, right? So trivial for me might be in the millions, and trivial for someone else might be in the tens of thousands, right? So the real technical answer to your question is, it depends upon who you are, and where you are in the system.

If you're a provider who is thinking of - and I've seen some folks here in in the meeting who are thinking of, "Oh, we're going to offer whose as a service," okay, "and we're going to go offer to every registry and registrar who doesn't want to stand this up, we're just, you know, give us your data and we'll just manage this." Their version of trivial would be different. So it's I think pretty hard to actually come up with a number that will work all the way across.

(Elliott):   Well, I think you actually did pretty well you see all the way across I mean if you did pretty well. You say all the way across. I mean, I think you did pretty well. I think you said kind of trivial at the high end is going to be in the millions and trivial at the low end is going to be in the tens of thousands. That's great, thanks.

(Rahm):   I think I said it could be that. I didn't say it would be that.

(Elliott):   Happy to caveat it by, in your - but let me try it like this. If (unintelligible) was standing up a service like this, what would be trivial?

(Rahm): I don't know. I've had a look at it. I haven't given it enough thought to give you an answer that, you know, I could, you know, go back and say, "Hey, that made sense." But the way I look at it, if I had to stand up a service like this, I would tell my engineers it better be able to handle millions.

(Elliott): Great. What if they came to and said, "(Rahm), we're getting 50 a day. Should we stand up a service like this?" What would you say?

(Rahm): I'd say, "What's it going to cost? How many months is it going to take?"

(Elliott): Well, you guys just spent months designing a system. You can - it's your choice. It's your system.

(Rahm): It's not my choice. This is a model.

(Elliott): It is in the hypothetical (unintelligible)...

(Rahm): No, in the hypothetical, if it was 50, I don't know. I'd want to go and find out, you know, is it going to cost me half a million dollars to build this thing for handling 50? And then I'd go talk to my lawyer, who might tell me you better damn build it because it doesn't matter that you got 50.

Steve Crocker: If it's 50, can you hire somebody to do that?

(Elliott): Can I hire somebody to do what, Steve?

Steve Crocker: To answer 50 queries a day.

(Elliott): And not build it, you mean?

Steve Crocker: Yes.

(Elliott):   Yes.

Steve Crocker: Oh, okay. So there's an alternative.

(Elliott):   There is an alternative, isn't there?

(Rahm):   I would say everything is trivial if you have the budget for it, right? But (Benedict), did you want to…

(Benedict):   I'd actually say, (Gavin), why don't you finish? Because you only have another slide left. Let's finish that and then, you know, let's open up for everybody else. Including (Elliott).

(Gavin):   Yes, so, moving on to the next slide, then. And obviously, this is the elephant in the room, which is the risk - whether this does actually reduce risk to contracted parties. We can't answer that question. We've taken it as assumption, because if we didn't, we would never make any progress. And so, you know, we just wanted to reiterate the fact that we're not the people to make that decision.

                    We did feel; however, it was important that transparency be a part of this, and that ICANN should you publish transparency reports. Not necessarily details of specific request, but maybe information about the types of requests and the types of people who're making their requests, and the sort of purposes that they're claiming for those requests. This transparent (unintelligible) is quite common amongst other operators, and I think it would be very straightforward to do that.

                    And then finally we felt it would be important to have a mechanism to handle complaints, which might include dilution requests, which ICANN may not be able to satisfy themselves. Obviously we don't expect ICANN to store any data needing deletion. But there may be other parties -- such as the identity providers -- who do. And obviously it may also be necessary for ICANN to

forward deletion requests or redirect requests to the relevant contracted party.

So those are the considerations that we had. And I'll pass back to (Rahm) now

(Rahm): Thanks. So we've listed these. These are not exhaustive, and we may end up adding more as we continue to do the work. And for -- I think -- almost all of them if not all of them, these are, you know going to be in the report for others. EPB2, et cetera, for others to go and think about and to go decide whether they want to act on it or not. Next slide, please. So we're here to solicit input from the community. And we're going to integrate that. We have I think three or four calls scheduled, and one final face-to-face in April, to go finalize the technical model. On April 23 we will publish the report, and we will be done. Questions?

(Graham): Thanks. I'm suspecting - what's that?

Woman 1: In chat.

(Graham): Oh, we've got one in chat as well. I'll try and manage a queue. And I've got (Mikele) and then, did I see (Fred)? No? (Mikele) and then we'll go to the online, and then (Tom)

(Mikele): Right, thanks. Thanks for the presentation. The first question I have is, why are there no women in this group? Why is this a group of men? There's not a single - you were incapable of finding a single woman across the entire technical community to work on this? Strikes me as a bit shocking. So, and that's the first comment.

Secondly, who on earth came up with the assumptions? Because I think they're fundamentally flawed. The assumption the number 3, "ICANN is the sole party that authorizes access to non-public registration data in the GTLD

space", is a fundamentally flawed assumption. I just don't see how anything can possibly work based off that single assumption. I would love to know where that came from. Goeran has spoken many times about reducing contracted parties' risk, yet that's not an assumption that's in here.

So I'm just having difficulty understanding what this is meant to do. Because sure, at a technical level -- I mean, Scott's explanation about how that works technically -- it's perfectly fine. But it's based on assumptions that I don't think fine. And to try and build a system which is so closely and inexorably linked to data protection without considering data protection, without considering the policies, without considering the laws - just doesn't make any sense to me.

That would be like going off and designing a car without considering whether or not you were going to put it in the Japanese market or the American market. That's why - this where I'm having - I'm having terrible difficulty understanding how you could do that. That leaves me very confused.

(Rahm): Thank you. Could you take us back to the assumptions slide? Yes that's good. I think that - or perhaps the slide before that. Thank you. So just a couple of things. As Steve said earlier on it's entirely possible that some of these assumptions that are written here are invalid and inaccurate. We'd like to hear about which of those might be invalid and inaccurate, and that will probably have an impact on our deliberations on what the model might be.

But we don't stand here to defend why these assumptions are accurate or not what we are doing here is documenting what we've heard and what has been asserted and you should take these -- and we've listed them -- you should take these as these are the axioms that that we have worked with. If you disagree with them, that's fine. But that's not a fight with us. That's a fight, you know, elsewhere in the community. We really don't have a dog in that fight, just to be clear.

Certainly on - and the other thing that you talked about was what Goeran had said about liability. I think it's actually been reflected there. But perhaps we ought to do a better job of revisiting that.

(Mikele):   So were you basing it off what's actually in your charter, (Rahm)? Not…

(Rahm):   I'm sorry?

(Mikele):   I'm basing this off what's in your charter, which - not what he was on the slides.

(Rahm):   Why not? Why are you not basing it on what's on the slides? We're presenting to the slides. We're telling you what's in our proposed document.

(Mikele):   (Rahm), the - your working group has a - your work group has a page on the ICANN Web site which has several documents, a draft final report and your charter. And in your presentation today you said you did your work based on your charter. So the query I had was, if Goeran on multiple occasions has said that this work was meant to reduce our liability, why is that not in the charter?

(Rahm):   Well, I'll have to go read the charter. And if it's not there, I'm happy to go add that. Because clearly that was part of our assumptions.

(Mikele):   But then the other bit I have a problem with is you did the work based on the assumptions, but you're saying you didn't develop the assumptions or validate the assumptions. I'm just trying to understand, where do the assumptions come from? I find that bit very hard to understand, because I…

(Rahm):   You think the assumption that RDAP is a mechanism is - it needs to be validated elsewhere? Do you think that the assumption that (unintelligible)…

(Mikele):   No, (Rahm), you said…

(Rahm): …is going to be deprecated - hold on a second. Let me finish. That that needs to be validated? I think we've talked to folks both in the community or you find documents that have been written - I think many of these things can actually be validated. Perhaps there are some of these that we have to go to list the sources of them. But to the best of my recollection I believe all of the 12 assumptions have some sources that that came - that we arrived at. I don't know that we actually invented any of these assumptions. (Elliott)?

(Elliott): And I want to - on that point, I mean, this very clearly came out of Steve DelBianco's exercise that Goeran picked up on to see if it could be technically implemented. I mean, I don't think there was any, you know, mystery about any of that. That's where they..

(Mikele): But there's no - it's the bit I'm having a major issue with, (Elliott) is the idea that ICANN is the sole party that authorizes access to non-public registration data (unintelligible).

