ICANN
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe
GNSO RySG Membership Meeting Part 4
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 13:30 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 everyone we can get started. I know Jim has somewhere else he has to be so if you can take your seats that would be great.

Woman: (Unintelligible) Europe.

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Thank you. So thanks very much to James Galvin and Kristine Dorrain who have done some work on the DAAR reporting. As you might be aware that OCTO started publishing these reports on a monthly basis. So Jim and Kristine have done some work and they're going to take us through the presentation today. And what we're hoping is that we can, you know, reach some agreement on what we think will be helpful to provide feedback to OCTO and see if we can be a little bit more proactive in this regard. So Jim and Kristine over to you...

Jim Galvin: Thank you. This is Jim Galvin for the record. So next slide please. So we have a few slides here up front. We did send them out earlier today. And I know that people are busy and maybe you didn't have a chance to read everything on here. I'll step a little bit carefully through a couple of these slides and let people take a moment to read what's there.

The first two slides are more about collecting history so that folks had a baseline and they understood what's been done before and what actually is factual and what's out there so that we have a baseline to start from our discussion. And I do know that David Conrad was in here this morning talking about DAAR. So there was some discussion about all that then. And I'm sorry that I at least myself was not here then but I'm fully aware of DAAR and what it does and how it works so all I missed was your thoughts and feelings at the time.

So the first thing here was to copy a few sentences out of what exactly DAAR is. And for the purposes of this presentation I want to focus on the last bullet. And there's a phrase there which describes DAAR as establishing a persistent fact-based repository for ongoing collection analysis and reporting. And I think that's an important focus here and something for us to keep in mind, you know, if that's something that we agree with. And then we can build on that going forward in the rest of this.

So next slide please. The RySG has spoken before about DAAR not quite two years ago when there was a statistical analysis of DNS abuse and gTLDs. there was a study that was done. There's a link there to the page which announces the study and the stuff that was there. And what I did was out of the three specific DAAR related recommendations in that lengthy report I chose a few key sentences that I think reflect what the RySG has said before.

So we have actually previously objected to the publication of this data because they - we want to understand how some issues of process and management of the DAAR data okay? The second bullet is just generally opposing the publication of the data but there's a little more context. It really is about the details of what's in the first bullet okay? And the third one is about a follow-up mechanism. So what happens when there are issues with the reporting? So in addition to just understanding the methodology of what

was created how do you respond to anything negative that came up in those reports?

Okay next slide please. So this is taken out of a study done, a review of the monthly report that Dave Piscitello did. And he has his own personal blog called the Security Skeptic and he took a look at the January 2019 DAAR monthly report when it was first announced and was published and ICANN said it was going to go do this. And he looked at that report and gave a review for the community of what this report looks like. And for me this is what made all of this stand out.

I mean the problem with metrics and statistics is you're often in a place where you can present them in a way to show just about anything you want. And he went through this monthly report here and demonstrated that you can look at this and it really makes things look really bad. Anybody who wants to look at it a little bit can interpret some of this data. And I put these two charts up here just to show, you know, the point here is that while only 12% of the actual zones have, you know, negative data in them you can look over here on the right and you can see that 51% of all of the anti-abuse stuff comes from that 12% which makes it very easy to say that you can get rid of one half of all of your security threats by simply eliminating new gTLDs. And that is an interpretation that comes right out of looking at this report and it's fairly easy to see that.

And if we go to the next slide please so this is the specifics and there's a pointer there to the security skeptic report, ICANN has also published all of the 12 months prior. So there are actually now there's the February ones out there too. So there are 14 months now of these DAAR monthly reports. So clearly they are there and they are here to stay and, you know, we now have to face the fact that this data is there and address the question of, you know, what do we want to do about how this stuff was presented and what it looks like.

Next slide. So given that assumption that the DAAR monthly reports are here to stay the suggestion here is that there really are three things that are issues I believe to be questioned that we should consider responding to. And the goal here is to have some discussion about whether or not these are the right three issues and then what we might do all about them.

The first of course is just that DAAR reporting is not purely fact-based. The way that presentation is put out there, there's a little bit of judgment that's applied in presenting some of the percentages and what they look like. And I think we need to - I would suggest that if we go back to the original purpose of DAAR which is why I called that phrase about a persistent fact-based data repository that I think we should focus on that emphasis. If these reports are going to be there let's make sure that they're just presenting data and they're not trying to put a particular spin on it to let the community see what it wants to do.

The second thing is that there really is no clear statement of the purpose of DAAR reporting. There's a lot of stories going around about what it is. You know, the most important distinction is whether it's a ICANN purpose or a community purpose. And I think that's an important discussion to have and then, you know, we should frame what we want there and perhaps tell ICANN to make an appropriate, you know, committed announcement about what they're going to do with these things or what they expect us to do with them.

And then of course the last comment which comes straight out of an old Registry Stakeholder Group comment about there's no mechanism for dealing with any concerns that might come out of these reports and none of that has been stated. So you have no way to respond or ask about corrections or, you know, specific details. Another way to look at that is that there's no indication that you had been exercising any remediation under the presumption that some of this you don't have any control over right? People buy a domain name in your registry and, you know, maybe they go do things and you really can't control that but you act on it. You ought to get some

points for having acted on it. And none of this data reflects the fact that any remediation happened. So you're just stuck out there with a flag that said you were, you know, acting badly.

So next slide which is really the last slide kind of framed this into a set of discussions to discussion questions to kick all of this off and look for people to express their own thoughts and views about where to go with this and, you know, what can we say, what do people think, what are your reactions, so kind of an open discussion at this point. And I guess we had 40 minutes and I'm ten minutes in so we have 30 minutes. So Donna first and then...

Donna Austin: Thanks James. So one of the thing I'd like people to think about is that there is a DAAR session tomorrow morning at 8:45. I'm not sure who intends to go to the session. I'm not sure what will be covered but to the extent that it's possible that we can as we work through these questions whether we get a sense of whether the group is and if it's possible to take that message forward to that session. I'm not sure whether it's possible because I don't know the way that the session is set up but I think that will be really helpful and timely if we could actually manage to do that. So maybe that's something we can think about as well. Thanks Jim.

Jim Galvin: So I mean let me just respond briefly to that. That DAAR session should be very much like the session that you already had this morning. It's just about them talking about DAAR and what it is and what's there. So I would - I offer that we should think about that. I mean it may not be the right place in a public forum for us to have any specific comments in the direction.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Often when (unintelligible) talks about DAAR and when they ask about so where the particular bits of proof in your system they say, "Oh no, no we cannot disclose." So the question is there are - it is not set in stone. It's an attempt. and when they plan to have an RFP-based approach to the next generation of contract which is useful to some degree, for example where the particular registry will be allowed to see statistics on

them instead of just pointing fingers saying, "Wow, you bet, why," we cannot say we're not allowed. Basically it happened because there were no RFP for this set of contracts and ICANN's paying money and the result is something they enjoy but with now yet actual result.

