ICANN
Transcription ICANN Kobe
GNSO RySG Membership Meeting Part 1
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 08:30 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

Donna Austin: Okay, good morning, everybody. Folks must have slept in or something or some other place to be. Welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting for Tuesday, 12th of March from ICANN 64 in Kobe. What I want to do is do a quick review of the agenda. It's a pretty substantive agenda that we've got for today. And it seems like there's been some things added by GDD that's taken me a little bit by surprise so if we could go through and see folks are comfortable with where this is going to go.

So David Conrad is supposed to be joining us at nine o'clock to go through – I don't know if folks will – there was a couple of blogs put out, maybe two weeks ago, came out on a Friday afternoon. There were some potential security threats to the DNS that ICANN had been focusing on so there are a couple of blogs that came out in relation to that.

And I know that David is running a session or John Crain, I'm not sure, this week on improving the security of the DNS ecosystem. So I think David wanted an opportunity to provide us with another view of that. And I've asked if he could stick around a little bit longer to give us an opportunity to engage with him on DNS abuse.

So that's a pretty open topic when we say DNS abuse, but we do have a session later today on DAR reporting, which Jim Galvin and Kristine will take

us through. But it's also an opportunity to ask some questions to David about that topic or, you know, others that you might have.

GDD, so RDAP implementation, SLA reporting requirements, obviously this is a recent – folks would have received their legal notice of the requirement for the implementation of RDAP. And thanks again to our RDAP Working Group that worked so hard to get the profile finalized. So it's an opportunity to have a discussion around that.

GDD Summit, so I understand that the GDD Summit, the agenda is in draft form. It's in pretty good form. I think I saw Karla come in here. I think what we need to understand is – I know session leaders have been identified but you know what the next steps so I'm hoping that we can have a little bit of discussion around that.

Contracted party satisfaction survey, I think most of us would have received that. RSEP improvements, I know there's, you know, Crystal and a couple of others have been working with – and Brian – have been working with GDD on that.

The proposed changes to the PIC DRP so this is something that started in January when Russ provided some information to us about as a result of complaints to the Complaints Office following one use of the PIC DRP process, they were recommending some changes. So we have some concerns here on a process level and potentially a substance level. And we sent, you know, we sent a note to Russ saying, look, we'd really like to understand the rationale as to where this has come from, why you're proposing these changes and why you think they're immaterial. So that information was provided by Russ, I think, I'm going to say a week, two weeks ago.

But as a group we haven't had an opportunity to discuss that yet, so I, you know, we probably – we don't have time as I see it to get into the substance

of that with Russ, but it will be good to get, you know, his take on what he thinks possible next steps are. But please bear in mind that I – as we work through this agenda I want to try to find some time later today so we can have that discussion because I know it was something that folks had – a number of folks had an interest in.

And then the Specification 11 change request process, so I know this is something that Cherie has, you know, posted a couple of times to our list about and I think if there hasn't been a session there will be a session on that sometime this week, so update on that.

Xavier and his team will come in with regard to financial updates. I've actually asked if we can have a little bit of a discussion about the registry comments that we had on the budget and I know there's an interest in some billing process updates.

So that's quite a bit to get through in an hour and 15 minutes but hopefully it'll be worthwhile. So our second session will be primarily led by Beth. And it's EPDP data protection work stream's focused. We thought it was important given the final report for Phase 1. It's been adopted by the Council but we have a conversation to understand there's a number of different parts that go with this EPDP, Phase 2, implementation of Phase 1. You know, how the TSG work fits into that and also, you know, RDAP is also an important consideration of that so we want to go through that as well.

We've got 90 minutes for that. Beth assures me she can do it in 12. But – she might be a little bit optimistic but we – if it's possible we might be able to carve, you know, 15-20 minutes out from there. I was going to say for the PIC DRP but, Jeff, you're in GAC from 10:30 today through to 12:00? Okay. So we won't put that there, but…

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Yes. Yes. So Jeff, when are you back in the room? What's your availability?

Jeff Neuman: I can be – well let me double check.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: If you can give me one minute I'll check.

Donna Austin: Yes, okay. So group photo at 12:00. Please don't leave and take a toilet break because that's going to hold us all up, so if everybody could – Sue, do you just want us on that side of the room? We'll have a quick photo and then everybody can…

Sue Schuler: Yes, it's going to be where the light's best.

Donna Austin: Yes. So we'll do a quick photo at 12:00. After the break we'll have an update from Elaine on the Customer Standing Committee. SSR2 Review Team requested a spot on the agenda so there's 15 minutes there. RDAP Pilot Working Group, you know, we could potentially switch that out, Jeff, if you want for PIC DRP, depending on Rick's availability, I'm not sure where you'll be during the day.

                  And then the GNSO Council update, so we've got a Council update under the second session, which will be primarily focused on the EPDP. And then there's another opportunity after lunch so anything that's left over so that's the split we'll have on that.

                  From 1:30, so as I said, Jim and Kristine have put together a – some work on the monthly DAR reports. I think because this is only a recent thing I think there's an opportunity for us to provide some feedback to, you know, John Crain and his team if we think there's value in doing that, but I think now is the time to do it rather than wait 12 months and see if we can change things. So Jim and Kristine have put some work together on that and there's some, I

think I sent that the list earlier today so if folks have had a chance to look at it that'd be great.

We had a really good workshop earlier in the week led by Sam on comment guideline workshop so Sam's going to run us through that. (Unintelligible) Working Group so Erica's giving a few updates during our calls and there's a number of substantive steps that we have to take to finalize that work, but there are I think two substantive issues that you want to talk about during that session.

And then the ATRT 3 has recently kicked off. Pat Kane and Erica are our representatives on that group and understand Pat is one of the co-chairs along with Cheryl Langdon-Orr so there's an opportunity there for them to give us, you know, obviously it's early days but will be great to hear from them on where we're going.

And then the CPH Membership meeting, we will – this joint meeting is actually in their room and we understand that's going to be nice and cozy. We, you know, we could try to make a change but I think there's somebody in this room at that time so we're going to have to go over to wherever the Registrars are, I'm not sure where that is.

Topics for Board discussion, so the Board actually asked or SGs, Cs, SOs, ACs, a number of questions and also asked for topics that we wanted to discuss. So we did respond to that – I'm sure I shared it at some point. The topics that we have for discussion were the budget, which I think Jonathan will probably lead that, they're budget related, and then also ICANN's kicking off – you would have heard about it yesterday from Cherine and if you were at the strategic planning session yesterday they're kicking off a discussion around governance and they're starting that this week.

And our question is why now? Given there's so many open projects that we need to finalize ,well, I think it would be good to finalize all the outstanding

work before we started another substantive discussion. So that was our question to the Board. And I believe the Registrars have done the same thing so we in fact got that conversation with the Registrars, CPH EPDP team update.

Tech Ops update, so that – the Tech Ops group I think has met this week on Monday so an update from them. And then a discussion around the Technical Study Group, so I understand the Registrars are having Ram and his team provide, you know, an overview of the Technical Study Group so it's an opportunity for the Registrars to share with us, you know, what they heard and where they think that's going. And then we break at 1645 and then we've got the session with the Board. So it's a pretty full day.

I think the – working through that I know we do want to find some time to have substantive discussion about the PIC DRP but I'm just interested, is there any other topic that we've missed that folks think it's important that we talk about during today? Yes, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, Donna, it's Jonathan. I think there's two things, one – we can cover it under Registry business AOB to just talk about the next year's budget very briefly and really actually I don't think we're going to talk about anything of substance, just see if anyone would like to contribute to the work on doing that. I don't anticipate there'll be a massive change; there'll probably be a handful of items. I'll probably rope in the ExComm to be involved there but if anyone want to be actively involved in that we'll make a call to just let us know that.