(Elliott): I'm not defending the assumptions any more than (Rahm) is.

(Mikele): It's, that's the bit I'm having problem…

(Elliott): Or any less, right? They came from elsewhere, right? Like, that was the - you know, you've sat there just like I have and watched, you know, on the stage as is we saw that dog and pony show. And by the way, you know, I think there is, you know, there is a way that this could be delivered that could work. But I think it's, you know, highly unlikely.

And, you know, the material question -- which again these guys can't answer -- is, you know, how many years would it take to get to the other side of all of these different parties who get created to authenticate et cetera. You know, you're probably two to three years away on a fast track, right? I don't know -

you know, I won't - your nods will not be noted for the record. Because, you know, that's not a technical question

But I mean, I think that that's the - sort of the missing piece in this -- and the piece that I've been screaming about in public forum -- which is like, it's great. That's great. We're still going to be years away, and we've still got to live in the world between now and then.

(Graham):   Thank you, (Elliott). Steve?

Steve Crocker: So, (Mikele), I empathize with you. There's actually sort of two big boundary conditions, if you will -- or interfaces -- and you've been focused on are these assumptions valid? Is it is this right problem for us to be working on, in a sense. I'm rephrasing. I hope I'm not straying too far from what you're trying to say. And I think those are fair questions. This group very purposefully said, "We're not going to challenge the assumptions. We're going to work within the assumptions."

But it's certainly fair -- stepping outside of the work that this group has done -- to raise those questions and to do so quite vigorously. I guess that's the only mode which you actually operate so that's not a required statement. But that's half of it. And the other half is this is built with the assumption that it can implement whatever policies are decided by the policy people. And that's also an inherently risky kind of process.

And so one might ask, "Well, what policies are likely to be implemented, and who's going to make those policies? And will they fit with this?" There's been some attempt at trying to anticipate that. But nothing formal and nothing definitive that can be said. And so that's another kind of high-risk area, if you want, where you have to go over to that set of people whoever they might be and say, "So what policies did you want? And will they fit into this presumed - into this implementation or this design that presumably capable for that?"

(Mikele):   Thanks.

Steve Crocker: So there's two pieces of work for you to do there, which is so go challenge the assumptions on the one side and to go stir the pot of what the policies are going to be.

(Mikele):   Thanks, Steve. And so I think, (Rahm), I think the problem is that you - I wasn't clearly articulated was that Goeran gave you a list of assumptions. I think that's the actual - you were given a list of assumptions by Goeran and ICANN org, and then worked from that. But the way you presented this, it sounded like the assumptions kind of came out of - it wasn't clear where.

                  But if you're working on the basis that Goeran goes, "Here's a list of assumptions, go do this," then I can completely understand how we end up with this. Now, and as Steve said, I'll quite happily challenge the assumptions. But I don't need to challenge it with you.

(Rahm):   Yes, thanks for that clarification. In fact, if I go back and recollect what we did, in our first face-to-face, we have some of these same questions, including the one on ICANN being the sole place for all of this to go through, et cetera. And we had Goeran on a call with us. And we asked him that. And he said, "Yes, that is a clear prerequisite condition of all of the work." So not all of those assumptions came from Goeran, but certainly some of these definitely came from the ICANN org point of view. Yes, and you can go back - if you want to, you can go back to the recordings for that.

(Gordon):   All right, thank you. Steve, can I get you to turn off your mike, please? Thank you. All right so I've got a long queue forming now, and we've got only - we're now down to 11 minutes technically. I think we can run over a bit because I think our next compliance update is a bit shorter. So I've now got (Dan) online, then (Tom), then Darcy, then Volker. I threw myself in there. Then (James) and then (Jothan). So (Dan) first.

Woman 1:   Okay, so this is (Dan Ryatt) from (unintelligible) Networks. His question is, in designing the model, did the TST make any allowances for the possibility for multiple levels of authorization? For example, cases where the locale of the registrar might create additional levels of restriction on authorizations that are contemplated by ICANN.

I understand that the TST didn't want to get into policy questions, but I'm curious if this model allowed for the possibility of multiple levels of authorization. And to expand on that, what kind of metadata regarding the query would be communicated to the RDAP server from ICANN? Are they going to include both information on the identity and the proposed authorization?

Steve Crocker: So the short answer to that is yes we did consider it, and yes the system will support it. Both the multiple levels of authorization and the ability to have information about the requestor in the system itself. We even talked about an ability to pseudo anonymize the requestor or if need be.

What we did was we tried to come up with a framework that could support multiple options, knowing that we didn't have the answers to what - we didn't know what the actual final answer would be to a lot of these questions. We even talked about different levels of identity providers. So the system is very flexible in what it can and cannot do -- well, what it can do, sorry -- and is really - what it might end up in the long run is based on policy itself.

(Graham):   Thank you. Okay, who is next? (Tom).

(Tom):   So I'm curious about - I have a general question, which is the, how you define non-public registration data, and whether or not it includes any data elements that are not in the legacy whose, say, pre GDPR?

(Rahm):   I think it's a great question. It's not a question for us. So what I'm saying, (Tom), is somebody's going to define what is public and what is nonpublic

registration data. Once that - whoever it is decides that, if there is a definition and if there is a set of nonpublic data, here's a model that can be used to access such data.

(Tom): So the…

(Rahm): We're not defining what that is.

(Tom): Okay. So the general impression I think I've received -- maybe others -- is that this is a replacement for whose, right? And so we could - we have to deliver something in six months per this new policy. I'm wondering if I need to figure out - for example if I publish traditionally pre GDPR proxy or privacy data that's what I publish into the whose, (unintelligible) redacted, do I also now need -- under RDAP -- start to provide the underlying data as well? That's one use case that I'm not sure falls - what I need to (unintelligible) architect something else because you won't get that out of my traditional whose database.

(Rahm): Yes, if that - if whoever it is who's making the decision -- the policy making -- whatever the decision is made, if the decision is that such access should be made available, this model will accommodate it.

(Tom): Okay. So you're saying someone is going to define nonpublic registration data. Not your group.

(Rahm): I don't know who that someone is. I just know it ain't us.

(Graham): Thanks Tom, and thanks (Rahm). Darcy is up next.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Darcy Southwell. So this slide says one of your assumptions is that ICANN is reducing the registrars and registries GDPR liability. Probably should say data protection law liability, because this is a global problem. But you also then later have a slide that says you can't comment on whether it

reduces risk. And so I I'm just - I'm struggling to reconcile those two things, because I don't know how you can say you can't speak to it, but this is your assumption. So how is this exactly alleviating our risk? Because I think I'd really like to understand that.

(Rahm): Yes, so would we. We're saying - this is an assertion that has been made, Darcy. The assertion that has been made and that we are noting is that unified access model -- whatever -- the ICANN will reduce the liability in registries and registrars. So we state that because we heard that. Then as we went through our process and as we went through analyzing all of this, what became clear to us is that we don't know if that assumption is valid or not, but it's not for us to say that it's invalid.

What we're saying is, "Hey whoever is on the - is affected, you guys had to go and validate it." So that's in the consideration section. So I think they're actually quite congruent. We're not - again, keep in mind, Darcy, we're not saying that the assumption is true. We're saying that's it that's a darting condition that we were told exists.

(Graham): Thank you. Volker, you're up.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, (Graham). Volker Greimann speaking for the record. My main concern is that certain element that's my view essential part of the GDPR is absolutely missing from this proposed model, which is the requirement to check each and every request, whether it's legitimate or not. Let's say you become accredited under this model. You're an entity that's used to drinking from the firehose that used to be whose. Let's call you domain utensils or something like that.

You get accredited for a certain amount of data that's set to your access levels. And the only thing that stops you to start drinking from the firehose again is the code of conduct that you may or may not adhere to. I mean, we

have a code of conduct with use terms currently in the whose, and see how well that has worked to discourage such actors from drinking from a firehose.

There's no review process for any of the requests. There's no requirement for the accredited party to provide a reason. No verification process of that reason in the process that would be triggered before the data is being disclosed. This is an access model, not a disclosure model. We would like to see a disclosure model, not an access model.

