

ICANN
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting
Tuesday, 14 March 2017 at 11:00 CET

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 recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Graeme Bunton: So we've got about an hour now before we then go and meet with the registries. And we're going to be talking about compliance, and we're going to be talking about the charter. If I can queue this up for Theo while he gets comfortable.

I don't know if everyone here has actually read the Registrar Stakeholder Group charter. I kind of - I should encourage you to do so, but I do that with some hesitation because the existing one is complicated and wordy and kind of incomprehensible. And it's certainly difficult if English is not your native language. It's difficult for me, and it is.

And so we have begun the process to revise our charter and Theo has been spearheading that. And he - I'll actually let Theo cover the rest of that. I

think we're making good progress. It's almost done. He just put something in his mouth.

So I think the intent is to have this ready for the Joburg meeting and then I'm actually not sure what the process is for ratifying it. Maybe chewy Theo can inform us and let us know how we're doing.

Theo Geurts: So thanks Graeme, and this is Theo for the transcript. So in terms of progress, we actually went a little bit backwards. We were done and we had a few open items. They are on the screen there.

And I also made a request to ICANN staff who are assisting us regarding this charter to make the charter more readable and de-ICANNize the language a little bit because we're always facing the issue that there are non-members who want to become a member who are not up to speed with the ICANN language are looking at our charter and our current charter is a perfect example of it, how clunky the wording can be.

So I made a request like can you make this more readable for everybody and anybody inside or outside of the community? And ICANN staff came back with massive edits and a lot of rewording. So we need to do that. And that's going to take more time than anticipated. So we're still shooting for Johannesburg, but I'm not 100% sure if we reach that state.

In terms of process for adopting the charter, from my understanding is it will go to the ExComm first so they can have a first shot at it. Then it goes back, and then at a certain point it will go to the members and I think there is going to be a vote after we process all the comments and suggestions because I assume there's going to be some significant discussion on that subject. Any questions so far?

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Theo. Just for entertainment's sake – because many of you are still eating – I'll share with you this is Section 4.3.1, which is around eligibility for elected office. This is from our current charter.

“Any representatives of an ICANN recognized gTLD registry in the possession of or with access to registry proprietary information or registry sensitive information as defined in the relevant ICANN registry contract is ineligible to represent the Registrar Stakeholder Group as a whole either as an elected officer,” blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

And it keeps going on like - oh, here's the other good one. “If a member services registrar with no unaffiliated third party registrants was under common ownership with an entity that in the last 12 months has voted in another SG or any constituency of another SG or holds a signed registry contact with ICANN that includes an exemption from the registry operator code of conduct specification 9 2013 standard registry context that prohibits a registry to directly or indirectly show any preference providing...”

It carries on like this for quite a while. No one know what this means. It's super problematic. So making the language readable on the new charter is extremely important, especially as we're translating it into other languages to be a more global organization.

So I guess my own question for Theo would be has there been any sticking points in the processes or any places you think we're going to see discussion or controversy or friction?

Theo Geurts: So - and this is Theo for the transcript. So the section you just read out to the public here, that has been removed. The charter team looked at it, and we

couldn't make any sense out of it. So anything that we couldn't make any sense out of it, we simply removed.

What this in front of us here are questions and I hope I'm not going to be doing all the talking here because these are the sticky points that we as a charter team do not know where to go with. So we need to have answers on these questions in order for us to progress.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Theo. Sorry, mouth full. This is the down side of a working lunch. 2.1 – ExComm, solved. So it's probably a little bit hard to have some substantive discussion on this because people haven't seen it. So I guess this is just really heads up, this is coming.

It's really important to our organization that we get this right, that everybody has a good hard look at this and that we can live with the results of this process.

So for context, that piece in there about registry sensitive data that was never defined in our charter has excluded many people from holding office and has made electing the ExComm quite difficult, especially over the past year has generated lots of problems and some anxiety that I would love to avoid in the future.