And on the topics for the Board discussion, we did send something to them in writing, didn't we, so we'll want to refer back to that and see what we said, okay. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Anyone else? Okay we've got nine minutes, guys, anything you want to talk about? Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Just to follow up on your question, if there's any way to move the PIC DRP substantive discussion to during the working lunch session that would be great and move something up. But that's probably the best time or if there's other times this week that people can get together that are interested, but I'm sorry, I have to step out, the GAC picked today to discuss some new gTLD stuff and asked me as part of SubPro to be there.

Donna Austin: Okay, so we'll tentatively put PIC DRP in that lunch session and Rick, maybe we can move the RDAP Pilot Working Group to another time or maybe we'll cover off what we need to cover during the EPDP update anyway.

Rick Wilhelm: As long as it's before lunch I'm good. It's for RDAP?

Donna Austin: Okay, so I think maybe we'll just accept that the RDAP update we'll do as part of the EPDP update anyway, probably make sense there.

Jonathan Robinson: Just on that – just responding to the part – it's Jonathan for the record. Jeff, what's the GAC's focus? Is there a particular focus they're after on the SubPro or is just generally an update and you updating as chair, they asked you to answer specific questions or issues?

Jeff Neuman: So I think – they're not very clear but I think it's just more on how can we communicate during the time between now and Marrakesh and set up maybe time – a process to work with the GAC so that they can give us more timely feedback as we get closer to the final report. But it is the GAC so they could throw anything in at any time.

Donna Austin: Edmond.

Edmond Chung: Edmond here. So I don't know whether we will have time but I mentioned this in the public forum yesterday and I think that we should pay a little bit of

attention to it in the next few months I guess. This issue of IDN variant TLDs, the staff seems to – staff put a paper that basically says each IDN variant TLD would be an application on its own which is a bit absurd for me and also each IDN variant TLD would be – would have a separate Registry Agreement. I think that's very strange for registries.

That basically means that IDN variant TLDs are not really variants anymore, it's a completely separate TLD application. I think that's really wrong so I don't know when we might be able to talk about this but I think we should talk about it and then make sure that that thinking goes away.

And all the previous recommendations on the subject actually from both GNSO and ccNSO has been quite consistent on this matter that IDN TLDs should be one application for – and include a number of IDN variant TLDs and that's, you know, that staff paper would have kind of reversed that – those policy recommendations.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Edmond. That staff paper – I don't understand where that's coming from. Is it a GDD issue or is it a…

Edmond Chung: It's called IDN Variant TLD Implementation something, recommendations, that was the paper that was put out and finalized in February earlier this year.

Donna Austin: Okay. Maybe we can ask Russ about that. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. I agree, it should be discussed, but I'm going to ask if you can actually coordinate with Rubens and get that into SubPro because I think that's really where it belongs. And part of the charter of SubPro is to consider the output of that work that's been going on. So rather than – and I heard your comments yesterday, rather than deal with it as a completely separate subject, there is a natural intersection that we're supposed to pay attention to anyway.

Edmond Chung: Except that it affects the current round as well because IDN TLDs that have a variant identified. So this is not only for the subsequent procedures, it's also…

Jeff Neuman: But they would have to be applied for in a subsequent procedure unless something else – unless there's a PDP that says otherwise because there's no other process for introducing new gTLDs.

Edmond Chung: No, no, but existing IDN TLDs would have listed variant TLDs in their original application. There just hasn't been a process of activating those variants. And in the previous round the recommendations have already been there and therefore in the application it was one application and listed all the variant TLDs. That is what the staff paper is suggesting to almost change, right.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Edmond. So Russ, I don't know if you know anything about that but maybe you could have a think about it? Thanks. So I guess we'll kick off – David, Gustavo, thank you for coming. So I know you wanted to talk to us about improve the security of the DNS ecosystem, but if we could have a little bit of an exchange on DNS abuse I think that might be helpful as well, so I'll hand it over to you.

David Conrad: When I touched this mic this morning it gave me a little shock so I presume that's just to wake me up for this morning with the Registries Stakeholder Group. Yes, so as I'm sure you're all aware, we've been sort of loosely involved in some attacks very recently, referenced in the press as DNS hijacking, also DNS-pionage, registration hijacking, so it has multiple terms.

And one of the things that it's highlighted has been a challenge in the context of security for the ecosystem. You know, many times when we talk about security in the context of ICANN we refer to DNS SEC while DNS SEC is a useful tool and in particular in the set of attacks that have been ongoing, it did mitigate a – one particular vector of attack.

The problem is actually larger in scope and in scale. The attacks that are – that were referenced in the press and which are still ongoing were targeting essentially registrar credentials to gain access into registry databases via EPP. And they were fairly successful.

So we, within the organization, are trying to figure out how we can facilitate the discussion about improving the ecosystem security trying to identify best practices, trying to encourage people to follow those best practices and it' beyond just telling everyone to, you know, please enable DNS SEC or sign your zones; it's also looking at things about deploying, you know, multifactor authentication, ensuring strong passwords, having password rotations to ensure that passwords get updated very frequently, applying system patches, just basic cyber hygiene kind of things.

And we would be very interested, my group in particular would be very interested in working with the Registry Stakeholder Group to try to, you know, come up with mechanisms, methods, processes, policies, anything that you want to think of that will help encourage people to basically ratchet up the level of security so that the attacks that we've seen and are continuing to see can be mitigated to some extent.

And I'm happy to answer any questions that I can answer because we're sort of constrained by some confidentiality in some of these discussions with regards to the attacks. But, you know, I'm very much interested in working with the Registry Stakeholder Group and the Registrar Stakeholder Group to try to sort of improve things in terms of security. And with that I'll pause.

Donna Austin: Thanks, David. Any questions for David? Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Yes, two comments in this aspect. One is that although DNS SEC mitigated one of the threat vectors in those cases, it was most likely just to – lack of knowledge of DNS SEC on the part of the attackers because they could have removed the DNS SEC delegation, they had the credentials to remove that,

they just didn't. So and I don't think they will make that same mistake again. So it's not that DNS SEC helped a lot in that.

The other that one thing that registries could do in this regard is expand offering of registry lock type services. That would have helped in these attacks. It would need to be, as I mentioned, registry lock-like because registry lock currently has some intellectual property from VeriSign preventing deployment by other registries.

But just pick a different mechanism and deploy the same idea with different tools and it work. It's possible the most registries could do that to improve because beyond like credential management is a more of a registrar action so it's more on their side to implement that, but on our side that what could help in this problem.

David Conrad: Yes, one of the things that we discovered, ran into, when we were starting to look at the mitigations associated with these particular attacks was that the definition of registry lock varies quite widely and some implementations may not be particularly effective for mitigating this attack because it was turned on via the registrar. You would go into your registrar portal and then turn on registry lock and if your registry is – registrar is compromised then, yes, all bets are off.

I do want to note that the attacks were sort of multifaceted, had a number of different methodologies. DNS SEC, the one particular because I think you're referencing where the bad guys forgot to remove the DNS record, was indeed a situation in which, you know, if they had thought about what they were doing they probably would have been able to get around that particular DNS SEC mitigation.

However, there have been rumors of other vectors of attack compromising the secondaries of name servers because the bad guys were able to get

credentials across a wide raft of things and then be able to go in and modify secondaries.