Scott Hollenbeck: Volker, Scott Hollenbeck. I actually have to challenge what you said about there not being elements of the process to do that. That authorization service that I described is intended to provide exactly that kind of function, right? There is a set of information associated with the identity of the person making the request, and the nature of the request itself. And an active decision is made with every query to determine if that requestor is authorized to see what they're asking for, you know, based on the mapping of that information with the policies that are encoded at that authorization service provider.

Volker Greimann: Yes, but say I'm a police entity that is authorized to check all data for Canada, if they have a criminal investigation. And now they pull every data from Canada that - because they can. Even if - whether or not there is a for the current ongoing investigation, just to have that data on hand because who knows if I can get it later. There's nothing to stop them other than the code of conduct, right?

Currently they make a request to us, we check that request, they state in that request, "Yes, we have a current ongoing investigation." We disclose the data. There's nothing like that in the current model. They request it, they get it, based on their access levels. If their access levels don't cover that, okay, that's a different thing. But they're not on a case by case basis. If I'm accredited to a certain level, I can drink the firehose with everything to that level.

Scott Hollenbeck: Well…

(Graham): I think Steve has a comment.

Steve Crocker: So, you raise an important point. There is another avenue for control that is consistent with -- I wouldn't say built into what we're what we've done, but consistent with -- which is the basic picture is that you have a series of requests from known sources with the credentials and so forth. And then you raise the question, well, suppose that they abuse that and go beyond what the intention is.

And my view -- I'll just speak personally, but I think it's consistent with this -- this is there has to be some form of audit and quality control if you want built into all of these things. So you have some group, whether it's law enforcement, whether it's intellectual property, or whether it's some other group that's making a series of requests, there is an oversight process as to - and discipline as to whether those people are behaving within the confines of the rules that are (unintelligible).

And that's true of basically all systems, whether or not they're automated or not, where you have authority and then they have to have some sort of oversight function. In some parts of government it's an inspector general, and in other cases it's internal affairs or whatever. And I got your attention over there.

(Elliott): Well, it's just that - I mean, what you said is there is there is protection in the breach. And…

Steve Crocker: I'm sorry, say that again?

(Elliott): You said there's protection in the breach. You said that, you know, if they do something wrong, you know, there is recourse if they're caught. But the system - you know what I mean? Unless you found a system to authorize

truth -- which I don't think you're asserting -- it's very difficult. And we're seeing such high error rates. Not just in the information -- the proper information -- which you can check for, but in the assertions. You know, I'm happy to share some stories with you outside of this room.

But, you know, I think that for all of us, I think the point here - you know these guys are doing what they've been tasked to do. And I think the point here for all of us in this room is keep your data and track your data now. We're going into a policy process. I can't tell you how many people from the community -- people from the (unintelligible). IP lawyers have come up to me and said that when I'm providing specific data in our blog posts and at the public forum, how appreciative they are.

Every one of you is collecting data on this stuff every day. Keep it. Track it. I mean, (Graham), maybe what we want to do is some formal process inside the constituency to take submissions from people. Because I'm telling you, everybody cares about that data. And the real bad actors in this process only can take advantage of the absence of data. Because they don't have any.

(Rahm):   So, thanks, (Elliott). So, Volker, I think the other answer to what you're saying is we weren't solving for that particular case, right? So just to be very clear, that was not what we were solving for. Back to you, (Graham).

(Graham):   Thank you. I've actually put myself in the queue, but I think we've just answered it. And so if I'm understanding correctly, all of our restrictions are - (unintelligible) being, like, (unintelligible) any particular contracted party, they would have to pre negotiate with ICANN to rule-set for what they find acceptable. And those rules would live inside the authorization mechanism. This system doesn't presume the potential for a manual review at the contracted parties, where we're queuing these requests, looking at them, going, we don't respect law enforcement from that geography or something. Is that correct?

Scott Hollenbeck: Yes. If well, I don't know if we're going to pop up that other picture.

(Rahm): Can we put the other schematic?

Scott Hollenbeck: Sure. And (Graham), never use law enforcement because it's such a tiny percentage of the queries. How about the partial trademark string, right? You know, which we see abused all the time. But one of the aspects of this model that I think is interesting from a contracted party perspective - and remember, I too represent a contracted party.

There are two classes of queries that we're going to see. Queries from the general public for public data. That's that loop across the top there, right? No authentication, no authorization, no nothing in that regard. And so the responses that those folks are going to get will be appropriate for whatever an unauthorized person is allowed to see.

The only other types of queries we will be getting will be from ICANN, right? And the easy way to do something like that has nothing to do with this auth 2.0 or OpenID connect process. It's more typically implemented using some sort of a privileged pipe. You know, IP address whitelisting. A client certificate for ICANN using TLS or something like that.

And so you're going to be responding to those two forms of queries. And we are suggesting that it should be possible for the ICANN RDAP access service to pass some identity information to the contracted party, so you know who's behind the query. But we didn't take that any further in terms of looking at what the contracted parties will do with that information, because that's kind of a matter of policy and not technology.

(Graham): Right. So then in your model you're saying that the actual ruleset would live with the contracted party. So they would get the request. It would have who the requestor is. And we can, you know, acknowledge or deny the request based on our internal rules that, you know, will be…

(Rahm):   Yes, you could do that.

(Graham):   …some mixture of both policy and national law and whatever else.

(Rahm):   Yes. (Graham), I think that's - the short answer to that is yes. The local policy --the whoever stores the data whatever policy they want to apply -- the model doesn't presume that the policy is overtaken by some other body or resides in another place.

(Graham):   Okay. I'm just trying to figure out where that veto lives. (James), you're up next. And then (Jothan), then (Caroline), and we're going - I'm going to give us until 2:00. So we've got 11 more minutes.

(James):   So, yes, everything and it has moved on quite a bit since I got into the queue. A lot of my concerns have been raised elsewhere. I just wanted to point out - who was it down here who made the joke, the 42? Was it (Gavin)? An so it's good to - I think the metaphor of the Hitchhiker's Guide is very apt here, because you guys have answered a question that no one really was asking the right questions to begin with and so you provided this answer to something - and, I mean, we can laugh, but really the technology was never the problem.

                 I always assume that once we address the policy questions that, you know, collectively the industry -- and it's been the intelligence and capabilities that are represented here -- would deliver on a platform that would it adhere to the policy decision. So I think I think the problem is, is that the hope of some and the concern of others is that the technology is going to answer or lead or box out the policy discussion.

                 And I guess - you know, I don't want to beat you guys up, because you were given sort of a - I don't want to - I have to be very careful. Let's say what Volker said earlier. I want to make sure you guys aren't working for the trash

can and that this stuff is DOA, and all of this effort is really ultimately just wheel spinning. Thanks.

(Rahm):   Thanks, (James). I think the actual response to your question on the technology et cetera is probably better raised Goeran and to the ICANN org, because it - I think there is an intent and a plan to take the output of this and to do more things with it. And I don't know all the answers for that. But Goeran spoke a little bit to that yesterday in the community session.

But that's a question that is probably best left and passed on to ICANN org. I'll make sure that that question does get passed on, because that's really where it belongs. And to your other thing of, you know, whether the work we do, whether it'll survive contact with reality and, you know, live on, et cetera, it may or may not. I think there are some pieces that we've talked through, and I think there is a framework and a particular model of how to go address up a problem like this inside of a community-based solution.

I think that may actually be the thing that survives all of the rest of the deliberations going forward.

(James):   Just one last comment, (Graham), since - (Mikele) opened this up with a statement about the diversity of the group. And I think it is very important for people to be mindful when you are part of a group that is hand selected by, you know, either ICANN org or some other thing, you know, that that kind of take a look around and see if it's representative of the community. Because that's the definition of an old boys' network. You know, I'm not - I know we all kind of bristle at that. But I'm just kind of putting that out for something for us to think about. Because those things tend to be invisible from the inside and only visible from the outside.

(Rahm):   Yes, fair enough. And let me just address that directly. To a large extent it was dependent not upon whom I asked to be on, but it was depending upon who had the time and the availability to be there. So it's more than just a

variable of - what you see is the outcome, but what you actually don't have is what I put into it, which was certainly greater than what I ended with. Thanks.

(Graham): Thank you. I believe it's (Jothan)'s turn.