Jim Galvin: So I think if I understand what you're saying I want to split that into parts. And let me know if I get this right first. There is an issue of the methodology that they use for creating the statistics that you're generating. I think that was part of your question is that correct?

Maxim Alzoba: It's deeper. It's in the text of the contract they sign - they signed with the particular providers of information which prevents ICANN from disclosures. And the lack of statistics is because they cannot tell you. And the second thing is yes some of the sources they do not have proof.

Jim Galvin: So I want to say two things. On the notion of the sources that they use and the data that they have, the DAAR stuff uses public data. So you actually have access to the same data that they use to generate those DAAR reports. And I think that's what's important for us to keep in mind here. It is true that ICANN is pulling together this data and they're maybe presenting it in their own way or they're presenting it in a way which is again just gets, what is the purpose of DAAR. But I'll sort of freewheel here and suggest that the intent is to present it in a way that's useful to this industry. And so that's really the question that we're asking ourselves whether that's true or not.

But with that in mind DAAR is intended to be something which is easily reproducible by anybody who's out there. So anybody could do what DAAR does for yourself. The methodology is actually described in the very beginning here if you go back up to the top where I, in the slides and I give the reference to the DAAR announcement that the DAAR monthly reports are happening, I think it was down one. Yes it's this one here.

So there's the methodology paper right there which explains the sources and where the data comes from. So that's first half of what you said. It is public data that they're drawing from that they're doing and then they're combining it in a known way as described in this paper.

The second half of what you're talking about is who controls those data sources and what they mean? And I'll give you my personal view on that right? I think that that's probably not really something that we should worry too much of about in the following - for the following reason. All of those data sources that they're using our - they've all been around for more than a decade, you know, some of them two decades. So they are well-known companies which have well-known processes. The quality of their data it is what it is. And they all have procedures. It's all documented and it's out there. You know, we can focus on whether or not we like what they do but the reality is everybody in the world uses them.

So whether we like them or not they are kind of there. And there's not much we're going to do about that. And, you know, we - and I don't think that we can ignore them because other people use them. And anybody could be doing what ICANN is doing with the DAAR reports. So I don't think there's a path for us to do anything about the fact that you might not like Spamhaus or SORBS or any of the others. And I would probably suggest that for anybody who has a, you know, a significant anti-abuse program you're probably using those sources yourself. I mean I can tell you that we're using some of those sources and we use that internally for our own anti-abuse program. It's all part of what we do. So did I answer - did I at least comment in respond to what you are saying?

Maxim Alzoba: Mostly. It was also about commercially available data. And for that ICANN effectively pays for those sources. And the terms under which they receive more greater information are not very beneficial for community because effectively they cannot disclose some of these. And even if it's limited disclosure or may be under some terms it would be best to have better

contracts. I mean and ICANN so yes basically paid for something which doesn't - which cannot be useful that's the issue. If they limited themselves to free information it wouldn't be an issue.

Jim Galvin: Okay Rubens.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jim Galvin: Oh okay then Jonathan.

)Jonathan Robinson: Sorry to Rubens. Maxim, I mean my thought on this final point of yours is in a way that's maybe an issue for the board right because that's about procurement. That's about how things are done. So in a sense this is, that's not the sort of nuts and bolts issue of the mechanics of whether this is good, whether this is useful, whether registries can use it effectively.

And I think if we're talking about finances to the board or, you know, that might be something to raise with them there. Anyway that's just a thought.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, two comments. One just to mention what I already mentioned to Dave Conrad earlier this morning about the including spam which is a content issue, not a security threat issue. But there is also one other problem with the data sources they use in DAAR in that they are using compromised Web site as an indicator, not maliciously registered domains. And we as a domain industry are not in the business of taking down compromised Web sites. We are not - most contracted parties do not take down domains just because they were hacked and someone uploaded malicious content. So if they focus their data sources on the ones that have indicated of malicious right to domains there are some that have, there are some that not. That would at least align DAAR a bit more with the mission of our industry instead of conflating what is hosting and what is the domain industry.

Jim Galvin: Okay we'll go to Sean first and I'll respond.

Sean Baseri: Great, thanks. This is Sean Baseri from Neustar. On the data source is something else we also kind of consider as well as when we're talking about data sources that have been used for many years they've been used in many applications. And so for example things like Spamhaus and SORBS as a data source they're often using mail filtration systems where the decisions are based on algorithms that are going to use them as scoring metrics. And so the actions are taken based on those data. Maybe an email gets shoveled to a different place or scored lower. While those data sources may be very valuable in those applications they may not always apply 100% equally in DNS abuse.

Jim Galvin: For me I guess when I think about these issues you raise an important question Rubens and Sean is replying to part of it, the issue of the sources it gets to the question of methodology. It is intended to be a scoring mechanism. And so one has to evaluate those things. And so they are creating as using an algorithm and so they're creating a number and trying to provide some kind of metric as - and in combining things.

                 If you're doing any kind of anti-abuse program you do this kind of thing on an ordinary basis. And so you're right, the quality of a particular data source, you know, varies with the application which is taking advantage of it. With - in particular with respect to the question of spam any kind of malicious activity and even unintended activity, unintended consequences or compromised Web site is an indicator of some kind of problem.

                 And depending on your anti-abuse program then sure you're going to look at these things, you're going to evaluate them and take action. And you're going to take different actions based on whether something is malicious or just an unintended consequence. But the idea of knowing that something has been used for spam and other kinds of things, spam is a leading indicator of whether there are problems or not. And so it's important to take on that data and use that. I think that the - I forgot the second thing that you actually

asked and I wanted to reply to it but I'll pause if there's someone else who wanted to speak.

Maxim Alzoba: Compromised Web site versus maliciously (unintelligible).

Donna Austin: Yes I did just reply to that. There - it's still an indicator and something that you do. Go ahead Sean.

Sean Baseri: Another item to kind of consider with these data sources is granularity of data too. And so again if you're using your data source is primarily designed for a specific application let's say DNS space filtering and you attempt to use it in an incident response type of role where you're actually using deeper investigation, some data sources for example may not have a full URL of some kind of abuse of activity. And so from a statistical standpoint using the data sources may allow you to get an aggregate number but in actual response standpoint wherever you are in that chain it may not be as effective.

Donna Austin: Yes, thank you. Now you reminded me. Thank you Sean. You reminded me of the other comment I wanted to make about what Rubens had said. For me one of the things that's missing from this data is even if you take it at face value and you accept the fact that there's these reputation providers and they're going to say something. And if we accept that DAAR reports are going to be there, we might want to tweak the presentation in some way, there's a critical piece of information that I would like to see added to it myself. And that is it should reflect whether or not even though it's a TLD you might have taken a hit because you had domains which were doing things that you really can't control the question is did you do anything about it? You know, did you remediate it in any way?

So in addition to the fact that you might find yourself with some points up there because sooner or later everybody's going to get a point, you know, are you going to get some credits non the other side? And so the DAAR stuff doesn't reflect any of the credits, doesn't reflect the fact that TLDs act which

are really trying to find a way I think in all of this is not just the negative side of all of the data reporting but something to say about the positive side and I think that's important. So that was the other piece. Thanks.