So one of the other best practices, or, you know, advisable practices or whatever words you want to use would be to be very careful in your distribution of your name servers for your zones having name servers in bailiwick is better than spreading them out across multiple zones because you're increasing the attack area. So there's – those are the sorts of discussions that I think it would be very useful to have in the context of improving the ecosystem security as a whole.

And there is just a note – there is a session on Wednesday from 11:00 to 12:30 I believe, that's entitled Coming UP with Best Practices for Improving Security in the DNS Ecosystem. It's being led by Merike Kaeo from the ICANN Board and hopefully people will be able to participate actively, you know, engage in discussion on this particular topic.

Rick Wilhelm: Rick Wilhelm, VeriSign. Just a quick one for Rubens. VeriSign does indeed have some intellectual property related to registry lock, but as also – but it's highly targeted around a specific implementation and as David notes, it does not prevent numerous other registries in the ecosystem from deploying versions of registry lock which seem to work in the marketplace.

So I just want to be clear that there's nothing that VeriSign is doing regarding its – any intellectual property that it has that is preventing innovation in this area and would be thus leading to any negative side effects in the ecosystem. Just getting that out there. Thanks, David.

Donna Austin: I don't see any other hands up. So, David, in your mind how do we move forward with this and how do you intend to do the engagement? Obviously there's a session this week but if you're talking about development of best practices how's that going to work in reality?

David Conrad: So we haven't really had time to sit down and think about sort of the best strategy for it. I guess one of the thoughts that we'd had was for us to basically come up with a strawman set of ideas about how to improve the ecosystem security and circulate that within the various stakeholders and constituencies for input. I'm sensitive to the interests in not creating or trying to minimize the amount of additional work and cost and expenses that people might incur.

You know, security is one of those things that if you have an infinite amount of money then you would probably be able to improve security a little bit but we want to try to identify things that are – get the most bang for the buck and then work with the various communities to figure out which are practical and feasible to sort of encourage.

We're also looking at various monitoring approaches to – so that we can provide more information to the community when we are, you know, when we're able to see various attacks. And one of the aspects of the particular attack that's going on was that name server addresses would change and in theory, if we had sufficient monitoring capability then something like that could have been detected and we could have been able to, you know, forewarn people that, you know, something odd was happening.

So that's another area that we're looking at. So at this stage, you know, the approach we'll probably take and we're happy to listen to any suggestions anyone might have, is to draft up sort of our thoughts, the Office of the CTO thoughts on what security measures would be interesting to take to try to improve the security. It's, you know, leveraging like (NIST) documents and SSAC advisories and those sorts of things so it's wildly unlikely there's be anything new. And then just try to get a discussion started within the community on how to move forward.

Donna Austin: Thanks, David. Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I would suggest conversations with RIRs in detection of DNS hijacking actually because other than they – nobody actually know what's going on in the world with IP address.

David Conrad: Yes, obviously we'll want to coordinate with all the different parties within the ecosystem more generally. It's – since everyone sort of relies on the DNS, you know, when you say the DNS ecosystem that's sort of - casts a very wide net.

Donna Austin: Thanks, David. Just one suggestion, you know, I saw the blog when it came out and I thought this is important but I didn't really understand why because there didn't seem to be much context. But I think what might be helpful in the future if these things come out maybe just – if there's a point of contact within our group that provide that – even if you forward it to Russ and Russ can get it to me and then we can get it to the list with some kind of contextual background, I think that might be really helpful as a starting point.

I would encourage folks to attend the DNS – the session that David's referred to on Wednesday if at all possible. We do have a CPH Tech Ops group with the Registrars. I don't know if this is something that they could potentially take up but perhaps we already have some avenues that we might be able to assist in feeding information and starting to think about this stuff as well.

Anything else on that topic?

David Conrad: No, thanks very much for the interest. I mean, this is something that can impact everybody. And actually one of the things – just to add – one of the things that we discovered in some of the discussions with some TLD administrators is they didn't fully understand the impact of having the registry compromise via the registrar an – EPP – too many acronyms going on right now in my brain.

And the fact that if the top level domain is able to be compromised in some way then everything under that top level domain, all the customers, are also relatively easily vulnerable to man in the middle type attack. So that's something that, you know, I think as more people understand the implications of where they sit within the DNS hierarchy it can get sort of scary if you start thinking about it.

Donna Austin: Thanks, David. So on DNS abuse, so a few, I don't know, maybe six weeks ago I went down to catch up with Russ and I also had the opportunity to talk to David and John Crain, and I reflected on the fact that, you know, as a stakeholder group we feel that, you know, the DNS abuse discussion is happening all around us within the community but we're not part of that and we would like to engage in that.

And David was a little bit taken aback I think that, you know, we seem to have changed our position because David was a little bit sensitive given he was involved with the security framework discussion. So I guess, you know, we are interested in being engaged. We think it's in our interest to, you know, be engaged in this discussion with the community rather than being on the backend of these things, so that's where we're – if you can give us, you know, kind of overview of, you know, what you're doing in OCTO.

And also note that later on today Jim Galvin and Kristine Dorrain are going to lead a discussion on the monthly DAR reports given it's something that you're going to do on a monthly basis, we're going to have a look at it and, you know, if we think there's value in providing feedback early on in the piece that's what we're going to discuss later today.

David Conrad: Excuse me. So currently as you're aware we've been publishing the monthly DAR reports. We're very interested in getting any feedback whatsoever on how to improve those reports. One of the goals of those reports is to provide information about sort of a baseline of what the network operational world is

seeing in terms of abuse across sort of an aggregate statistical view of abuse across the domain name name space.

And the next sort of step in that process is to make available to the registries a access to information about their particular abuse statistics as seen through the DAR process, and information that we collect through DAR. And that would be made available through NAPI so that the registries who are interested in finding out where they are relative to the baseline could see that information and it would only be their information, it wouldn't show anyone else, and it's not something that would be made public in any way, although, you know, the information that we use in DAR is essentially public information through the various RPLs.

We're also planning on looking more closely at sort of the outliers that we see within DAR and then contacting those stakeholders, as registries or registrars, right now just registries because we can't get the registrar data, and seeing if we can provide help, you know, try to understand why they appear to be targeted by the bad guys, try to offer whatever information or, you know, assistance we can to help them, you know, address the fact that they're attracting the bad guys to their domain names.

And all of this is intended to try to move the needle on reducing DNS abuse in sort of a more active way. And as always we are very interested in whatever input the – we can receive from any of the stakeholders but in particular the Registry Stakeholder Group. And, you know, we will do everything we can to try to address the concerns and worries.

You know, I understand that there have been some concerns about the DAR program and its implications with regards to the registries, you know, we're trying to figure out how to address those concerns and reduce worries about what the impacts are and what information will be made available through DAR and that sorts of thing.

So I'm I guess mostly saying that I'd be very interested in input and again, sort of discussion particularly, you know, constructive suggestions on how to improve things, and how we can interact better with the registries in trying to address the DNS abuse issue.

Donna Austin: Maxim and then Rubens.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I have two small questions to David. The first – what kind of information is like those background baseline? Is it just numbers of the strings we think that something is wrong? And then, the second question, do you have a plan for the next I'd say framework of contracts which would allow you to use more – to give registries more (gradial) information?

Because as I understand currently you cannot share anything you get from those sources with the registries and thus we cannot do anything with this information.

David Conrad: So the information that – and we're still finalizing – John Crain, excuse me, will have more information about this, but we're still finalizing the – what information will be made available through the APIs. The – but my understanding is that that it'll be the average – well it'll be the individual registry's score in terms of reports of abuse averaged out and then compared to the baseline that's actually published within the DAR reports.