(Jothan): Hi. I want to definitely thank all of you as recognized technical experts. I mean, we've got the author of (unintelligible) RFCs here, Scott Hollenbeck. We've got Steve Crocker, (Rahm) (unintelligible), lots of very respected technical leaders -- thought leaders -- that are looking at this. So I definitely recognize that. I think you're catching a lot of vitriol energy because some of this - there was a report filed like on March 7. Many of us were on airplanes and haven't had a lot of time to review this. We're a bit on our back heels and probably reacting in ways that - we're grateful to you for clarifying.

So some of the things that we really brace ourselves for are the - we'll call them the data researchers type that seem to have been bundled together with law enforcement or other critical uses and defined as critical, when this is a lot of folks who are simply - they've built a business model about data that may have been freely available. And those hit the services very hard for contracted parties. Often more so than the typical consumer.

And while they may be providing important results to people doing important good things, many of them just have a commercial dependency on this. And the burden of supporting that commercial dependency often falls upon us and our systems through the form of service level agreements that we have with ICANN. And as we look at this, we want to make sure, you know, we are building a robust system that can support law enforcement and other crucial needs.

But I look at page 5 of the report that came out on March 7 and I see - in fact if you go back a slide or two here, it was defined - one more I think. One more. One more perhaps. There we go, use case 1, authorized users. This was probably just a, you know, a velocity thing. But we do note that security

researchers are bundled together with law enforcement, registrars, registries as being critical and must have.

And I think to them and their business models that may in fact be critical or must have. And I know that they certainly have Goeran's ear, and it may have come through with a high intensity. But while it's critical perhaps to their business models it might be more considered realistically to be optional or even important but not certainly critical.

And it seems like that may have just been a quick editing thing in keeping it very high level. But a nuance like that is going to be very helpful as you clear the passive groups like the (unintelligible) or places where anonymity and people's personal privacy is more important. Thank you.

(Rahm): Thanks, that's a great comment. We, you know, we're doing this with kind of an eye both to getting it out as well as with an eye to doing it right. And that's really why feedback sessions like these are really good. And I don't have a problem with critical comments or the energy. It's - you know, we're proud of the process that we've gone through and what we have. But what happens to it from there on is whatever happens to it, right? This is not a, you know, this is our model and you shall use it or anything like that. So no trouble - keep the comments coming. Better to have lots of comments and lot of critiques et cetera in it, because the end of the day -- and I'm speaking as a contracted party -- I'd much rather have as many of those criticisms come in now before we start to put a single line of code together.

(Graham): Thanks.

(Jothan): Just a quick response, again, very quick. So it kind of starts to create some foundational things that lean together in support of some of those groups. And I'm not necessarily opposed to them getting data. But I do want -- if we're building systems that have costs to us -- that maybe as these lean together,

are we building a framework that just creates their status quo access once more in this new regime? That's my concern commercially.

(Rahm): Thanks.

(Graham): We've got two minutes left before we need to move on, and I still have (Caroline) and a very quick Volker in the queue. I would love to get you guys, but you've got like a minute each.

(Caroline): That's fine. Thanks. And I think the conversation you had with (Graham) probably helped me a little bit, although I'm trying to get my head around how that's layered on top of this model. But I totally share Volker's concerns, but I appreciate that's creeping into the policy area. But is it the case that it is definitively saying -- at least for this draft schematic -- that the authorization entity would be a third party versus the contracted party? And is that assumption or (unintelligible) linked to the liability issue specifically?

Steve Crocker: It is a possibility of the system, but it is not predetermined. So the - we - in the document we actually have this list of actor models, where we go through and we describe which actors are doing what. And in some of the actor models, there's there is a third-party authorizer. In some of the actor models there is not. The way we put this together was, we wanted the flexibility that policy can decide what was the right way to do it and what was the - and how to get it done.

(Caroline): So another consideration could be a dotted line to the contract a party to be determining the authorization request.

Steve Crocker: Yes.

(Caroline): Okay, thank you.

(Graham): Thank you. Volker, last word?

Volker Greimann: Okay, very brief. Because you're fishing for opinions, here's just one brief suggestion how you could fix a lot of the issues at least that I have with this model is by having the requestor includes a request reason and giving the contracted parties an option to accept, deny, and give a reason for denial. That would already fix a lot of issues, because then we would control the data again, and the distribution of the data.

Steve Crocker: Volker, it's already there.

Volker Greimann: Great.

(Graham): Well, thank you for coming. I think we got a lot out of that. I hope you did too. So we really appreciate you guys joining us today and sticking to it. I know we ran 15 minutes long. So we appreciate it. Thank you.

(Rahm): Yes, thank you for having us over. Appreciate it.

Woman 1: I (unintelligible).

(Graham): Yes. So next up we've got ICANN finance, I believe. We sort of ran over our compliance team update, but we'll come back to that in a few minutes if you guys don't mind. There should be a whole bunch of room up here on the left side.

We're just getting the slides up. We'll be good to go in a moment.

You can - so, welcome. We have - I'm not sure how long we have with you guys. I don't think it's (unintelligible) 20 minutes. So we're getting an update from ICANN finance. Feel free to introduce yourself and get going. We'll get the slides up shortly.

Becky Nash: Thank you, (Graham), very much. Good afternoon everyone. This is Becky Nash from ICANN finance. And if we go to the next slide, I'll just do a quick introduction of those that are here. So we are joined here by Xavier Calvez, ICANN CFO, and my colleague Shani Quidwai, director of finance from ICANN. If we go to the next slide. We have provided a set of slides as distribution where we have information related to FY '19, which is our current fiscal year.

Our year to date results -- financial results -- through December. We do have slides on the draft FY '20 budget with highlights. And then we have a section on the overview of the public comments that have been submitted on the draft FY '20 operating plan and budget. We're going to start with that section, only because we have a limited amount of time. And then we do have an update at the end as it relates to our billing and payments process.

So if we could advance to slide number - I think it's 16. Thank you very much. Yes, thank you. So the public comments on the FY '20 operating plan and budget. The draft was posted for public comment on December 17. And the public comment period ran through the February 8. We'd like to highlight that this was the first year that the draft operating plan and budget was submitted for public comment as early as it was.

And the reason why it was at least a month and a half earlier it's just due to the fact that with our new bylaws and the empowered community process, we need to have time for that process at the end of the approval process in order to have an adopted budget go into effect prior to the fiscal year. So this is a theme that we'll be undertaking of trying to do these activities earlier and earlier each year.

So we do appreciate the community's involvement. So we're - the stage that we're at right now is that we are seeking clarification on comments that have been submitted by different stakeholder groups and individuals. And we are then due to publish the staff report on public comments just subsequent to

the ICANN 64 meeting, so the week of March 19. But the purpose for this session is to go over the themes of all of the comments that have been received.

And then we do have a slide specifically with the registrar stakeholder group and related comments that we would like to engage with members here today. Prior to moving ahead I just wanted to highlight that we did receive 143 individual comments, submitted by a variety of submitters - about 18 or so different groups or individuals submitted.

We provided on this slide a trend just so that we can show that the level for FY '20 is down from the FY '19 operating plan and budget, but it's pretty comparable to the years prior to that, FY '17 and FY '18. We will discuss on the next slide just about the reason why the comments seem to have decreased this particular year.

So at this point I'm going to hand this over to my colleague Shani, who's going to go over the next couple of slides, and then we'll ask for some engagement on comments that have been submitted.

Shani Quidwai: You can switch to the next slide. On this side you can see the groups that had submitted comments. And the decline that we saw in FY '20 is primarily driven by individuals. In the prior year there were a lot of fellows that had submitted comments regarding the change in funding to that program. And aside from that group, the comments are relatively stable year over year.

There's some movement within some of the groups specifically, but overall relatively flat. If you move to the next slide we can look at the themes a little more. So there were three key themes that composed about 60% of our comments. Those were financial management, budget development process, and community support and funding. And there are a few other -- five or six -- that make up the remaining themes.

And in the next slides we'll go through the comments that you submitted and where they fell under. If you could move to the next slide. I believe your comment was that you guys had agreed with the submission from the registry stakeholder group. So when you look at any of the statistics, it will just show as one. But if you flip to the next slide, this is how the registry comments had shaken out. Three under financial management, three under ICANN org headcount, three under the reserve fund, and then a few across a few other different categories.

With that I'll hand it back over to Becky to maybe go in through these a little more and then eventually touch on the billing updates.