Woman: I just...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

JC Vignes: JC Vignes from Uniregistry. I think you make a very important point regarding sources and perception. To share a public and personal story we made the Spamhaus top four last week. And so I was okay, you know, we need to do something because repetitionally it's really bad. We are out of the list this week. We don't know what happened then. We don't know what happened now.

And perception-wise it's a real problem because I agree with you that everybody uses those sources but this is a report made by ICANN, the Internet regulator telling the world that we are bad guys in the 50% of this new gTLD program that all of us are (trunkening) lead to bad stuff. So in terms of granularity and remediation I fully agree but I would also like to know because ICANN as Rubens said, contracted with those guys.

I need to know a lot more about their methodology because if I'm adding a bad name last week and my name is clear this week it's great, but I want to know why. And I want to know as a compliance officer what I can do internally for those things not to happen. At the moment we are resourceless in both directions.

Jim Galvin: A quick question for clarity. When you say I think when you're asking the question about wanting to know the methodology, you mean the methodology on the sources...

JC Vignes: Yes.

Jim Galvin: ...like Spamhaus and SORBS?

JC Vignes: If I can believe those sources are good enough to tag us in any way and however non-granularity now or however greater it might become as we hope I want to know that they know how each TLD can or cannot make the list.

Jim Galvin: So those reputable reputation providers -- and I call them that only because they've been around for a while and the ones that they're using -- they all have fully documented processes and procedures on their Web site. One just has to dig in and do that and look at it. And they have, also have mechanisms for remediation so you have a way that you can get in there and apply and see what's going on if you want to. Otherwise you're right, they're always dealing with a moment in time. You were on the list then you're not. If you didn't take any action it's like oh, lucky me but there you go.

JC Vignes: Just briefly for the record we did check and we did, you know, none the wiser which is a problem in itself.

Woman: I think Kurt's next.

Kurt Pritz: Hi. Thanks and thanks Jim. I have somewhat of a different take on the report or add different issue and it's clearly born out of ignorance as you'll soon find out. But I don't understand the value of trying to derive distinction between new and legacy TLDs. I don't understand how this is actionable? If I were to take this to its logical conclusion and did a study of about ccTLDs would I rate the ccTLDs on their delegation date or when they entered the zone? That doesn't make any sense to me. Does it make sense to differentiate .travel and .jobs from .shop and .art? That doesn't make sense to me either.

At what stage in five years from now will we start to transition the new TLDs into legacy TLDs and do this? I would, you know, when I read this report I just start asking a whole lot of different questions about what's the distinction in these new gTLDs or the legacy TLDs, you know, information that would be helpful to us as an industry in finding out what sort of attribute of a TLD might be attractive to guys that do, you know, entities that do bad things.

So, you know, to me this report raises a lot of questions and is not actionable because I don't - it doesn't make me want to say new TLDs are bad. It makes me want to say, you know, what a new TLDs and legacy TLDs, you know, gives rise to the ability for this bad behavior? So I don't know, to me it's sort of worthless.

Woman: Thanks Kurt. Is Katrin next and then Crystal and then I'll put myself in the queue.

Katrin Ohlmer: Thanks. This is Katrin Ohlmer, two points. So one is once the real goal or message ICANN wants to put out and to whom? So do we want to say TLDs in general including CCs, Gs, new gTLDs have a certain abuse level and this was mediated how? So this would be something I would be interested to kind of follow-up with ICANN.

Of the other point is about methodology. So the February report says it's more than 800,000 incidents we had in the new GDDs. So pardon me, would that reflect the Spec 11 3B reports really, 800,000? That can't be the truth. So I would be really interested how they come from the pure figures to presenting us this chart price including this amount of abuse. Thanks.

Crystal Ondo: Crystal Ondo. I just wanted to follow up on what Kurt was saying. I think they're not making a timing distinction and this is what actually has me really concerned that will be the topic of our compliance meeting tomorrow. They're making a contractual distinction between what worked and what didn't based on new F abuse obligations. And I think what their ultimate conclusion while

they didn't say it is that perhaps the abuse provisions we have in our registry agreements weren't strong enough. And they're angling to make those stronger. So I think there is a bleed over between what DAAR is doing in their reports and how they're treating us in audits and what they're looking for long term. And it's definitely something to be a little concerned about.

Kurt Pritz: So this is Kurt so forgive me so I'm not familiar with the distinction between the abuse provisions and the legacy agreements and the agreements for new gTLDs. I know, you know, simplistically new gTLDs have URS and some other provisions that the legacy TLDs don't. But I don't know specifically what preventative measures that are in the legacy agreements that ICANN would be seeking to implement in the new gTLD. That's the...

Crystal Ondo: No ironically they're - the difference is in new G is we have Spec 11 3B. And they're saying, "Look that's not working or you're not in compliance with it as new G on registry operators because clearly there's all this abuse and none of you are doing it right," which is clearly not the case but I think that's the tail they're trying to tell through DAAR.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks this is Kristine. Rubens or Maxim I see you after Sheri. I just want to do a quick time and process check. We're we have ten minutes left. One of the main goals of this session is because we wanted to circle the wagons a bit and figure out when is it going to be time for us to have that sit-down conversation with the (ATO) department and what are our sort of concerns?

I think we have good information for now that our current concerns still mirror the concerns we've had consistently over time as reflected in the report that Jim already put in the slides but also our comments to the CCTRT and to the general methodology paper. So I think I'm still hearing those same concerns. So if I'm not now is your chance in ten minutes to speak up so that if there are alternate viewpoints we get those on the table.

And then we don't have to set any firm, you know, deadlines now. But be thinking for when there's a show of hands about who might want to be involved in some sort of writing, drafting group to put together sort of an outline of our concerns and present those to OCTO. So as we wrap into the last nine minutes of the time that we've been allotted just kind of be thinking about those things. And if you have an alternate viewpoint and you haven't raised your hand please do so now. Thanks Sheri. You're next.

Sheri Falcon: Hey Sheri Falcon in the mix. So just to kind of speak further around Kurt's point, to make this report meaningful boom, boom, boom, to make this report meaningful, you'd need a lot more information right? For example Triple X is a perfect example in that it's a legacy TLD but has some nuances required for Spec 11 activity. So legacy TLDs didn't really have all the kind of details around abuse reporting and blah, blah, blah typically.

But XXX by way of example had a pretty significant cost point at that point and some verification. So those factors cost, verification activities and how that impacts abuse reports and DAAR reports would you imagine be factors to consider? And even inside of that to the remediation point what is the point of these reports? Like if it's just to sort of say this is happening blah, okay I don't know that that's so useful. It would really be helpful for the industry to say this is happening but these are really great registry operators or these are really appropriately responding TLDs. I mean I guess that's going to be a real substance question for the ICANN team is what is their attention for these reports and how can we as the community shape that intention to really maximize its impact for us as responsible registry operators?