So you'd be able to, you know, whether it's phishing or malware or botnet command and control, you would be able to see, you know, your value compared to the baseline that's made public via the DAR reports. The information itself we are constrained by the licensing terms that we have with the various RBLs in making, you know, information – specific information available.

However, you know, the intent here is to provide basically a hint that, you know, this is where your organization is showing up in this particular array of threats that network operators are using to make decisions about things like email or blocking of particular websites. And if you want more information those sources are available if necessary.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. Two comments, one, is my long stand comment regarding spam, publishing spam statistics is like in publishing the number of trucks that passes on the road just because drug traffickers happen to use trucks to smuggle illegal drugs. Some of those trucks will be carrying illegal drugs, some of those trucks won't. But we are publishing statistics on how many trucks are passing for those roads just because some smugglers use trucks to carry through illegal drugs. So that's a content issue that's outside ICANN's mandate that skipped being published.

The second is that while I understand that those RBLs are used actually used by network operators, the fact that ICANN is publishing information based on those and getting those information sources more relevance and more credibility and that's a problem because they are opaque in nature so we can't verify the data, we can't verify their methodology, and while I understand that we can't change them, they are what they are, they are what they do what they believe is better for the network, the fact that we give them credibility is something of concern to the stakeholder group.

It has – the stakeholder group has many times positioned itself regarding this. And that still stands. Thanks.

David Conrad: With regards to your first comment, by analogy, the risk is that if a particular road is being driven primarily by drug traffickers it's not unusual, or not unheard of that the police will actually block off the entire road and force people to go to other places. In the context of, you know, ICANN, that translates into people simply stopping to use new top level domains, and that's not, in our view, the benefit of anyone.

So yes, spam itself is – can be seen as a content-related issue but spam is the primary vector by which most other threats, the DNS threats, are actually propagated. So as such, we see it as a leading indicator of problems that occur within the context of DNS abuse.

With regards to specific abuse types, and the RBLs, we have actually had some success in getting some of the RBLs to change their policies. One of our criteria in selecting an RBL for inclusion into DAR is that their processes and methodologies are actually published. If there are concerns about a particular RBL, please let us know and we will see what we can do to remedy those particular concerns. And if we're unable to then we will consider dropping that RBL from the DAR collection.

Donna Austin: Thanks, David. Any other questions for David? Crystal.

Crystal Ondo: Thanks, Donna. It's Crystal Ondo, David. I just wanted to say that I appreciate what your office is doing and I think there's an opportunity for registries who do their abuse monitoring or farm it out to talk to you so we can jive the reports you're seeing with the reports we're seeing and fill those gaps because there are gaps, Rubens mentioned some of them, but to make DAR better we need to help and that's on us so that your office understands how we view abuse, what we need, what we need to action it and why we think some of what you guys are publishing is not accurately reflecting the ecosystem in which we live.

David Conrad: Yes thank you. Thank you very much. I mean, DAR is sort of in its infancy and we're still trying to improve the methodology, improve the information that we're providing because ultimately the goal of DAR is to provide information to groups like the Registry Stakeholder Group to help facilitate both the policy development processes and also just how they go about doing things.

It's not intended to be punishment of any form, it's intended to actually be helpful and any way that we can improve it to make it more helpful we're very interested in pursuing.

Donna Austin: Thanks, David. And hopefully when we get to the discussion later on in the day that'll be the start of our process to provide that feedback back. Sue, I understand we're trying to get Ken Stubbs back on the phone. Have we got him?

Sue Schuler: We are connecting now.

Donna Austin: Okay. Any other questions for David? I think Ken Stubbs has a question he wants to ask you but I don't want to give it too long. But I thank you very much for your time in coming in. This is really important for us too and we do want to engage on a more regular basis about these topics so I think it's, you know, let's keep moving forward and, you know, we meet every other week so there's always opportunities that we can get you on calls if there's something that you really think that we should know about we can facilitate that. So, any luck, Sue?

Sue Schuler: He's on the line.

Ken Stubbs: Donna?

Donna Austin: Yes, go ahead, Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, hi. Very much appreciate the opportunity – hold on for a second. Yes. Pardon my ignorance, gentlemen, but why are we talking about so much of these issues – I won't use the word "publicly" but shouldn't this – a lot of this be discussed behind closed doors because what we end up doing is inadvertently just closing potential sensitivities.

You know, I would love to have somebody reassure me that the only thing we're seeing is the part of the iceberg that's sticking out of the water and that these issues, the serious parts of these issues are dealt with purely behind closed doors with high technology, members of the various registries and interest group. But I don't really see a necessity for transparency on a lot of these issues if they could expose us vulnerability-wise. Thank you for hearing me out.

David Conrad: Thank you, Ken. So if you're referencing the issues that I spoke about initially with regard to improving the security of the ecosystem, the attacks that are ongoing right now, as I think I mentioned, none of them are actually new; what's actually new is the target of attacks going higher up into the infrastructure and targeting critical infrastructure and not just – I should be clear, not just registries and registrars but they're also targeting Internet exchange points and telephone companies and governments and it's a fairly impressive in terms of the scale and scope of the attacks.

But none of them are particularly new. They've been known about some of them and known about for, you know, 15 years. What is relatively new is just the intensity, the focus of the attackers and at this point, you know, there are some aspects that are still being held confidential in order to not sort of giveaway how much knowledge is known about the attacks and that sort of thing, but by and large the attacks that are being referenced are things that are known and can be addressed one way or another but it does require concerted action, not just of particular subsets of the community but across the community as a whole.

So in that sense we need to be open to provide this information to people, you know, people have to choose strong passwords; registrars need to implement multifactor. None of that is something that is particularly sensitive and it's been known about for some time.

Ken Stubbs: Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks. Thanks, Ken. Jeff, I think David might be a little bit time pressured but…

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, I'll just do it really quick. For the DAR reports I know we're talking about later, but if we can see more of a breakdown, we kind of group all gTLDs together, and I think, you know, there are different types of TLDs that we recognize like brands, geos, and others, and I think if you started to narrow down a little bit more because right now you're sending a message through the DAR reports that there's a lot of abuse going on in gTLDs kind of all grouped together and I think what you'll find is that the abuse is really in only certain types of TLDs and not at all in others.

David Conrad: That's exactly the kind of input that we would love to have. We have received input that goes the exact other direction, that we should actually only provide aggregate statistics for all the TLDs that we have. We're happy to explore what works best for you all in that particular because. So, yes, very interested in having those discussions.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks, David. Thanks, Gustavo.

David Conrad: And I'm going to have to run to another meeting. Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Okay. Okay so we're going to hand over to Russ now for the GDD update.

Russ Weinstein: Thank you, Donna. Good morning, everyone. Thanks for having us. I'm Russ Weinstein from GDD, the Director of Registry Services and Engagement. Again, okay?

((Crosstalk))

Russ Weinstein: Graceful as always. Again thank you for having us. I think it's really important that we continue having these open dialogues and while we do them regularly at the ICANN meetings again, Donna, when there's things to talk about during your weekly calls let me know and we can facilitate whether it's GDD specific related things or whether it's, as we internally call it, the friends of GDD like OCTO and Compliance and Finance and things.

So I'm going to move this, this is awkward. So just want to make sure that we're available for you all and I'm not sure – I imagine Donna's keeping you up to date but we are talking on a very regular basis and it's working well I think.