Becky Nash: Thank you, Shani. So as it relates to the comments submitted - first of all by the registry stakeholder group. I think the registrar stakeholder group said that they support all of those comments except indicating that they did not have any concerns -- or you did not have any concerns -- about the funding of future rounds for new gTLDs. So with that, we acknowledge that there were some specific questions just as it pertains to headcount and expenses related to staff costs.

And I don't know if there's anyone here that wanted to elaborate a little bit about the support on the questions related to ICANN org headcount. From ICANN finance team, the message that we have been providing to all of the stakeholder groups is that FY '20 as compared to FY '19 pretty much the funding and the expenses have stabilized. And what that means is that funding is growing at a slower rate than it may have in previous years, just based on the fact that with the new gTLD delegations all being pretty much complete, we're not seeing the year over year growth that we may have seen three years ago, but that we are moderately growing in funding.

And as a result, the headcount and other organization costs are also moderately being contained. And although there is increases in headcount, it's at a much slower rate than it had been in the prior years, and is less than

2%. So those are just some of the comments that we have as it relates to the overall theme for ICANN org headcount. And I don't know if there any members here that wanted to maybe elaborate on that comment at all?

(Graham): Thanks, Becky. Actually, I think our comment was largely written by our treasurer, who relatively recently left the RSG and is not at the moment here. Although I'll look around the room to see if anybody else has anything they wanted to add at this point? On this point. Right. Heads up, (Billy) is coming. But just not right now.

Xavier Calvez: I'll add a little bit of color in addition to what Becky just said, just so that you understand that when looking at the numbers, we're talking about stabilization of headcount at about 400 people. The reality of the trend is that over the past 15 months, our headcount has decreased from 400 to 388.

It's not a huge decrease, right, but the point is that there's a trend that is resulting from a set of controls that we've put around hiring, which are very simple in that for any hiring -- whether it is a new position or it's a replacement -- there is a set of approvals that need to occur up to the CEO. So Goeran approves any hiring, inclusive of potential replacements.

So we challenge any department in the need for hiring or the need for replacing an existing position, which has helped (unintelligible) of course the growth of the headcount. This is in the context -- as I think you will all know -- of the increasing amount of work that the entire ecosystem feels you all in this group and others have regularly express the challenge of the workload, which of course is equivalent in the organization.

So stabilizing or reducing the headcount is in the context of trying to get more done, which is what we should try to do all the time, but of course it is a continuous challenge. I just wanted to put a bit more color around that, happy to address the smiley faces around the table.

Becky Nash: Thank you. so if there are any other comments in general, we would welcome those. We just highlighted a couple of the themes that were submitted. And of course we welcome any other comments.

(Elliott): Xavier, no surprise, six months later, I'd love an update on the litigation reserve. Yes, you know, the thing we talked extensively about in Barcelona. Publicly. We had a long public discussion of it.

Xavier Calvez: Yes, it's the vocabulary, sorry, that was putting me off. The - so (Elliott) is referring to the new gTLD program application fees which had been (unintelligible) for $85,000 that had been defined to help cover for all the costs of the program, including the potential risks associated with the program.

The risks associated with the program at the time of design were of various kinds. Could there be the phases of the program that were not planned for and that could be necessary? Could there be other risks of relative to the processing of the applications? Could there be litigation type of risks in other legal type of costs? And it's not just litigation if you just think about it this way. IRPs is also part of the challenges to the application processing that could have occurred.

So there was an amount of the - a fraction of the fee representing the intent to be able to cover for this type of costs. So the - in the budget -- the draft budget that's published -- you can find a section on the new gTLD program with a document that shows the entire cost of the program, the entire recap of the application fees collected, and the cost of the program that we offer show the cost of the past and the future application processing costs, but do not include the potential costs of the defense or litigation that we could incur in the future, because of course we don't know what those costs are. We don't project for litigation costs.

So when you compare the applications fees left and the total application fees and the total application processing costs, there's a remaining amount of funding that is of application fees unspent that is $68 million. So that's the currently estimated amount available for defense and litigation, et cetera. And potentially any other risk to the program which are mainly at this stage litigation defense cost and IRPs cost. I don't know if that fully addresses your question.

(Elliott):   No. I mean, I know that number. You know, I think that was great to help everybody else understand that there is a $68 million reserve, you know, and there's a separate discussion about the need for a reserve fund in order to sort of protect for general budget overrun. And you know I'll repeat for this room since we're recapping that I felt very strongly that ICANN org should not have taken $32 million from the auction proceeds to replenish their reserve when there was a $68 million reserve available.

You know that reserve is not considered in any way a budgetary reserve. Now, you know, I run a public company. Every year in our audit, you know, we have reserves just like you do. Every year we sit down with our auditors and we assess the likelihood of the items that the reserves are set aside for happening. I would imagine that the risk of litigation this year as you sat down with the auditors had to be assessed as less than it was last year, no?

Xavier Calvez: So this is and you are pointing out to a possible practice that you were describing as reviewing with the auditor a reserve. There's no specific reserves from a technical standpoint for the new gTLD program.

(Elliott):   No, wait. So let me - now I need to understand this. You have audited the financial statements, correct?

Xavier Calvez: Yes.

(Elliott):   Great. So those statements, do they not contain a specific reserve on the balance sheet?

Xavier Calvez: Absolutely not, no.

(Elliott):   So where does that money sit on the balance sheet? Because this is the long back and forth we had in Barcelona. Where does that money sit on the balance sheet?

Xavier Calvez: In investment accounts for these funds that are remaining. That's what it should be.

(Elliott):   So then it is..

Xavier Calvez: It's vocabulary, (Elliott). There's a confusion between the notion of a reserve and the notion of a bank account or an investment account. So we have investment accounts and yes, those are audited. It's not a reserve for future costs that we are estimating to be X amount of dollars. It's simply the difference between application fees collected -- $362 million -- and…

(Elliott):   Well, now you've made a totally - you made it sound like a profit.

Xavier Calvez: No.

(Elliott):   Well, the relationship between the balance sheet and the income statement is revenues less expenses equals change to the balance sheet. This is all very simple. You know…

Xavier Calvez: (Elliot), please give me a second. I recognize you want to teach me accounting, but the point is…

(Elliott):   Sorry, no, hold on…

Xavier Calvez: …there's a program.

(Elliott):   …I don't want to teach you accounting. I want to hold you to where this money is, because I feel like it keeps moving around.

Xavier Calvez: I can show it to you. Can we move the slides please to the slide either 12 or 13, I don't remember.

(Elliott):   I don't want to teach you accounting. That was dismissive.

Xavier Calvez: Good.

(Elliott):   What I do want to do is not have semantics define this discussion. So let's go to the balance sheet. You show me.

Xavier Calvez: No, next slide, please. You are pointing out to a notion that was included in the application fee to ensure that the level of that application fee was sufficient to cover for risks. I'll finish. Just a second. Is sufficient to cover for risks. There is - that created a total amount of applications fees collected for the program of $362 million. There is then a set of costs that have been incurred by the organization to (unintelligible) to evaluate the applications.

That amounts to -- projected until the end of the program in the future - that's not done today -- about $290 million of costs. And therefore there is a remaining gap. I think you are thinking that the notion of covering for potential litigation costs. Eight years ago it resulted in the creation of an account in which that money was put. That was not the case.

(Elliott):   I think we should look at the language from the program.

Xavier Calvez: And I have. Believe me, I have.

(Elliott):   It very clearly took 50% of the application fee - I'm not going to say set aside, but attributed it to litigation risk. That's fine. Here we are. It was a $68 million number. I know originally it was a much higher number than that. You're telling me is currently a $68 million number. Okay. What was the $68 million number you referenced?

Xavier Calvez: It's the difference between the total application fees collected and the expected total cost (unintelligible).

(Elliott):   Understand. That's great. I'm - let's use your definition. Okay. In this budget, how much money -- in the budget that you've tabled now -- how much money will be spent on the previous program?

Xavier Calvez: You mean the current program?

(Elliott):   The - I'm not talking about the next round.

Xavier Calvez: The 2012 round is what you're saying the previous program.

(Elliott):   That's right, yes.

Xavier Calvez: You mean - so in which current year? Now, tomorrow?

(Elliott):   I call it previous program because I've been selling those names for a number of years now.