So we need to be careful about the provisions we put inside of our charter because we're going to presumably live with it for quite a while. And also for example the mechanisms by which we vote are captured inside the charter, and currently they're very clunky.

We don't do a lot of voting aside from the vote for office. The most recent one was around the extension of the privacy and proxy spec. And we had to

fast track that because of time constraints. And if you'll recall we were splitting into two separate fast track motions.

So it required some jumping through hoops and being very careful because a full regular process to vote on an issue essentially takes a month, given our current charter, and that's very slow.

So heads up, this is coming. Spend some real time on it, maybe chuck it to a lawyer if you have one inside your company. And give us some real good feedback on this and think about how -- those of you have experience in history in the Registrar Stakeholder Group -- think about how we do things, how this might make those things better, what this is going to look like in practice. Is that a hand (Tom)?

Tom Barrett: Yes I guess I would caution against taking out sections because you don't understand them. They're put there for a reason. Maybe they need to be better explained or separated into multiple points.

But I wouldn't simply eliminate sections because the current team cannot understand them. So I would caution against that and try to understand more about the history behind some of these.

Theo Geurts: Thanks Tom and that is a very valid question. So in terms of process, we have a charter team. We are being assisted by ICANN staff. Two of them are right over there if you could maybe raise your hand a little bit. Thanks.

So in this process, ICANN has reviewed the language of our old charter and it proposed new language. And every time we go through a section, there is the new proposed language and there is the old language. And then the charter

team discusses what is the best language here, what does capture our intent for the members here.

And there are sections which we had -- after long discussions -- still had no idea what the purpose was. And one of the problems we are facing is there is no collective memory from people who wrote it ten years ago with a certain purpose, and we can't ask these people any more what was the spirit.

But it is language that is non-usable because it has no meaning or it doesn't capture the intent any more. So what happens in that process is we review it. Then there is a decision that we strike the language, which is being marked as being stricken.

The next charter meeting we revise the language again. Do we still feel the same about this? Do we still need to strike the language? So there's a thorough process there of removing language if required. So in terms of process, there's a little bit of what we are doing or what we were doing because we are actually past that stage.

Of course if you want to compare it Tom, there's always that option to go back to the old charter because that will be part of our discussions. Thanks.

Tom Barrett: Yes there actually may be some historical information that you can draw on. Maybe the current group doesn't have access to it but it may be in the archives of the mailing list. So I can certainly help point you in that direction. We can have that conversation.

Theo Geurts: So what I will do here Tom -- and this is Theo for the record again -- I will check with staff what we actually removed and I will pass it on to you. And if we can set something up, going through these archives which go way, way

back, we can actually see if it really needs to be re-entered into the charter. But my gut feeling is no, but we can surely do that. And I think for transparency sake, that is perhaps a good idea to do, so thank you for that.

Another thing I wanted to highlight – and this is important for your membership status – is all these practical issues like on the screen for example you see – picking a random one – yes, 2.6.2(G), should there be a penalty system?

Now why is there language like “should there be a penalty system”? Because we as the ExComm, we are sending the invoices every year, and we also deal with the fact that for whatever reasons, people are paying late.

For us registrars, it’s pretty normal to add an extra penalty fee or some kind of interest for people who are paying late. So the suggestion was made should we do something within the Registrar Stakeholder Group? And that is why the question is up there because we as this charter couldn’t come to full agreement there.

And it could be that we don’t come to full agreement within the stakeholder group and then it would actually I assume mean that that section will go.

Could also mean that during the discussion people come up with better suggestions than a penalty system. But that is just something practical that will affect you all if you are a member and if you are renewing your invoice when it gets sent out again. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Theo and we certainly appreciate the work that the team is doing on this and I feel personally pretty confident that if the team is looking at the old

charter and doesn't find the section incomprehensible, that it's probably pretty incomprehensible. Stephanie, I saw your hand?

Stephanie Dechesneau: Quick point, I support Tom's ask for context but I caution that we not take it to the extent that we're considering anything that was once decided so is still the best model for the group. I think we need to actually think about it in our current context because there are probably – even there are probably decisions that we would come to differently today than whenever we last looked at the charter.