Our agenda is here today, I'm going to let Gustavo start with the RDAP items because he's got to get over to the Registrar team as well. But if there's something on here or not on here that you want to talk about also please just raise your hand and we'll get it in for the time. So I'll kick it over to Gustavo so you can get going.

Gustavo Lozano: Hi. Gustavo Lozano, ICANN. So, yes, thank you, Russ. So this is the timeline that we have for the RDAP implementation. As you may remember back in August we sent the proposed gTLD RDAP profile for public comments. We received public comments, we also provided our public comments and after several months of hard work with the RDAP Pilot Working Group we finally published the RDAP profile in February, weeks ago.

This is a really important milestone that we have accomplished because this profile will allow interoperability between all these different implementations. On the same day that we published that profile, we also sent a legal notice to the contracted parties requiring implementation of RDAP. And the deadline for that implementation is the 26th of August. It's important to mention that ICANN will provide some webinars on April the 10th and 11th and the idea of these webinars are to go through the requirements.

Next slide please. And as was mentioned, these webinars are targeted for contracted parties so the idea is to have you there and go through all the requirements and if you have any questions we can resolve those questions during the webinar and if not obviously we'll take them back.

And I think that maybe project managers and developers that are working on the RDAP implementation should attend these webinars. And we assume that these persons will have basic knowledge on RDAP. Next slide please.

That registry boot-strapping, so as part of the work of the RDAP Pilot Working Group the group recognizes there is a need to have a centralized repository for registry base URL for RDAP. As part of the gTLD profile registries will need to populate a link element and that link element needs to contain the base URL for that registrar. So it will be a lot of work for all the registries to go to all the registrars to get that information.

So the idea is to have a central repository so you can, as a registry you can just go and get this file or this repository and from that file populate those links element. Next slide please.

And the important thing here is that by May 2019 ICANN will publish that repository so by May your teams will be able to get that file and start playing with it so that you're ready for August. Any questions? Yes.

Rick Wilhelm: So, Rick Wilhelm, VeriSign. Thanks for the announcement of the webinars, I didn't know about that. If the goal of that is to have technical teams on there and be able to ask questions it would be good to have some slides published in advance. If you're going to want questions from technical folks, they tend to the sort that like to digest thing in advance, reflect upon them and then they'll come back with questions. While they certainly do have the profile which they're digesting, if there's going to be any new – any new information at all published in those slides, getting those out in advance is going to be helpful. Thanks.

Gustavo Lozano: Okay, we will publish those in advance.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Gustavo. Donna Austin. So I guess I come at this from a slightly different perspective. It might be helpful if when you develop those slides that perhaps you could share them with Rick, who was the chair of the RDAP Working Group just to do a sanity check, I think that might be helpful as well if Rick doesn't mine of course.

Rick Wilhelm: Happy to help.

Russ Weinstein: Good suggestion, Donna. I think that's good that Rick and the GDD team stay connected on all things RDAP. We can move on then. Thank you, Gustavo. I'll let you go give this pitch to the registrars now. Next couple things are public service announcements. So we're getting excited to go to Bangkok in May for our next GDD Summit. We published an agenda, oh the slide didn't come out so good. We published an agenda recently with the collaboration of many on this group and as well as the Registrar group. That's available now online.

In addition to the GDD Summit in Bangkok there'll be these partner events going on, the Registration Operations Workshop on Thursday afternoon following the conclusion of the summit, the ICANN DNS Symposium the following two days, Friday and Saturday. I think – yes and then the DNS OARC the next two days after that.

And the DNS Symposium I know what I think they're working towards is trying to have at least that first day or part of that first day focused on more DNS abuse mitigation discussions so if you haven't booked your travel yet or you have a flexible arrangement please I would encourage you to attend at least that first day of that DNS Symposium. I think the second day is going to be more on emerging security technology related to DNS stuff that's way beyond my capacity.

There's a couple items in red here that I wanted to flag for the group. So we developed the agenda collaboratively with you all and thank you for that. It looks like there's one session that was proposed by the CPH that's still in need of a moderator and content developers. So that's the Making ICANN Policy Development Work for Business. I think we've talked about it on the lists but just want to make sure and push that because if we can't pull that together let us know, we'll juggle the schedule, we're working towards a final agenda published in 22 April.

The other item in red there is we've got high level session titles and I think we're looking for more fulsome descriptions just like we would for an ICANN meeting so people know more than the title of what they want to go participate in. It says 15 March there, I think we ended up pushing that to 27 March realizing 15 March is Friday this week. So please get those in to our team, Karla is the lead on that for us so Karla Hakansson for those who don't know, she's over there looking at me. Please get those in to our team by the end of the month essentially, 27 March so that we can get that agenda published.

The other item here is you know, in the past we've had some challenge with room sizing, sizing the right room to the topic and matching interest. To try and help us fix that we're going to send out a poll shortly after the agenda is published where you guys can essentially indicate your interest for what sessions – it's not a commitment by any means but if you help us by giving us what you think you'll be attending then we'll make sure and have the right sessions in the right rooms for capacity reasons.

As always in the front and back end of the summit we have time for one on one meetings with the GDD team so please take advantage of that. Any questions?

Donna Austin: Kurt has one.

Kurt Pritz: Hi. Kurt Pritz. I have two questions or a comment and a question. One is – been collaborating on a registrar for a presentation at one of the sessions, and the other guy kind of needs to know an answer pretty soon as to whether, you know, our participation will be accepted on the panel because airfare prices go up and company policies require some advance notice.

So we need some – I think some decisions about the population of panels before April 22 is required so people can make commitments. So I don't know the decision making process for this and what role the contracted parties play and what role ICANN plays, but we should look at accelerating that at least making commitments to those who are willing to participate.

And then, you know, I'd just like to learn from anybody in the room, or you, that knows what Making ICANN Policy Development Work for Business is, you know, who's the champion of that and what's it about? Because it sounds interesting as an interesting opportunity for us but it's sort of vague. So I don't know if anybody can talk to that.

Russ Weinstein: So I can try and take the first question. I think in terms of participation in the panels I think that's mostly something you guys are working out as contracted parties for the sessions you're leading. If it's one that I guess has ICANN tagged as the leader of it please let us know and we'll help make those decisions quickly. In general we welcome the support and the participation of the contracted parties in all the sessions.

Some of the – if – just one other thing that popped into my mind is for those who are planning on participating in panels or leading sessions, some of the feedback we did get as we were developing the agenda was please try and think about how to make your sessions non-lecture based and interactive discussions and so it's a challenge to do but it does make the event more beneficial to everyone I think to really engage. So Karla has a…

Karla Hakansson: Hey, Karla Hakansson. So just so you know, if you go to the link that you can't see that's up there right now, I can send you the link, every session except for the Making ICANN Policy Development Work for Business, has a speaker or moderator so that person can be contacted to say does the panel, you know, who should be on the panel and should they be going and for the airfare question. So I would encourage you to make that happen.

That's one of the reasons why we were pushing really hard to get all of the sessions determined by this date so that we would have that all of the trip planning questions available or answered at least by that point. So I would encourage you to do that.

As far as that one session, that came up from the 2018 GDD Summit survey, and as a high interest topic from the Contracted Party House. So that's where that originated from and then when we did the invitation for voting by session, that it also registered pretty high both on the Registry side as well as the Registrar side. So there is a high level description about it and I'm happy to take this offline, Kurt, if you want to look at it.

All of that information is again available at the link, you'll see different tabs in the workbook so you can peruse and see more information about it, but happy to take with whomever is interested about pulling that session together.