Xavier Calvez: I understand. So we are planning to have $15 million spent, including refunds.

(Elliott):   Did you say 50?

Xavier Calvez: Fifteen.

(Elliott):   Fifteen, and what's a refund?

Xavier Calvez: Including refunds. Refunds of applications that are withdrawn.

(Elliott):   And other than refunds, what's that money being spent on?

Xavier Calvez: So there is a number of costs relative to…

(Elliott):   Sorry, let me ask it differently. How much of the $15 million is refunds?

Xavier Calvez: Six.

(Elliott):   And $9 million is being spent on the previous program? Talk about that a
                    little?

Xavier Calvez: Sorry, I didn't catch…

(Elliott):   What is that $9 million for?

Xavier Calvez: There's the personnel cost associated with the processing of applications
                    (unintelligible). There's 50 applications left. Those are in the applications that
                    take a lot more of the time. I'm happy to provide more details and expansion
                    on costs incurred (unintelligible) program. There's a number of (unintelligible)
                    costs pertaining to the program.

(Elliott):   So it's $180,000 this year to review - $180,000 per application to review 50
                    applications?

Xavier Calvez: I'm sorry I didn't (unintelligible)…

(Elliott):   Nine million divided by…

Xavier Calvez: I don't understand what the 185 is.

(Elliott):   Hundred and eighty. A hundred and eighty-five, we all understand, was the application fee.

Xavier Calvez: Right.

(Elliott):   A hundred and eighty was $9 million being spent to review the applications, 50 was the number of applications. So I just divided.

Xavier Calvez: Yes, understood. But no, it's just 50 applications. The program contains for example (unintelligible) has nothing to do in total with the number of applications.

(Elliott):   How many if you just had to look forward, there's 50 applications left. Will they all be reviewed in this budget? Like, of that 50, how many do you propose to review?

Xavier Calvez: All of them.

(Elliott):   So then in the 2021 budget, there will be no applications left to review?

Xavier Calvez: Likely not, correct. But that depends of course of what is going to happen to those 60 applications. It's not our decision to - that they are withdrawn and so on.

(Elliott):   But you've budgeted. Look, you know, again, I think everybody in this room, you know, they prepare a budget every year. They make their best guess. Some things are higher. Some things are lower, of course. In this budget you're saying you've planned -- you hope -- to go through the 50 applications this year.

Xavier Calvez: When you say this budget, which budget?

(Elliott): The one you're tabling?

Xavier Calvez: No, this is not the budget. This is the funds under management. But the budget for FY '20 is not assuming the end of the program by the end of FY '20, no.

(Elliott): You used the $15 million number. What period did that apply to?

Xavier Calvez: FY '20.

(Elliott): Great. That's what I'm talking about, okay? So does that $15 million contemplate reviewing the 50 applications that are left?

Xavier Calvez: I can't tell you that because we don't know how many of these applications will be either processed or withdrawn or terminated for whatever other reasons. We don't budget for…

(Elliott): I'm not asking you to tell me what's going to happen. I'm asking you to tell me what you've budgeted for.

Xavier Calvez: Which is it what I'm telling you. We - I'm not - we are not specifying which applications will be withdrawn at point of time, for example.

(Elliott): You said, which. I'm saying how many. They're very different things.

Xavier Calvez: We don't schedule…

(Elliott): I'm not holding you to…

Xavier Calvez: We don't budget to how many, (Elliott).

(Elliott): Would you - you're leading the budgeting process, as the CFO, yes?

Xavier Calvez: Right.

(Elliott):   Great. Are you using the estimate of the number of applications to be reviewed in preparing your budget?

Xavier Calvez: For certain costs, yes.

(Elliott):   Great. How many did you use as an estimate?

Xavier Calvez: As being completed within the fiscal year 2020? I don't remember the number but it as something like 10 to 20. Sorry? It was 10 or 20 or something like that.

(Elliott):   So you're going to do 10 or 20 this year and that's going to be the $9 million.

Xavier Calvez: It depends on what's going to happen with those applications - hold on, let me finish. You're assuming that I decide what happens on which applications when. What I'm trying to finish in saying if you don't mind not interrupting me is that the life of the applications at this stage are dependent upon the decisions that are the amount of work performed by the organization on daily basis.

It's (unintelligible). It's auctions that get resolved. It's IRPs that get to a point of completion where then the applicants decide at that time what they want to do. It's not anymore how much processing we're passing on these applications on a daily basis, which is why we cannot predict what is going to happen with these specific applications, and therefore at what point of time they will be withdrawing and therefore at what point of time they will come out of the number of applications that we deal with.

One second. The volume of work is not at this stage anymore based on the life of those specific applications, driven by the volume of work that we carry

out on those applications. Because it could be an IRP we spend for example on one application, one, $8 million. Yes.

(Elliott):   I'm asking you…

Xavier Calvez: No.

(Elliott):   I'm asking you for your assumptions. I'm not putting words in your mouth. I know that you don't know. I am happy to provide you with whatever latitude you want. I'm asking you what assumptions you made in coming up with the $9 million number. And all of it is in service to trying to get a sense of when you have run through this.

Xavier Calvez: If that would have been your question that would be helpful to have.

(Elliott):   The (unintelligible) $68 million.

Xavier Calvez: No.

(Elliott):   So all of this is -- I'm saying for me -- this is in service to trying to figure out when the work is completed and what the pot of money left might be. (Unintelligible) question what I'm asking is what were your assumptions that went into the $9 million?

Xavier Calvez: So I suggest then that we look together at the budget for the new gTLD program that we currently have, that we pull these assumptions that we have used, which will then let you be able to have comfort or not on the fact that there's $68 million left for risks coverage or not. And that you'll draw your opinion. What I'm trying to say -- what I was trying to explain before -- is that there is no specific reserve as per se pot of money sitting other than the $112 million or $98 million at either date of application fees unspent, of which we are currently estimating that it would be $68 million left once all the costs of the application reviews would have been completed.

(Elliott): So it's just gone into the general treasury.

Xavier Calvez: No.

(Elliott): Like, it's gone into the - it's just sitting on the balance sheet. There's nothing specific to it.

Xavier Calvez: It's segregated just for the program.

(Elliott): It is segregated.

(Graham): I'm not saying we're done on this, but there are unfortunately other things we need to cover. And I know you guys have a piece on local payments that I think is pretty interesting to people, and we're already over time. So if we can just distill that down, and then let's set up another conversation to finish that out because I do think it's important.

Becky Nash: Thank you, (Graham). If we could go to slide number 22. This section here is just an update on the overall billing and payments process. We just wanted to highlight that we have on our website a quarterly update as it pertains to several process improvements that have been worked upon or are in progress currently as it relates to the overall billing process.

And again we encourage members to go look at our website under payments and billing and we have this roadmap just highlighting ongoing projects that will result in more efficient invoicing, automation of the emailing of invoicing, and then eventually automation of the billing contacts for registrars as well. So if we could go to the next slide please.

Xavier Calvez: So the document that Becky just showed is an update that we provide on the Web site, for those of you who are interested there's a billing and payments page on our Web site. If there is more information that you would like to

know, we have leveraged response that we provided to the complaint of a year and a half or two years ago to provide a comprehensive view of a number of improvements on billing.

And that's what is on that page on an ongoing basis over the past couple of years. We have a number of either registrars or registries individuals have shared in the past a number of questions on practical issues relative to payments. And some are a little bit related. I would suggest we talk quickly about both the bank fees and the currency other than USD, because I think that there's a number of you who are based outside of the US who issue payments to ICAN for your invoices in the currency of course in which your bank accounts are set.

And it so there is international bank transfer fees that are incurred by you or the registries to pay ICANN's invoices, like any other business is incurring the same type of fees when you do the international payments. So I think that there was it was a certain amount of ideas relative to how do you avoid that? Of which why doesn't ICANN open a bank account for example in Europe? Thinking that that would resolve the issue.

So it doesn't. We've had a bank account in Europe for a long time. But the issue that we have is that the tax status of ICANN, of a tax-exempt organization and a nonprofit does not let itself collect - let me rephrase. In the jurisdictions other than the US, we cannot collect revenue -- what is described as revenue -- as nonprofit organizations in liaison offices in those jurisdictions.