And then just by way of random example on this last Spec 11 sort of audit ICANN identified a URL that our reputation service provider didn't identify. And arguably our reputation service provider uses some of the same sources that ICANN used. And so that kind of discrepancy although we weren't penalized in any way for it, it was just an obvious something outside of what our reputation service provider let us know about ICANN found. And so while

nothing bad happened this time I don't know what will happen in future scenarios if these reports are used or findings are used in a negative way against us is an industry or as registry operators.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. It is Rubens then Maxim than Gg. Okay sorry just Maxim and Gg and Donna. Okay Donna next.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. I see quite a dangerous overlap of audit we saw of the fact that we all regulated by Spec 11 and the big DRP theme where there is no, basically no conflict of interest safeguards. Imagine panels who will SSC guys contracted by ICANN boards are BL guys there who say, "Obviously you are wrong. DAAR proves that your bad guys, you have 30 days to or like ten days to do whatever it says," that that's why I would recommend us to say that no big DRP changes are material because what they're trying to pull in my opinion to say, "Oh, it's only for those lines of text which are about what you wanted to have add to PDRP," and I believe I asked (Bruce) if it's applicable to whole Spec 11? "Yes," he answered.

So it's quite dangerous all (unintelligible). And if we do not want to see guys on the panel sitting saying, "Obviously you were not following our blogs and therefore you have to change everything in your TLD because we're not happy with that."

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. Gg then Donna.

Gg Levine: Thank you. This is Gg Levine. I agree that there are all lot of weaknesses with these reports. But there's been a lot of discussion about how the reports make registry operators look bad, but what about the fact that there is some abuse going on and, you know, not by the people who are involved in making registry operators, you know, a reputable group, those that are probably not represented here? But wouldn't it be in our best interest to put pressure on those actors that are allowing abuse to take place to put pressure on them to not allow that kind of abuse? And granted, you know, some of the

reputational sources probably do indicate some false positive. But it seems to me it's a start and it's a fact of the matter that I don't think we can sweep under the carpet and just say that, you know, they're being mean to us because maybe there is some action that would be appropriate to take. Thank you.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. I think Donna then Crystal.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kristine, Donna Austin. So I think Gg's point is a very good one. And I think what we, you know, in addition to how we want to engage with OCTO on this, it's a discussion some of us have had before. But it's more about how do we get on the front foot and communicate with the community of about the things that we are doing in responding to this too, you know, just to show that we are good actors? One of the, you know, we've done a couple of sessions about innovations and new gTLDs and the, you know, differences in what success looks like. But this is - this looks to me like a really good cross community discussion or high-interest topic discussion that we could set up for Montréal so that we can, you know, explain to the community what it is that registry operators due to respond to abuse to show that we are good actors and we are responsive to this. So I think, you know, that's in addition to how we engage with OCTO I think there's another aspect to this as to how we get a little more proactive with the community in, you know, showing that we are good actors. Thanks.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks Donna, Crystal?

Crystal Ondo: Crystal Ondo and I definitely agree with everything Donna said and I wanted to actually say the same thing. But there is an effort with Bryan Schilling who is a Consumer Protections Director maybe consumer safeguards at ICANN he reports to (Jamie) and he has been running a smaller group that's been discussing this with the IBC and BC and other interested parties. And the plan is to have such a cross community something at Montréal that includes reputation service providers, and hosting providers and other people talking

about what registries duo for abuse because while I get Gg's point that we shouldn't sweep it under the rug I think most of us don't. And we understand abuse happens and we are very well staffed and supported financially in terms of trying to prevent abuse. But there's no way to get rid of all of it.

And what DAAR is reporting is not accurate and what we're seeing in our actual zones, and that's the problem. Not that I'm trying to say there's no abuse. But I'm saying what they're showing is not what I'm seeing. And they also don't - ICANN doesn't understand the registries can't just take action based on a random report. You have to have evidence to support that. Otherwise you're risking legal liability for taking a domain down. And so on until ICANN understands what we need to see in a report and what we expect to take action, I don't think we're going to get to the same point with them.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. I am not seeing any more hands at this point and we have one minute left to go. Anyone have any final thoughts or Jim do you have any closing comments? No? I think then we'll be putting out a call for people to participate in a discussion drafting group. Is that sort of the next available step? So if this is interesting to you feel free to volunteer for that.

I took notes. You have a lot of really concrete things I think that came out of this session today and got a lot of really good participation so thanks everyone for participating.

Donna Austin: And thanks very much to Jim and Kristine for putting that together. I think it's something that, you know, since the audit we've - we understand that it's really important for us and we should be more proactive in response to some of these efforts. So I think this is a really good positive step for us so thanks very much.

So moving on so comments guideline workshop that was held earlier this week. I'm going to have that over to Sam. Thanks Sam.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Donna. This is Sam. So on Sunday morning bright and early at 8:30 we held a workshop to really discuss the process that we follow for developing Registry Stakeholder Group comments. And this was part of a larger effort that Donna and I have been discussing and I know that those of you who dial into the biweekly calls have heard me talk about and mention a number of times before which is to establish some guiding principles that we can follow when we are writing both responses to open public comments but also other position statements or letters or documents that are coming out of the stakeholder group.

You know, we talk a lot about how the membership of the RySG has grown significantly and as it has grown we've also become a lot more diverse in the interests that we are representing. So what we've been, you know, kind of working towards and maybe even struggling with a little bit is how to make sure that our comments are capturing as much of the interests that are represented within our membership as possible. So the goal is in, you know, starting these conversations is to ultimately come up with a living written document that will outline some of the principles to follow that, you know, future iterations of the stakeholder group can follow, can feel free to update from time to time and things like that.

So we got together at 8:30 and Sunday morning and I was very impressed with the turnout for A, the early timeslot and B, because it was during the weekend session. So I really want to thank everyone who attended there because it was a great discussion and we got a ton of input and feedback that I think is going to become very actionable and very useful for us here at the ExCom level to actually put into practice.

So the feedback kind of fell into two camps. One is some of the logistical things that we can start putting into place and then some are more principles-based which we will then take and put together a draft for you guys to review and will, you know, will continue to work on refining that over the coming months.

So I'll just quickly go through some of the decisions that maybe some of the ideas that were discussed. And then I will open it up for A, any questions but also for anyone who was there participating if you guys want to chime in as well. I'm sure everyone would be happy to hear from you and not just from me. So another thing we talked about that I think is probably the biggest shift in how we operate is establishing a sort of a triage committee or a tiger team for reviewing the different common opportunities that come up. So right now what we kind of do is, you know, as of the VC of policy I can take a look at things. We discuss them during our biweekly calls. They go out to the membership as part of Wim's matrix and sort of just leave an open question as to whether the stakeholder group should develop comments on this.

What we're thinking about doing is soliciting some volunteers with a kind of swath, a wide swath of expertise among our membership because, you know, you guys have a lot of expertise in a lot of different areas which is I think one of our strengths as a stakeholder group to review each of the comments, put them into context for the rest of the group kind of explaining what this is about and why the stakeholder group should be commenting and then from there start developing drafts and also, you know, get other members involved in contributing to those drafts. You know, not necessarily being the ones to actually put pen to paper but to provide some input and, you know, ideas to the person who is holding them.