Donna Austin: So we have Kristine and Jeff in the queue, but I think what the missing piece is here is that those people that have been identified as, you know, responsible for moderating or whatever don't understand that they're responsible for pulling that together as well so they're empowered as the decision maker to decide who the panelists are. So I think that's probably the missing piece that we need to feed back as well so thanks, Karla. So Kristine and then Jeff.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. I just have a real quick question. Thanks, Russ. For the follow on sessions, the Registry Operations Workshop, etcetera, will there be ICANN or other remote participation opportunities there for those who are not going to Thailand?

Russ Weinstein: I do not know. I'm sorry, but we'll definitely get back to you on that one. We'll circle it back to Donna on the list so you guys can have it.

Donna Austin: Yes, there usually is; we don't know. The Registration Operations Workshop is not necessarily an ICANN one or it's a partnership one I think, with VeriSign…

Russ Weinstein: Yes, I think it's a joint event with VeriSign.

Donna Austin: Yes, it's a joint event with VeriSign, so.

Russ Weinstein: Yes, I imagine our – if our infrastructure is there it's going to stay there throughout the week but we'll get back to you on it.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. And this is quick too. There's a session on the agenda for Subsequent Procedures PDP update. It's got GDD as the lead. I'm pretty sure I'm going so I'd be happy to help out whoever is leading that.

Russ Weinstein: Thank you, Jeff. I'm pretty sure we'll take you up on that offer. All right. Okay next slide. Oh.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, about the, yes, nature of the summit, actually I tried both, yes, to participate and to work remotely, even if the sound is crystal clear and video is good, yes, it's more workshop-like kind of interaction and the value of remotely looking at what they're doing in that room is somewhat questionable. So if you send someone it would be better than trying just to see what they're doing. Thanks.

Russ Weinstein: All right. The next one, another service announcement, we just recently launched our annual Contracted Party Satisfaction survey. This is your opportunity to provide us feedback with how we're doing as GDD. We're partnering with the Media Group again this year, they're the ones who have helped us with this survey the last couple years. The feedback you'll provide is anonymous.

You got the email from an address that's not an ICANN address. If you don't think you got it – it only went to the primary contact for each registry and registrar. If your organization didn't get it let us know and we'll make sure we remedy that. We're really trying to drive up participation in this survey.

We've had I think last year's response rate was around 17% or so, trying to drive that up to 25% ideally even more but realistically speaking I think 25% is a really good goal for us to have and would encourage the registries and the registrars to participate in this.

We hope to be able to share top line results at the GDD Summit. What that'll – in order to do that we're not going to be able to extend the deadline so if there's a push to extend the deadline that'll be one of the consequences there. The survey itself is really fairly brief so should maybe take 10 or so minutes and there's a lot of opportunity to provide more thoughtful feedback beyond just multiple choice if you'd like as well and we always appreciate that.

Karla Hakansson: So just quickly, 71 people have responded, completed the survey so far out of 1026 invitations that were sent. So take a few minutes, you know, at your leisure today at lunch so please log in and take it, you have 20 more days to take it, so really appreciate the feedback and the input that you'll give. Thanks.

Dietmar Lenden: Hi. It's Dietmar Lenden. Can you hear me? Yes. Just a quick question, Russ, did the email go – if you are the primary contact and your email address is,

let's say, for 10 TLDs, were 10 emails sent out or was only one email sent out? I guess my first question. One email.

And then when you're responding, are you responding just as a primary address holder and not as the 10 registries because each registry might have a different response to the survey?

Karla Hakansson: Well if you're going to have the 10 separate TLDs but you're saying that only one contact is for each of those TLDs and they're having different experiences, I think that what's the one address that it's going to you're going to have to sort of collect the feedback across those, unfortunately. Now if that's the case and we're seeing, and I can check to see based on the TLDs that you have with addresses that it went to, so if that's a problem we can actually resend it if you need to capture that additional feedback. Do you want to connect after this?

Dietmar Lenden: Okay, cool. That'll be great.

Karla Hakansson: Okay.

Dietmar Lenden: Okay, yes thanks. Thank you.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. And I actually had a similar question but related. So for a registry operator, Amazon specifically, 52 TLDs, we respond one time and it gets counted as 52 to raise your number or it gets counted as one?

Russ Weinstein: It gets counted as one, but we already de-duped the list so we're looking at the percentage off the de-duped list, yes. Move along? Next slide. RSEP improvements, we wanted to provide an update on implementation of these improvements. So as you recall we've been working for a number of years discussing what's going on with RDAP and how do we implement it a little better. And came to agreement in the fall and since then just wanted to provide an update of where we're heading with that implementation.

So our target is to be able to launch that improved RSEP in June dialing it back what we've been working on so far has been reviewing and updating the documentation, things like the work flow and implementation notes. We're sharing those with the discussion group and we met on Sunday with the discussion group and had a productive chat there.

And then our next step is once we're comfortable with the documentation between ICANN and the registries, we'll go ahead and publish a blog post announcing these changes to the wider community and we'll inform the GNSO that we're doing this just in their role as RSEP is a policy but we're not affecting the policy we're affecting the implementation of the policy. But just want to make sure they hear it from us and not through a blog post and get caught off guard.

The action item I guess on that front for the stakeholder group is you all have councilors, please as councilors think about socializing this concept with your fellow councilors who aren't in these discussions and ensure this is well received update.

And then in May we'll provide more detail and training type information to how to use the new RSEP, quote unquote, and including a session at the GDD Summit. Any questions? Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Two comments, one of the GNSO Council aspect of this, I think there are possibly in rather safe areas with other CPH councilors with NCPH councilor that might be somewhat different, but that's a strategy that means the other councilors needs to figure out so when the time comes. And one is just to mention to the stakeholder group that during the RSEP discussions we end up flagging some possibilities for (MSA) improvements so just put a marker for us down the road looking to it possibly not now, I don't think in neither GDD or us have the bandwidth to now but possibly after during 2019 be a good time to look into it.

Russ Weinstein: Thanks, Rubens. Go to the next one. I think we can move on, you guys have these slides in the interest of time. So the other one I know we – Donna, you'd wanted to talk about was the PIC DRP improvements. There's the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Procedure that was developed back in 2014 as part of the new gTLD program launch. It's part of your contracts in Spec 11.

So based on – I think I talked some of this in Barcelona as well but based on experience that ICANN Org gained and feedback we got through the Complaints Office with the first time of using the service we got feedback that there's opportunities for operational improvements and so we went about trying to effect those into the procedure, things like sharing communications with both parties, similar to other dispute resolution proceedings, disclosing identities of the panelists with the parties, just trying to make sure there's equal information out there and timely information out there.

And so we went about effecting that into the procedure just so it's all transparent in one place and you don't have to have auxiliary documents to understand how this is going to work. And propose those changes with rationales back to the Registry Stakeholder Group. So our thought was we would make these changes, we think they're largely operational changes, we're not changing scope of what could be complainable or criteria of how those complaints would be decided.

So we felt comfortable that we could make those updates to the procedure, share them with all, get your comfort level and put those out for public comment and then incorporate those as updated procedure.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Russ. Donna Austin. So this is something that we'll discuss later in the day. Thank you for providing us with the rationale for the proposed changes. For the stakeholder group when we first saw this in January there was an issue associated with the process and then also a question about

whether the suggested changes were material or immaterial, so we still haven't kind of been back through your – the rationale that you've provided to see whether we're, you know, we still – those concerns still exist. I think they do but we need an opportunity to discuss it at the stakeholder level.