So we have an office in Belgium. We have a bank account in Belgium. But we cannot receive funds and revenue in that bank account. So - and that's because of the tax status, the VAT application that would result from that, and the translation of that tax status locally onto the overall tax status of ICANN.

However, there are potentially other solutions to address the need that would want to look at, and that could allow registries or registrars outside of the US be able to issue their payment to ICANN in the currency of their choice while ICANN would receive the corresponding amount of dollars and with also avoiding the international bank transfer fees.

So what I propose we do because of the time limitation is that we provide a briefing on what that solution could potentially be, because I actually believe that it addresses the concerns of local currency, of international bank fees, while allowing still ICANN to receive the funds in the currency of the contract. I think we have a question from (Mikele). That's okay, (Graham).

(Mikele): Just very briefly, if you could take payments - it's (Mikele) for the record. If you could take payment by credit card, I'd stop harassing you. And I think several of the other European registrars are probably in a similar position. Because at the moments -- and I've told you this repeatedly -- if you send me an invoice for below a certain sum or you do some kind of adjustment, it's probably more cost effective for me to wait until I'm in the ICANN offices and to give you cash than it is for me to send you the money via wire transfer. Because I'll get hit with, like, a 30 or 40 euro per transaction fee.

And if I'm paying you an adjustment of $10 or something like that it's just totally pointless.

Xavier Calvez: Understood. So that's why we had listed credit card payments. When you said that I saw other heads nodding as well. So I suspect there's an interest in the credit card payments from others as well. So okay, understood. So I think that we'll - then this is why we wanted to be able to engage a little bit on this topic because we can work on the solution for local currencies, but if it's easier than that we work on the notion of credit card payments, then this is something that we can prioritize.

Okay. The one thing that I want to make everyone understand on the credit card payments is that you're interested using it is because there's also to some extent, one, a logistical ease to do so. Two, there's also rewards on the credit card systems which result also on the other side in a cost. So this is why we currently have a limitation on the amount of payments that we accept by credit cards, because of course that triggers a cost for ICANN, which is in the - between 1.5% and 3% depending on the type of payments that we receive.

But we will come back to that topic then on the basis of that feedback. And we are trying to see the same feedback from the registries, but I think it's less a matter of what type of contracted party you are and more a matter of where you're located that triggers that need. So I'm assuming we'll have a similar type of feedback. Thank you.

(Graham): Thank you. Who has - we're grossly over time, right? Anyone have very quick pieces? (Mikele) again, lickety split?

(Mikele): Thanks, (Graham). Xavier, I think this is very helpful. I think it's also helpful that, you know, you guys have been making incremental improvements to some of the kind of invoice processing. I mean, this - the idea that you would physically send out hard copy invoices - just bizarre.

The one question I do have for you is with respect to ICANN travel support, if the disbursements (unintelligible) is that something was handled by you guys or is that handled by them and on their behalf? It just seems to be a little bit of inconsistency with respect to the notifications that they send or don't spend. And that's - it's just because for some of us it's just we were trying to kind of line stuff up internally afterwards.

Xavier Calvez: Sorry, I didn't fully understand your - the subject of your question.

(Mikele):   I'll make it simple. I'll talk to you separately, then I won't - because (Graham)'s going to beat me over the head.

(Graham):   Okay, I think we can wrap up with finance. That conversation is clearly not over, and we need to tease that out, so I think we've got understanding on both sides. So we'll need to set something up.

Xavier Calvez: May I suggest that after (Elliott) I have had a chance to sit down as much as we think we need to address the questions and the points that then we come back, and I am happy to work with (Elliott) to come back to this group at maybe next meeting to provide a comprehensive briefing that then addresses that the information if not the points.

(Graham):   Yes, and so that would be great, because I think you heard exclusively from (Elliott) there, but I have actually quite a bit of back channel going that there is a substantial number of people in the room who are very interested in the outcome of that conversation. So let's make sure that happens, please and thank you. Thank you for joining us.

                Okay. Who - what is next? What am I doing? What are we doing, guys? What are we doing? Quick compliance group update. Greg, (Christian), who wants to take that?

Greg DiBiase: Super quick, just a reminder that…

(Graham):   Names.

Greg DiBiase: Oh, sorry. Greg DiBiase for the record. Just a reminder, we have a thing called a compliance subgroup, where if you are having an issue with compliance you can email us, and we will bring these issues to ICANN as a group. I recommend everyone in this room to join we've had a lot of productive activity. This last meeting we raised several issues to ICANN about things we're seeing.

One was a thing we've continued to see which, is timing and the lack of a quick response. And they said they're working on it. I think the takeaways to know is that we asked about how they're enforcing the (unintelligible), if they're just forwarding on emails. And they said, they're receiving a lot of complaints, but they've consolidated them into single queries to registrars. So they've sent one, I guess, long notice generally what you are doing (unintelligible), and that's how they've been handling the (unintelligible).

Two, we had an issue seen by many registrars that ICANN was sending them notices for redacting the registrant org field which as it may contain personal data that there was a strong opinion that that was not proper and that was also discussed in the EPDP in parallel. ICANN said that they would revisit that determination now that the EPDP recommendations are out. And I'm pretty sure that means they're not going to try to enforce that.

Man, do I want to go into the whole privacy proxy? Well, I'll say that last. Okay, then the last thing I want to note is that there are changes to compliance generally, at least from a staffing perspective. (Maggie) is no longer with ICANN, and (Jen) is moving to legal. And they noted they'd be receptive to sharing our ideas on how they can improve their processes and maybe general philosophy towards compliance. So we've actually - I've already got a lot of good suggestions on the complaints subgroup list. I'll send that out to the list generally.

And I welcome your participation. And we can send a friendly letter to ICANN saying, you know, this maybe is a new starting point. Here are some different ways we think we can interact more effectively. Okay. Anyone have questions before I go on the privacy proxy thing, which will lead to the next?

Man 1:   (Unintelligible) for the record. On the topic of inconsistent interpretation of policy and contracts, did you talk about that with them? talks that's listen

Greg DiBiase: Yes. So, that was a big heading that we're seeing that, and the enforcement of registrant org was an example of that. Some registrars were saying that compliance was pursuing the issue. Some registrars are saying that compliance had dropped it. We saw an issue related to transfer in which the transfer was rejected for evidence of fraud. So, yes. We raised that issue generally. And I think the big picture idea there is we want a consistent opinion from ICANN on these things, and it shouldn't differ from registrar to registrar.

Man 1:   And did they give any kind of signal as to how they'd like to try and achieve that? With more transparency or anything?

Greg DiBiase: Yes, I think the best way to do that is that when we see an issue, we raise it as fast as possible to them and say, "Hey you need to give us what the rule is here that is going to be consistently applied to all registrars." Other than that they gave a vague statement that, you know, "We try our best to treat everything the same and be consistent."

(Christian Urban): This is (Christian Urban) speaking. Just to add on that, (unintelligible) quite often said that if you see something like this please come to me with this. And this is what the compliance subgroup does. We collect issues like this and especially was we see issues being handled differently. Like, we take them to ICANN, and, like, in front of maybe ICANN meeting where we have a meeting with compliance, we basically give them a long list of things that we would like them to answer at the meeting, so they are well prepared.

Compared to how meetings with compliance was three, four years ago where they were not prepared for the stuff we asked, and they always had to say, we will come back to that. So by doing in this way, they come prepared for this. And they see what we come with that just is handed inconsistently.

Greg DiBiase: Okay. So a specific issue that was raised in the group and it turned out that a lot of other registrars had a differing interpretation than compliance is that

compliance believes that if proxy or private service is enabled and underlying registrant is updated that does not trigger the change of registrant provisions in the policy.

So a practical application would be that if the registrant changed and they did not opt out of the 60 day lock the domain and the registrar locked the domain accordingly and prevented a transfer, that act of preventing a transfer is non-compliant under ICANN's current interpretation. They didn't say that they were going to change their interpretation, but they said basically we realize that this calls for further instruction. Did I get that right, (Reg)?

(Reg):   Yes, I wanted it raised in the public group because I wanted ICANN to hear from the registrars and for the registers to hear it from ICANN, so that it wasn't just all being filtered through me. It is specific to an issue that (unintelligible) that we're dealing with (unintelligible). I'm not trying to get you guys to solve my compliance tickets. I just want to have that issue in the public.