Like I said we'd like to kind of use that group and map different people to different areas of expertise so that, you know, when something comes up that's very technical we know who to go to to get a recap of that or if something is a little bit more legalistic you know, we have plenty of lawyers here. So this group I think is going to help us as, you know, once we are able to get it up and running it's going to help us be a little bit more effective in identifying what and how we want - what we want to respond to and how we want to respond to this.

And one of the biggest questions that we've been grappling with a little bit is what to do when there are, there is a diversity of opinions on a given topic within the stakeholder group. So this came up most recently in our responses to the subsequent procedures PDP initial reports and the supplement report and the Worktrack 5 report where, you know, we're a pretty diverse group. We're lots of different kinds of registry operators. We're not always going to have 100% agreement on sometimes big topics that sometimes like smaller aspects of bigger topics.

So I think having this group in place and getting a lot of early review is on the help us identify when those instances come up so that we can make decisions and give the membership a lot of advanced notice. If we're not able to put together a cohesive Registry Stakeholder Group position something it gives the members a lot of time to either coming up, kind of form smaller clusters and submit their own comment or submit their own comments as individual companies.

Some of the other items that we are, you know, going to consider putting in place are giving some dedicated time as part of the - what we call perhaps as an extension of the biweekly call to really do a deep dive into comments. Right now we always cover the open public comment periods on our biweekly calls but especially in times when there are a lot of open comments it's more like a, you know, just kind of running on the laundry list giving you guys quick updates. So what we're talking about is, you know, dedicating maybe 30 minutes is part of the call or at the tail end of the call for those who are interested in going and doing a deeper dive into the comment giving them the chance to kind of really sink their teeth into them. And again this is just in the service of getting early input really tackling these comments, you know, not at the week before they're due so we can give everyone a lot of time to review and provide their input on them as well.

And then some - just a few of the other things we talked about was making better use of our Web site, improving the way comments are presented on

our matrix making them more of a living document so you guys aren't just getting updates every two weeks when (unintelligible) goes around. So I know I've kind of droned on a little bit here on this. These were some of the bigger more logistical things we talked about. Like I said we're going to start drafting some of this into a principle document that I'm very excited to share with you guys in the coming weeks.

I'd be more than happy to hear any input that you have or if anyone who was there on Saturday are sorry Sunday wants to chime in with anything else from the session? Rubens go ahead.

Rubens Kuhl: I wasn't there Sunday but I just want to support the idea of when divergence happen that they are reflected in individual comments instead of a convoluted stakeholder group comment.

Samantha Demetriou: Yes thanks Rubens. We talked about that a lot. And, you know, how when we try to reflect the diversity but sometimes that makes it really hard for the reader of those comments to actually make any use of them. So very much something that came up during that discussion. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Sam Donna Austin. Well one of the things we did discuss is, you know, when we do have differences of opinion in our comments whether we should say well, you know, it's six registries think this and there's two that think that and I really don't want to get into that situation of doing that. And one of the reasons being that we have 80 members we assume a lot of the time that, you know, if we don't hear from you, you agree but it quite often it's only maybe a dozen registry operators that have an interest in your topic. So it's not a fair representation of what's going on.

And I think we also need to understand that, you know, we probably have an 80/20 rule here that it's only 20% of the time even less than that I would think that we'll be in this position where we have those differences of opinion that we need to, you know, try to manage in some way.

One of the things with the guidelines is what we're hoping is that it manages expectations for the members of the stakeholder group but, you know, just recognize that the importance of a, those topics where we do agree the importance of a cohesive stakeholder group comment and the importance of that in the community I guess.

So it, while it was a divergence of comments that led us to these conversations, the conversation we had on the weekend was much broader and it was actually, you know, some really good input on how we can manage things and other tools that we can use to perhaps engage people more in this process. So, you know, we have a Web site. We don't use it as much as we could and I think that's something that if people knew to, you know, if you could just go there once a week to see what's going on that might be more helpful than just trying to do a search on your email to find something from Wim to see if there's something you want to contribute to. Thanks Sam.

Samantha Demetriou: All right any other questions or input? All right so I - oh, sorry Gg go ahead.

Gg Levine: I just wanted to acknowledge that there are a handful of people that do most of the commenting about half of the Registry Stakeholder Group. And I'm just in awe and appreciate the amount of work that goes into that and the amount of knowledge and research that goes into providing these responses. So I just wanted to say thanks to those of you who are doing the bulk of the work.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks very much for those kind words. All right like I said we'll be continuing to follow-up on this so I expect more updates and expect some documents to review in the future and call for volunteers to serve on this supercool team that we're going to put together. I'll probably make up T-shirts. It'll be really fun. Thanks everyone.

Woman: But will there be a tiger?

Donna Austin: Thanks Sam I think one of the outcomes of this meeting is that we'll have another half-dozen working groups. Erica. So Erica has been leading the Evolution for Working Group. And she's doing a tremendous job so thanks to Erica for her efforts in pulling this together. It hasn't been an easy ask so I think there is a couple of things that Erica wants to run through with this. Thanks Erica.

Erica Varlese: Great, thanks Donna. Thank you Sue for pulling that up. So for those of you have been on the calls I know we've provided a few updates over the past few months. I took - we started in September picking up where the previous group left off. There was - we are Evolution 4 Working Group but we had - there was a pause when the group first started working on the proposed amended and revised bylaws and charter. At the time we were working on incorporating in the state of Florida and it became clear that there would be a lot more changes needed. So they decided to pause and then we picked up again in September. And so if you don't mind scrolling down a little bit.

So just to - just going over this to cover why we we've been making the changes. We've needed to update our bylaws and charters so that it matches Florida State Law for incorporation and as such we're using it also as opportunity to just go through and see any other changes since it is a, you know, it's an in-depth process. And so we've been - we've shared with the membership I believe I think it was at the end of January or early February we shared our proposed changes with everyone. And that included the proposed bylaws and charter as well as an FAQ document that we have been working on to kind of explain the changes and make it a little bit easier to go through and process. And the language is different which has made it longer and there's just - a lot of it's just kind of for lack of a better word legalese that needs to be included. So we wanted to kind of give more context and background for why that was happening.

And we took - great thank you Sue. We can go through this part. So we sent the proposal around and we got just a few comments and highlighting - so to highlight what we are changing, you know, we're working - we've - we're planning to or we're proposing to adopt a new voting quorum for 33% instead of 50% just to, you know, better reflect activity levels and things like that.

We've proposed some changes to weighted voting and other elements that are kind of codifying different roles of the ExCom largely in part because we need to for the - to comply with the Florida law in terms of having a board and how the board reflects the ExCom and everything like that so kind of mapping those roles together so it is clarified and we are compliant with that.

So I'm not going to read everything to you since, you know, for those of you who have read it, you've seen this and, you know, I'll just leave that up there for you to review as we talk through this. We received a bit of feedback in the - we had a feedback period for I believe it was a month and we - the team had a call about two weeks ago at this point to work through that. And, you know, we didn't get a lot of feedback which I think is a good thing. I hope it's a good thing. And we did get enough that we've had some pretty substantial discussions in our last call that we're still working through.