Given we've all been, you know, in prep mode for this meeting we just haven't had time for substantive discussion on that so we hope to do some of that today but I doubt that we'll finalize it, so.

Russ Weinstein: Okay yes, yes, just continue to let me know how you want to engage on this. This is something we'd like to push forward and implement but want to do it right with you all and so let's stay close on it. Next one.

So dovetailing off the PIC DRP, we've had a – some chats with registries who are interested in changing parts of their voluntary Public Interest Commitments, the Part 4 of the Spec 11 in their Registry Agreements. And this has kind of happened over time, we've gotten these requests periodically from time to time. And essentially we don't have a defined process to do that – to do those changes. And we recognize that we probably need one but we want to make sure and do it thoughtfully and carefully with – in collaboration with you all.

So our thinking was from a process procedure perspective it could work a lot like the process procedure we used when some community TLDs came to us and were looking to modify their Spec 12 so we collaborated – Craig Schwartz led a group on your end and collaborated with us to develop a procedure that we think is reasonable and hopefully effective. We haven't touched it yet but hopefully effective to go about a registry proposing those changes, us evaluating them, us – and getting feedback about them in some instances and then implementing them when possible.

So our thinking is it probably looks similar both in product and process to that – to the Spec 12 change process. And I think we've been talking with the

registries and I think Sheri from Minds+Machines was kind of your lead person on that. And I know it's a matter of bandwidth and getting people engaged on it so I think we're ready to go when you're ready to go but we've been kind of waiting for that demand.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Russ. I think there is a session on this this week if it hasn't happened already.

Sheri Falcon: Yes, Sheri here. It's on Wednesday afternoon with Karla so I think we've got a pretty strong interest. Six months ago it wasn't as strong but I think all the other PIC related discussions have given the perfect conditions and a significant amount of registry operators are planning to attend on Wednesday, so I can send that around additionally this week if anybody is interested and doesn't have it already on their agenda.

Russ Weinstein: That's great. Thanks. Okay. Next slide. So just wanted to put in front of you all again the IDN Guidelines version 4.0 was proposed back in May of last year by the IDN Guidelines Working Group, I forget the official name of the group. I know Edmond, you were on it. And we've been evaluating as GDD how we go about implementing that updated guidelines so that we can provide you the right information and we're prepared to support those guidelines once implemented.

Many of you have that version 3.0 embedded in your contract; when the Board adopts version 4.0 that then becomes embedded in your contracts so it behooves you to begin reading those documents now, they've been published and they're at that link at the bottom of the slide. We're working on providing more substantive information that we can provide at the GDD Summit in May.

Our intention is to fully honor the requests this group made to the working group in terms of implementation timing regarding like a six month window for many of the recommendations and an 18-month window for several of the

other recommendations. So we're interested in doing this together with you. We want everyone to be successful if they're doing IDNs to do it per these guidelines as they're designed to, you know, reduce user confusion, reduce opportunities for cybersquatting and cybercrime and things like that.

So if you have questions about it, happy to take it. I think you had several representatives from the stakeholder group on that working group who are also great resources. Thanks.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. Just a comment mostly for the stakeholder group, not for GDD that different from what was being discussed in the Subsequent Procedures that was more leaning towards leaving the measures to handle – to avoid confusion and security issues to registries, this framework is quite prescriptive in adopting one specific solution and requiring all contracted parties to follow that specific solution. So we might want to look into that and comment that given the community seeming to prefer some – leaving that to each registry to figure out using their customers as a base of reference to what to do and this is not what is in the framework, so we might have a discussion on that.

Edmond Chung: Edmond Chung here. Actually just quickly back response to Rubens, in – I'm on that working group obviously and helped draft the final version. In how I read it is not supposed to be that way. It's the only I guess prescriptive part or two parts which is the IDN A 2008 and the using LGR for the table publishing. That was the – I think those are the only – in terms of the confusabilities and those kinds of things there are specific language to say that registries are – should do their own and are free to do their own.

But we can definitely make sure that's the case. And that comes to my kind of question, you mentioned that there's going to be an implementation, I guess – I wonder if there's an implementation plan, is there going to be an implementation document that is going to be published or what do you mean by implementation? It seems like an implementation plan needs to be created

on top and beyond the guidelines, which I wonder if that's going to be kind of encapsulated in a separate document or something? How do we contribute or respond to that?

Russ Weinstein: I'm looking at – Sarmad is in the room so I think I'll defer that to him. But I don't believe we're planning additional set of documentation.

Sarmad Hussain: Hello. Sarmad Hussain from ICANN staff. So yes, we're not planning to publish a document on top of IDN Guidelines or IDN Guidelines will remain the normative document. This planned implementation Russ has been talking about is just internal coordination between multiple teams which are involved in implementing these guidelines within ICANN Org. So we've actually been working over the past year to just make sure that that implementation is smooth across the various teams involved internally.

Russ Weinstein: Any other IDN related questions? I know, Edmond, you had one actually related to variant TLDs, it might be a good opportunity to ask that with Sarmad in the room as well.

Edmond Chung: If we have time, I can probably bring it up. Sarmad has heard it a few times, and I brought this up in Barcelona meeting as well. I thought it would be changed but it wasn't. So again, the particular issue is the paper for IDN variant TLD implementation recommendations, a part of it has specified that the idea would be to have each IDN variant TLD be applied separately as separate applications, both for gTLDs and ccTLDs and also have a separate Registry Agreement. Each IDN variant TLD separate from the primary IDN TLD would have its own Registry Agreement.

I think both of those are, in my mind, clearly against the policy recommendations back then for the first round and most likely for the SubPro as well. Both of them are implicated on this particular implementation plan. And I guess I'd perhaps like to hear why the thinking is to reverse the GNSO policy recommendations on the subject and request – require a separate

application for each of the IDN variant TLDs, because right now in the first round what happened is that there's one application, the primary IDN TLD is listed, and then the variant IDN TLDs are listed in the same application as well.

The understanding is that there would be an additional process obviously for activating those variants, but definitely not a separate application. In fact, there is a case where VeriSign applied for IDN variant TLDs in two applications and was asked to withdraw one of them. So I would really like to understand why the staff now thinks that – wants to reverse that of I guess fundamental principle of IDN variant TLDs.

Donna Austin: Edmond, I think what we need to do as a stakeholder group is do some communication to – I'll find out from Russ who that is so we can get an answer and pursue it further if we need to. We are pretty pressed for time, we've got a hard stop in – I can't read that but anyway, 10:15, so and we still need to give some time to Becky and Xavier so if we can – Russ, I don't know where you are?

Russ Weinstein: Agree, Donna. I think we do want to make sure you guys have time with Becky and Xavier and Shani so thank you all for having the GDD folks. Turn it over to Becky, friends of GDD.

Becky Nash: Great. Thank you. Thank you, Donna. Good morning, everyone. My name is Becky Nash. And I'm from the ICANN Finance team. And I'll just introduce our speakers today, if we just go to the next slide. So we're here with Xavier Calvez, the ICANN CFO and myself and my colleague, Shani, both from Finance. We will be presenting an overview today of the public comments and also shortly talk about the billing and invoicing process.

Just before I begin, we do have a short time on the agenda. We sent along a package that we would just like to highlight that the Finance group does publish quarterly financials on our website so that this packet includes an

update on our year to date, fiscal year '19. We also have information about the draft FY'20 operating plan and budget.

But just given the time, we wanted to spend most of our session today on the public comments that were submitted by the Registry Stakeholder Group. So if we could just jump to slide Number 16, that would be helpful. And just as a point of reference, the draft FY – the '20 operating plan and budget was submitted for public comment right before the yearend, December 17, 2018.