(Elliott):   I just want to clarify on that. I mean there's a distinction between privacy and proxy here, right? In privacy, the registrant - yes. So we should make that clear. Because..

Greg DiBiase: Sorry, I meant proxy services, which almost everything is a proxy service because most don't actually say the registrant's name. But yes you're correct.

(Reg):   It's the other way around. So…

Greg DiBiase: No, it's not.

(Reg):   No?

(Elliott):   Darcy?

Greg DiBiase: (Elliot) said I'm right.

Darcy Southwell: Well, if (Elliott) said you're right. This is Darcy Southwell. So I guess - and for those who weren't there yesterday, I think my biggest issue with this discussion is the fact that it feels to me like compliance is interpreting the transfer policy one way in this particular situation and interpreting a different way for another situation, which is when you have information in the public whose that's redacted for GDPR.

So I don't know how you can interpret the transfer policy differently for those situations when it does what it says. And so we can certainly talk about how we do this. I know we're running out of time today. But I would like to encourage us to consider, do we go back to compliance and ask them to explain to us very specifically, what is their interpretation of the transfer policy? Because they can't have it both ways. Like, it's one or the other.

And so I'd like to see that issue solved. It's a policy question. It's not - I mean, I know poor (Reg) is dealing with the compliance tickets, and that's frustrating. But it's a policy issue that - and it's a precedent I don't like. They don't get to play favorites. Thanks.

Greg DiBiase: Right and to be clear, I'm not accepting their final word of this is what we think. You know, we're sending follow-ups after this meeting and we're going to figure this out.

(Graham):   (Joyce), and then are you about done? Do you have more? Okay. So we have 11 more minutes before we have our next mandatory break and a bunch of stuff to cover, so.

(Joyce):   I think we were told yesterday that the compliance department is going to hire a team of consultants. And that really scares me because I don't know where the best sources that they can get it feedback from other than the registrar group. And the outside consultant come in here, set up all kind of rules and it

just going to make our job much harder. And (unintelligible) first (unintelligible) I think, and secondly they should really get our feedback -- our input -- first. That's just mine.

(Graham):   Thanks. I agree and I don't disagree with you. So, they definitely need our feedback. I think that's super important. I don't think ICANN -- when they realized they needed compliance desk -- had any idea what it meant to run a service desk of any sort. They were just, like, we need to do compliance and they didn't hire any expertise, and they haven't built up any it would seem in that amount of time.

And so I think sort of any reasonable outside consultant is going to look at them and their processes and just be like, "Oh, Christ. Jesus." And have to rebuild. Sorry if compliance is in the room. I like you all You're nice people. Oh my God. So I actually don't think that would be the worst, because our interactions with them and have never revealed any particular expertise in any of it so.

Sorry, (Owen). You're one of us now. Okay. I will say, you know, we pay $1000 a year to join this party and joining the compliance sub team makes that worthwhile, full stop, just that group. Plus all the wonderful lunches and things that you get. So please if you're not part of the compliance sub team and you would like to be, you should talk to Greg or (Christian_ and get on in there because it's great stuff.

Eight minutes. We need five minutes to wrap up a couple other things. We need to talk about privacy and proxy and sub pro in somehow three minutes. ICANN has requested that registrars extend again the privacy and proxy in-term thing. So James Bladel cleverly in the 2013 RAA set a sunset provision on when the in-term spec for privacy and proxy services would run out. And I think that was 2017.

James Bladel: Yes, that worked out great, didn't it? And so it was expiring, and we wanted to extend twice I think already. And we're not going to have to but we're going to either need to extend it again or let it lapse. I think we should entertain the idea of what would happen if we let it lapse. I - okay, so the whole point is that -- just for a little bit of context -- when we were negotiating 2013 RAA, ICANN showed up with a fully baked privacy proxy consensus policy and said, here this is going in your contract and we said, no way. Time out. Back up.

This is a community discussion. You can't just hand us the end product here. And I don't think I'm speaking out of school I think this is a well-known story. What we did do is we pared it back to just the bare essentials, put it into a specification. But to ensure that the specification didn't become permanent, we gave it a sunset date of three years ago, right? So it seems like the temp spec - I don't know if it served its purpose. I have no idea.

The sunset date definitely hasn't served its purpose if we just keep kicking the can every year. And then the final point of it is all of this is being swallowed up by the EPDP beast, so what's the point? You know, I think we should have that conversation with ICANN, of what's the point of continuing to renew this? Tell us what happens if this expires.

(Graham): Thanks, James. I don't disagree. I certainly don't think the sky is going to fall. I don't think anyone is going to materially change how they do anything. Volker and then last word on this because (unintelligible) then we need five more minutes for other stuff. And we're going to have to skip (unintelligible).

Volker Greimann: Basically I'm of the same opinion as James. However, we are currently in a very interesting situation where the implementation work on the privacy proxy working groups final result has stalled in a way or is not progressing, at least. I don't know the terminology ICANN is currently using. Paused, thank you. And one thing that could happen if we decide not to extend it is that ICANN suddenly feels an urge to unpause the entire thing.

Q: So we might have to weigh the alternatives here. A, continuing with the temp spec in good faith or just because we feel like it, because we're generous. Or B, be faced with the possibility that IRT is being restarted and the privacy proxy accreditation program with all the costs attached to it is something that's looming on the horizon again. That's the only potential risk that I see with not extending. Otherwise I would be entirely in James' camp.

(Graham):   Thanks, Volker. Real short, from Greg. Super - and then (Pam) and then…

Greg DiBiase: I mean, I guess..

(Graham):   We have a hard stop in four minutes, and we have a couple other things. So lickety split.

Greg DiBiase: Now I'm thinking about it, I think maybe we should think of this longer, because extending it - I don't see really any negative consequence. Not extending, it we give a talking point that the PPIRT needs to be opened right now. So I don't know.

(Pam):   I'm going with Greg. I think that's the least harmful consequences. This will come up at councils meeting tomorrow and I anticipate our councilors would freak out if we say we are going to propose continued pause of the IRT. Okay. I know we're going to do that, but I guess there's no point to stirs the pot any further. We just extends forward until end of 2020? Is that what (unintelligible) is proposing? Right?

James Bladel: I defer to the cooler heads.

(Pam):   It's harmless. That's my (unintelligible) thanks.

(Graham):   Until the completion of the (unintelligible). (Cyrus) has asked to extend. I'm sorry, we can't. I - so we need more discussion but ultimately you guys get to

decide. This is a thing we actually vote on. It's one of the very few issues because it's in our contracts that we actually run a vote And so we'll be doing that between now and April.

(Cyrus):   I was only going to throw out, why don't we propose 2025 at the good next period? That's an arbitrary point that we could reasonably accomplish it.

(Graham):   Three thousand? Let's just go full blast. I'm not - actually did that that would be pretty funny. (Zoe)'s got three things, I think, for us. In three minutes.

(Zoe):   Okay. So this is sort of new things and reminders. So tomorrow we were originally having a (unintelligible) meeting. This because it got opened up in the CSG is now open to anyone that wants to join. So this will go out in the reminders tonight. I'm just announcing it now. That is tomorrow at 10:30 to 12:00 time slot. The - and sent an email yesterday about this.

              The - what was scheduled for tomorrow morning 9:00 to 10:30 (unintelligible) so the public safety working group - that meeting that was scheduled for tomorrow morning has now been postponed until Thursday, 10:30 to 12:00. Again, I will send out another reminder tonight and tomorrow about that one.

              And finally of course we do have the registrar strategy planning meeting for Friday. The agenda hasn't changed. I'm still waiting on confirmation of the room. I hope to get that very soon. Just to say if you didn't RSVP and you're planning on coming I need to know that like yesterday. So, yes. Thanks.

(Graham):   Okay. So we've got a 15-minute break now and then the registries meet us in this room so we might want to clear a couple spots at the table, so they don't feel unwelcome. And then we'll need to - so then we meet for an hour and a half, and then we need quite a break because then we need to trot all the way over to (unintelligible) Hall to meet with the board. So slam a coffee and get ready to party.

(Zoe): Thanks, you can stop the recording. But just FYI, everyone that's in the AC room, you can stay in this. It's the same AC room, but they'll need to clear it as it's a new meeting. So you don't need to leave it.

END