So a large part of what I wanted to do with this time that we have now is kind of raise a few points that came up that we're still deliberating on and just go over the timeline as well so people know what to expect. We will likely be meeting if not late next week then probably the week after when we've all recovered from jet lag to go through these final points and fine-tune everything before we announce a vote to the membership since this will need to be voted on formally. And that will need to meet the 50% quorum from active members in order to approve this.

And so those things are still to be determined depending on our deliberation as a team. So Sue if you don't mind scrolling down to - I might end up actually skipping some of these just for the sake of time. But if we go down to

I think the page after this. Or yes, I guess we can, sorry we can - sorry if people don't mind going back up to the last page. Yes that's - I forgot what was after.

So these were some of the items that we have up for review and discussion. For now for this session I wanted to raise to the stakeholder group just to kind of guide us in our next conversation to get a little bit more feedback and make sure we're on the right track before we go through this final process of announcing the vote and everything like that. You - we will be of course presenting another proposed bylines and charter with, you know, we'll highlight anything that did change since the last feedback period. But two items that were pending for us and that we will be talking about is we're - we received some feedback about, you know, within the ExCom -- and we had a discussion about it too - within the ExCom, you know, there's no limits on how many people from a certain company can be represented or within any of the official roles. But we do have a limit on how many - how - a delegate can only represent one company so there's this kind of discussion of whether or not those were inconsistent or - and also just if we wanted to update that since in the past there was more out of necessity that we place that limitation.

So we had a discussion about that in our last meeting and kind of wanted to bring that to the group because we were working on thinking through okay if we do make this change where delegates can represent multiple parties what are the possibilities that we might be missing in terms of how that could affect things in terms of votes? And likewise, you know, we received feedback on the rationale for changing weighted voting which is up on the screen here just so you don't have to listen to me read it to you. And we - I think we also just kind of expected a little bit more feedback on that too since it is one of the bigger changes I think that we have. So I wanted to raise that to the group as well just if there was any feedback or thoughts that people had on those changes specifically or anything else that might have come up that they wanted to bring up here and then we'll take that into our next conversation.

There just for that's if anyone has feedback or thoughts or questions anyone thank you for - I can't see who's hand that is. Kristine thank you. Go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. This is Kristine. I really appreciate all of your work on this Erica. I actually did not submit comments only because I ran out of time and had really gone through and reviewed it so it was really great. My primary question relates to the suggestion that weighted voting - weighted voting reflects the fact that some registries represent more registrants. Issues such as those that involve policy are more important for a large member of registrants.

And I just - I think that maybe one commenter had commented on it in the Registry Stakeholder Group list but I thought maybe we could have a little discussion around that because there have been policy determinations that, you know, with one fell swoop a one policy change could completely wipe out an entire registry's business model. So does that - that would put an entire registry out of business. So you could foreseeably note that someone says for instance this is going to be a policy that no TLDs can be verified or validated or whatever. I mean that's kind of an absurd one but let's say that was a policy recommendation.

You know, for a lot of registries that have most of the registrants fine carry-on, it doesn't matter. But it's going to put a whole bunch of people out of business. And so I don't know what the answer is because I understand that where you're going here like I get this. But how do we take into account the fact that some policies are absolute, you know, an absolute, you know, death acts to some registries? Thanks.

Erica Varlese: Great, that's Kristine. Yes I think that's kind of where I am. I don't quite have an answer for that and was hoping you all could help me with any feedback or if that's something that we'll need to keep mulling through. So if anyone else has anything that they want to add on that point it is welcome or if you

don't have anything now you can also tell me at any point this week or after. Okay.

Ashley Roberts: Yes Ashley Roberts. So I don't have a follow-up point of that one but I sent a couple of comments on the list and so I just wanted to go over a couple of those and see if people have any thoughts on them. One of the points I made was - is that better? Oh there we go. One of the points I made was about in certain areas some of the proposed changes were about kind of investing more with decision-making power to the ExCom. And I thought it would be in terms of kind of make sure there are appropriate checks and balances. One suggestion I made was that you could insert an additional line there that would give the membership the opportunity if there was a particular decision that was being made by the ExCom if a member or a couple of members felt sufficiently strongly about that then they could make a recommendation to put that decision out to the full membership rather than it just being made by the ExCom. So that was one suggestion. I don't know if people have any thoughts on that.

And the other suggestion I had it kind of relates to the conversation we just had about comments and just generally making kind of policy statements and policy positions for the stakeholder group. There's - there was a section in the revised charter that kind of partially spoke to how that process for how decisions are made and how policy statements are submitted on behalf of the stakeholder group. But it seems to me that that (externation) the charter was kind of incomplete. It kind of spoke about a certain particular scenario. So I wondered if there is a way that I don't know if it should be in the charter itself or perhaps in some other in operating principles or some other document but somewhere that where it fully documents the process for, you know, kind of coming to and agreeing and then submitting policy statements. And perhaps it would be that document the Sam was just talking about.

Samantha Demetriou: Erica if you don't mind I can address the last point. Actually one of the things that, you know, I've been thinking about and we at the ExCom have

been thinking about in the development of these guideline documents is your feedback right? So providing more clarity to our membership so that we are setting expectations appropriately and everyone knows, you know, the rules that we're kind of playing by as a stakeholder group but also maintaining the flexibility for, you know, to make changes to those as I don't know different circumstances changes or membership changes and things like that. The process of updating the charter is very onerous which is why this is still an agenda item after like six months.

So I think we - we're thinking at this point that we rather have that be a bit more of a living document that is memorialized on our Web site but not necessarily totally carved into stone into the charter. But it is something that we're very much aware of and, you know, getting those processes a little bit more formalized so that you guys as a membership have, you know, plenty of clarity on how we are running the business kind of thing.

Ashley Roberts: Thanks Sam. Yes that certainly makes sense to me. And I agree that you want to give yourselves as much flexibility as possible to change it in the future. And so I guess I'd suggest that you maybe remove that section to kind of work with the complete bit in the charter just remove it all together or put a reference and say, you know, if you want to look up the process for how we kind of reach policy positions you can see this other document.

Jeff Neuman: Hello, Jeff Neuman, a couple comments. So I'm looking at (Pat) because he was around at the time and some others. When we first formed the stakeholder group the idea was not to vote on policies. It was to really come to consensus. And when the group had a consensus that's when it took a position on a particular policy. And related to the concept of consensus is the notion of impacted parties.

So if the there were like in the example Kristine had raised where there was a policy that would or a proposal that would impact verify validated TLDs more than anybody else then the consensus would give more weight to the

comments of those that were significantly impacted then it would for let's say an open TLD for which it had absolutely no impact. And all of this points back to the notion of when we take out the voting section for things like policies -- and I know this sounds ironic -- because in the voting section there's a sentence which probably doesn't belong there. It actually belongs elsewhere, but it says that all decisions on policy are made by consensus or something to that effect. When you take out weighted voting -- and this is probably more a drafting thing -- when you take out the voting section you take out the general principle of everything being decided by consensus.