The public comment period ran approximately 53 days, a little bit longer than a traditional or a standard amount for a public comment. But that was just due to the timing spanning over the yearend, which could have holiday periods or the New Years. The public comment period did end on the 8th of February. And we are here at ICANN 64 to engage and obtain clarification on the comments that were submitted by various groups.

This helps us then produce a better staff report with responses and we are expecting to publish the staff report on the FY'20 operating plan and budget public comments just shortly after this ICANN meeting.

Before moving into details I'll just give a really high level on this slide. This gives a view of the past several years' trends and the number of comments that have been received. So we can see that in FY'20 for this operating plan, we received 143, excuse me, 143 individual comments. It's down for the prior year, which is FY'19, and just as a point of reference, in the FY'19 operating plan and budget we received a large number of individual comments from the fellowship and other individuals that drove the number up during that time.

So now I'm going to hand it over to my colleague, Shani, who's going to go on the next slide about some of the different themes. Thank you.

Shani Quidwai: Thanks, Becky. Here on this slide you can see the different groups that had submitted comments. And as Becky had alluded to, comments from individual

contributors was down significantly when compared to the FY'19 operating plan and budget. Aside from that, that specific group, the number of comments was relatively in line with the prior year. You see some change within certain groups but overall as an aggregate it was relatively in line.

If you could go to the next slide? Here we have an overview of what the key themes were within the comments that we received. And you can see that about 60% of them come from three key themes and those are financial management, budget development process and content structure as well as community support and funding. The remaining 40% are dispersed over five or six categories with community outreach funding, ICANN Org headcount, policy development, reserve fund and the GDPR.

On this next slide what you can see is this overview of the comments as well as the comments that your group had submitted. So you can see those were dispersed over six or seven categories, financial management, ICANN Org headcount, reserve fund and a few other. At this point I'll hand it back over to Becky to dive into the comments a little more and hopefully clarify some other responses and questions.

Becky Nash: Thank you, Shani. We also would like to highlight that in this slide deck that's available to everyone we do have a table that compares all of the comments submitted by theme from each submitter. That's also useful information just so that we can highlight areas that received a large number of comments that we could collect themes.

When looking at the comments submitted by the Registry Stakeholder Group, some items I just wanted to point out first of all, we do appreciate the comments. This is really part of ICANN's overall mechanism to get feedback. And of course I'd just like to highlight that with the operating plan and budget the overall empowered community process is a responsibility of the communities and this just helps us allocate and ensure that the operating plan and budget is meeting everybody's expectations.

When looking at the comments submitted from the Registry Stakeholder Group, first of all we had a few positive comments that I just want to acknowledge and thank you very much for, highlighting that cost control is welcomed by the Registry Stakeholder Group for the FY'20 operating plan and budget. The theme is that funding is stabilizing meaning that it is growing at a slower rate and as such ICANN Org has submitted an operating plan and budget that has expenses that are also growing at a slower rate.

And we'd just like to highlight that for FY'20, this is the first year that ICANN Org has included in its budget a replenishment to the reserve fund of which it is budgeted to be a $3 million reserve fund contribution. So we still have a balanced budget, meaning funding less expenses less the reserve fund contribution is balanced, but it does mean that we are budgeting lower expenses by $3 million in order to budget for a contribution from operations to the reserve fund.

A couple of other comments that we'd love to hear about, we read in the submission that as it relates to ICANN's funding, there was a recommendation that ICANN could discuss or review forecasts with individual registry operators. This is a unique comment in the respect that it's a recommendation and we've taken note of this idea. It isn't something that we've done in the past necessarily but we would welcome ideas on how to facilitate more information about funding.

The next major area that we note in the submission is related to staff costs. As we indicated, the FY'20 operating plan and budget is an era of stabilization. The comment is highlighting that costs have continued to grow and specifically as it relates to headcount and staffing. There are increases, they're moderate increases as it relates to standard of living cost increases, and a nominal amount of additional headcount is budgeted for FY'20. And I do say nominal just because of the fact that it is considered stabilization when it's a approximately 2% growth.

Most of the headcount additions that are budgeted for would be back fills or due to people departing, we would be refilling positions. But we do want to indicate that for FY'19 and beyond there is a very strict process to approve every headcount that's being added to ICANN Org. So again just to highlight that there are specific comments submitted about departments, and areas and we don't have the opportunity to respond directly to those today as the staff report is not yet finalized, but we want to acknowledge that we've received this input as it relates to headcount.

Xavier, go ahead please.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Becky. And sorry, I can't see everyone when I'm sitting over there so that's why I'm standing up with the mic. Just to add on the topic of staff levels, growth or lack thereof, this is a comment that is – I'm sure you've seen is provided by a lot of different organizations, so we want to give its right important.

Just a quick comment relative to the trends of headcount, it's a bit deceiving in the budget documents that you see because we are always looking forward but we continue to have a headcount that's very significantly under the actual budgeted amount. So when we say budgeted number of 395 or 400, and that increases to 405, we happen to be having the headcount of ICANN decreasing over the past 15 months consistently. It may not sound like very significant numbers to you. We were 400 15 months ago, we are 388 today.

But the point is that we are 30 heads below the budget, continue to consistently be below the budget in number of headcount and therefore in spend and intend to continue to do so. So when you see the numbers we are effectively managing the reality under those budget numbers. And due to the mechanisms of controls that Becky indicated, to be very specific, there's no

hiring or replacement of existing positions that happen without the combined approval of HR, mine, and Göran's.

It's not many companies even our size who require the CEO's approval for any hire, including replacements. We want to be really careful with it; it has helped us contain the growth of the headcount and even influx that growth towards actually a small decrease. I just wanted to make that point. I know it's a subject of sensitive interest in the community.

The last comment I will make is I think you all need to think about the headcount in terms of the volume of work that is required. The budget documents explain at the level of detail of 350 projects, where the headcount spends its time in its work. So when you look at headcount, look at what work is getting done.

Last comment, you will see that your group as everybody else's group has made a very similar comment; ICANN needs to contain its staff. And we need more support here or there. It sounds paradoxical especially when you look at it from our perspective. But it's a very helpful feedback for us to listen to and receive. We all want to contain the resources of the organization to what we absolutely need to spend and that's what ICANN needs to continue doing and your comments help us do that, keeping ICANN accountable in its management of funds.

At the same time, you, and everybody else, is saying there's more work, we need more resources, more help. And so that's the balance that we are looking at and receiving those comments we try to balance the need for more work that is all on our plates with the containment of the resources of ICANN. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Xavier. So we were supposed to have a hard stop six minutes ago. So I had a brief chat with Becky. We'll see if we can find some more time for Becky and the team to come back today but I want to discuss that with the

group before we do that. So I'm sorry about the line – the question online but I think we're going to have to call a hard stop here and then we'll see if we can make some more time for Becky to come back. So apologies, Xavier, I'll just say poor time management on my behalf.

Xavier Calvez: Okay so just a quick comment, we will ask Sue to circulate the document that we have that's more comprehensive than what we've discussed. One topic that we wanted to address was a quick update on the billing improvements that we've been working on that were resulting from discussions with various registries. There's information in the deck that you will get and there's information on our website because we have a page on billing and payments. If we don't get to come back, if that would be the case, then you've heard that from us. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks very much Xavier and Becky and Shani. And we'll take a break now, we're back in here at 10:30.

Sue Schuler: Thank you. We can end the recording.

                          END