So a couple things and on to Ashley's comment, at a minimum we need a big statement up front in the charter itself that says all policy decisions are made by consensus period. Originally weighted voting was only supposed to come into effect for the more administrative things like election of counselors, board members I think budget. And there may have been some other things at the time that there was voting of and I just can't recall it. So bottom line is that as we adjust and come to the realization that quorum is impossible to keep at the same standard because of the increased attendance we cannot take out the important goal and aspiration of all policy decisions are made by consensus.

And we're putting more and more power into the ExCom some of which is out of necessity but as we do that coupled with some of the other provisions we need to be very careful of avoiding capture which brings me to the last comment which I think was one of the first ones mentioned. If we are afraid of capture then the one person may only represent or vote on behalf of one delegate makes sense as well as no two persons on the ExCom from the same company makes sense.

So either we adopt both of those or we adopt none of those. But I think to only have in the charter that one delegate can't represent or one person may not represent more than one company in voting eliminating that without eliminating you - but you can have two people from the same company on the

ExCom which has now given all this more power just it seems to me to be a little bit of a kind of ironic and imbalance. I'm not suggesting one way or the other. I'm just saying we kind of need to make a decision of what our goal is and then conform the rules to our goal.

Erica Varlese: Great. Thank you Jeff. I really appreciate that. That's helpful to hear especially the background and context of thank you. Sam, go ahead.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Erica. Just wanted to respond to the last point about voting delegates versus representation on the ExCom. And I don't know that I agree that it is a fair comparison. I don't think there - those two things are necessarily equal because the ExCom are elected and the voting delegates are just designated by the people that they represent. And Jeff doesn't agree with that last statement.

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Erica Varlese: You - that the voting delegates are selected by the people that they represent or that the ExCom are elected?

Jeff Neuman: So it actually makes it I would say it's actually worse to have two on the ExCom and voting especially as you got to weighted voting where the more power is in the hand of the few. But what I will say is remember, if one person is voting on behalf of two companies those two companies actually submitted forms saying we acknowledge that they are representing more than one and we're okay with it. I don't understand why that is even an issue for the stakeholder group at all. But again you do both of them or you do none of them. It just doesn't make sense to me.

Erica Varlese: Say so I'll speak first on behalf of the working group which is that we haven't made - I don't think we've necessarily made a final decision on the voting delegate matter right? So it's still an open thing that we're considering. My point is that I just, I don't think it's the same. I don't think you can really drive

direct comparison with having, you know, an organization be represented by more than one person on the ExCom because it's just, it's apples and oranges right?

And, you know, the - in terms of delegating a single person for multiple members, you know, we do also offer the possibility of an association membership in the stakeholder group where, you know, multiple organizations can be represented by a single person who participates so, you know, like the BRGs, the Geo groups. So, you know, it's - these are things that are still open but I just don't think putting them - putting on the same footing as the ExCom makes sense.

Kristine Dorrain: Actually just want to do a QuickTime check because I - do we have - we have time? About ten minutes okay. Yes so I guess this will probably be last thing but Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. So I actually do not agree that association membership is the same thing as - and again I am biased right because I do represent more than one company or I could. I could be the voting rep for more than one company just like you work for a company that's got two members of the ExCom right? So we kind of come in this with biases and we're going to agree to disagree.

But at the end of the day I would argue that if two companies willingly sign a form that says that you can represent them and they knowingly do that then that is completely different than saying that there's some sort of capture from an individual person especially in the case of myself when its brands and they are so low on the totem pole of the weighted voting.

But putting that aside I just think that it's - it hasn't been a problem before and I don't - I think we're creating a solution to something that's never been a problem. And I don't foresee it being a huge problem. And I don't think and the last point is there is a section there a proxy voting but it's very impractical

and it requires that you get a proxy. So like in theory I could get a proxy but it's only with respect to individual issue and it's got so many limitations that it's just not a substitute. So thanks.

Erica Varlese: I think that the proxy stuff is because of Florida law right?

Woman: In terms of the - how it's limited...

Jeff Neuman: Yes it is. But I'm just saying that it was argued in one case. When the comment was made there was some comments on the email that said well don't worry, you can always just get a proxy if you represent more than one. And I'm saying that that actually doesn't really work like that. It's much more difficult. I'm not putting down or saying the proxy thing is wrong. I'm just saying it's not a substitute.

Erica Varlese: I think just for time we'll probably wrap here. (Beth) I saw you hand go up a little bit earlier. I didn't want to - okay, I'm not ignoring you. Okay I think on that point then I don't want us to go over so I appreciate that conversation. It's helpful and just to go through really quickly Sue if you don't mind scrolling all the way to the bottom just to show what's coming up next. We will be meeting as a group taking this feedback into consideration, you know, as Sam said and I said there's a few points that are outstanding mostly on these topics. So we will discuss that and, you know, we're hoping in early April to be able to hold a vote. It depends on the timelines and our - it depends on our discussion. The timeline depends on our discussion so we will be meeting soon to go over that. And hopefully, you know, once we've come to a decision, hopefully within the next few weeks we will send that out again to the stakeholder group and hold a vote again this time, you know, incorporating the feedback we received here and previously. So it is a little TBD but that's just kind of what's to be expected.

So I'll wrap this here. Donna I don't know if you just want me to go into the next part yes. Oh go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Erica. So Erica and (Pat) are going to give us an update on our ATRT3. But I just want to make a public service announcement. We have to get from here over to the registrars which is in the other building as I understand it.

Woman: Is it at the Convention Center?

Donna Austin: Yes at the Convention Center. So and I understand we can get coffee at the other end. So, you know, once we wrap up here we'll go across to the registrars and we're, you know, due to speak to them at 3:15 so it takes about ten minutes I think to walk across so over to (Pat) and Erica and then we'll finish up here and I'll see - we'll see everybody over in the registrars room. Thanks Erica and (Pat).

Erica Varlese: Great. So I'll just all be dominating the rest of this. So we just wanted to give a quick update on the Accountability and Transparency Review Team is not officially started yet but we have had some plenary meetings starting at the end of January. So we wanted to use this time to give (Pat) and I will both be there representing the registries and wanted to use this time to go over a little bit what's happened so far, just give an update and also request a little bit of feedback. And considering time I think it might be best if we also just send this to the group and get some feedback via email too.

                  But in a short we've had I think four calls so far, you know, just going through the planning process to get started. There is a one-year timeframe for the review so that will start during our face to face meeting. In the first week of April we'll be meeting in LA. (Pat) and Cheryl Langdon-Orr have been elected co-chairs. So we've started - so far we decided to use the in terms of what we've decided on and have started with we're using the updated operating standing - standards as our guideline. We had a brief informal meeting yesterday and currently where we are is that we're looking for feedback on topics in areas of priority for each of us for - and for us, you know, these are

the elements of the bylaws that refer to, you know, what we will be reviewing the actual substance of the group.

And we wanted to use this chance to have the stakeholder group just if there's any feedback you have for us since we will be representing you on this we want to make sure that we have that in mind and that what we're bringing to the group is accurate. So we wanted to use this chance for, you know, we have 13-ish minutes if there's anyone wants to raise in particular, any priorities that folks have for us or, you know, of course questions too but this is the - we're specifically looking for feedback on this. So I know that was quick. (Pat) is there anything that you want to add there?

(Pat):   Yes, the only thing that I would add is that given the response to the CCTRT review from the board where 37 recommendations were made and that action was taken on six from the board's perspective is that we want to make certain that we are getting really tight on what the objectives are for the ATRT3 so that we're not putting a lot of things in front of the board and then get a comment that is we don't have the budget to do any of this. And so when Erica is asking for feedback what are the priorities for the stakeholder group so that we can make sure as we're representing this group what do we want to take a look at from the standpoint of accountability and transparency that's meaningful to us so that we can make sure that those are prioritized or at least advocate for those parties within the group itself.

Jeff Neuman: Hello.

(Pat):   Hi.

Jeff Neuman   Jeff Neuman. So I'm trying to get my head around this because we've had two ATRTs but those were under the old bylaws. Now we have new bylaws and a new ATRT so it's kind of difficult because the first thing I would've said is, "Well how have we followed through on ATRT2 but a lot of that may have already been handled with the new bylaws. And so maybe if it's possible are

there things that are still unresolved with ATRT2 or is there any way to help us like kind of narrow the issues down to give help to you all when you're doing this?

(Pat):   Thanks Jeff, great question. This is (Pat). So staff is going to put together - let me back up. Staff is going to put together an overview of what has been done around ATRT2. So we'll have that when we get together at our first face to face meeting on April 3 through 5 which is our kickoff for a year. So we'll take a look at that so we can certainly push that around to the group to go through that.

But you're right in terms of were under new bylaws. And so it's kind of like looking backwards may not be the right thing on ATRT2 but we're obligated to take a look at that in terms of what the bylaws are. So one of the things that may be considered is to do a light touch on ATRT2 and kind of take a look at where we are under today's bylaws and going forward because one of the things that Erica and I have talked about in the group a little bit is that when you listen to Cherine and Goran talk about the next five-year plan and evolution of the multi-stakeholder model, the evolution of unique identifiers, security and stability, the no lobbying lobbying item around consensus, I'm sorry privacy issues and content around the globe and then the last pillar being of course finances what do we need to do to look forward under the current bylaws and changes that might occur and then and maybe do some things in that direction that are forward-looking as opposed to a more backward looking since to your point ATRT2 is under the old bylaws.

So we're still going through that. And we just want to make certain that we capture what this group is interested in if there's ideas that - and we'll take them up until, you know, April, May because we don't have to have the terms of reference in until June 3. So we've got 60 days to get the terms of reference in and turn it into the board and then our intention is in Marrakesh to actually review those with each of the SOs and ACs to get feedback. But we'd like to get more feedback ahead of time.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. And say well you also just brought something to my mind (Pat) as well. How does this interact with the new study or whatever - I forgot what it's called that Brian Cute is leading? You know, I would think that I would hope in your terms of reference and (Brian)'s group that there's some clear delineation. I'm not sure I fully understand what Brian's group is doing versus what yours.

And then I'll just make the general statement I made yesterday I don't know where it falls but essentially I think one of the biggest problems of the multi-stakeholder model is how you find consensus. We talked about this right, I think (Pat) at one point. How do you find consensus amongst parties that don't all have incentives to reach a compromise or that benefit from staying in their silos? Again I don't know if that's accountability, I don't know if that's Brian's. I don't know where it fits in.

(Pat): So this is (Pat). So I think that when you take a look at what Brian's mission is it's really around the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model and the governance piece. And so I think that that's really what he is going to focus on and will look at the accountability and transparency around that starting with what's Brian's statement of work? What is - what are the deliverables that Brian's expected to deliver in as part of that process?

So I think that in my mind it's clear what the difference is between what Brian's doing because he's going to take a look at what doesn't work or what works and we're going to take a look at how accountable other people in that process and how transparent is that process. Does that help?

Erica Varlese: Okay it seems like there's no other questions so far. So what I'm thinking is we can, you know, I guess when we have that document you mentioned from staff, you know, the ATRT2 we can share that potentially with the group. And then we could send this out as well just for a little bit more background and

see for folks to provide feedback via email to. Like (Pat) said, you know, we can take this into April and May.

(Pat):	So one other thing I would add is that this comes right out of the bylaws and so this is kind of the first area we're looking at in terms of areas that we are either obligated or permitted to take a look at by bylaws. So augmenting this or using this as an identifier to say yes here's something that falls underneath this would be very helpful. So we'll get this sent out to the mailing list and then again we'll send out the other document when it's available.

Erica Varlese:	Go ahead Donna.

Donna Austin:	Thanks Erica and (Pat). So I have a question. My understanding is that you are representing the GNSO, not just the Registry Stakeholder Group so you were appointed by the GNSO is my understanding. Is that correct or...

(Pat):	That's correct. But this is where we live.

Donna Austin:	Okay, just wanted to clarify that. So this, you know, like many of the other working groups that we have this will likely become a standing item on our regular agenda so the intent would be that we, you know, get regular updates from yourself and Erica in how we can provide input and help you in any way but thank you.

So if there's no other questions for (Pat) and Erica at this point, just a reminder we have a closed session with compliance tomorrow. I think it starts at 1:30, not 100% sure. (Ray) circulated a or maybe Sue circulated a Doodle poll in relation to the communications piece that led up to the audit. If people can take some time to just, you know, take a look at that, it's quick and dirty analysis of, you know, how you felt the communications piece went and it's what worked well, what can be improved, what puzzled us.

It will be really helpful if you could just take five minutes to have a look at that, put down your thoughts on the Doodle poll and then that will help (Ray) in that part of the session tomorrow. So just to from folks could look for that email that would be great. And hopefully we'll get a good turnout to that session tomorrow and hopefully it will be a good discussion about, you know, the remit of compliance, how they use the DAAR report. So Brian will be leading the first session. Crystal will do the session on, you know, how those reputation feeds are used by compliance and then we'll go into a discussion about the communications because I think it was - we weren't very happy with how that was managed.

So we're hoping to kind of reset the relationship with compliance. This is an opportunity to do that so hopefully that will - we'll be all happy when we walk out of the end of it. So Brian that's, yes okay.

Sue: Okay. It just says 1:00.

Donna Austin: It's at 1:30 in Diamond. And just remember it is a closed session so if you see anyone that's not supposed to be there. So I think we're good for here. We'll meet the registrars over in the - do we know what room it is Sue?

Sue Schuler: Yes we're in Room 301. And just as a logistical they are serving coffee in that other building. So rather than stand in these lines it should be significantly less lines over in that other building. The coffee is in the reception hall over in the KICC and it is a significant walk as Donna said.

For those that are following us online you will have to log into the other Adobe room which you can find on the full schedule. And we'll be back in 15 minutes.

END