Graeme Bunton: Agreed. Thank you Stephanie. I see a hand from Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. This is the - this will be the third version of the charter that we've had. So the first - there was an old one under the old pre-change the GNSO structures, yada, yada, yada.

And then when we moved to the one that we currently have, ICANN staff – (Rob) and his team – helped kind of translate the old language into something that was compatible with the newer one.

But we didn't really do much in terms of dealing with these stupid issues we have like the voting processes, some of the stuff around the budget, some of the titles around members of the ExComm.

There's a bunch of weird legacy things in there that they don't make any sense. In 2001, 2002, 2003 or whenever the Hell these things were decided on, they probably made perfect sense. But in 2017 they just don't.

I would - I can understand, I mean, (Tom)'s concerns about, you know, just removing something because people don't understand it is a little bit

dangerous. Totally get that. But I'd agree with (Stephanie) and others, you know, that just because something was there doesn't necessarily mean that it needs to be there.

As a group, being able to vote or at least get the backing, the support, or the lack of support or whatever it is of the group in a quick fashion is really, really important.

I chaired this group for three years, and it was one of the biggest headaches I had with trying to understand how on earth to get that. So we really do need to fix it because there are issues that arise and we're expected to react quickly and we can't, and that's a problem.

Theo Geurts: So – and this is Theo for the record – so my experience as the chair – and I haven't been doing this for years, but more like eight months or seven months actually – it's been a wonderful experience because we're making so much progress and the language is getting so much clearer and we're tackling all these problems like you just described on doing a fast motion setting up of it and doing the voting positions.

That is being tackled in a magnificent way I think. So even though we still have some work ahead of us, I'm pretty sure that a new charter will be workable in a lot better fashion. I mean, I've been there in the old charter many, many times now as secretary figuring out like how do we do this and how do we do that. And the old charter is like a nightmare to find stuff in.

And given that experience, I've been hammering on to getting these issues out of the way in a new charter because I definitely want to see them again and I definitely want to go through that process again in the near future if I'm still an ExComm member. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Theo. Do we actually need to tackle these questions in front of us here today and now? So is that the intent?

Theo Geurts: That was the intent or we're taking up some considerable time here. And if - so let's turn this around a little bit. Is there anything that people want to discuss now?

Graeme Bunton: Tom is that an old hand? Michele that's an old hand too. Right so I suspect there's not because I think people are really going to need to see the whole thing and see it in context, so it's probably a little bit hard to tackle these as a whole.

They're interesting questions though like 2.6.2(C), what 10% of budget means. That's good that we should figure that out because that came up very recently when we were talking about a white paper on cross-field validation was, if this costs more than 10% and what is it 10% of.

So good, I think we - I'm very excited to see the outcome of this process. So who else is participating in this? Luc. Zoe. Janelle. Great. Oh, Joyce, awesome, so thank you guys. This is important work you're doing. I'm sure we're all super excited to rip into this new charter.

We can put these questions - I don't think we have time to really go through them now - but we can certainly put them on the list and discuss them there. And there will certainly be more questions I'm sure. Great. Thank you for the update. If there's anybody - and no one's got anything more on that? Awesome.

Okay next up on our list of things to talk about today is ICANN compliance issues. So I'm going to again editorialize a moment. I was pretty disappointed that Jamie Hedlund had not joined us in the closed session with compliance on whatever morning that was earlier – Sunday, thank you. Time has no meaning here.

But it was good that he showed up today and had a bit of time for questions and did apologize for missing that and apparently was not his fault. Most of you I think – or many of you anyway – were inside that compliance session, and I would describe it as spicy. Disconcerting.

And so I think we have some sort of structural and relationship problems with compliance at the moment. There is certainly a lot of dissatisfaction I was hearing from registrars around the audit process.

And so we should probably have a little bit of a conversation about how we want to think about repairing our relationship with ICANN compliance, the best way to move forward with discussing these issues with them, collective pain around the audit process.

And then also out of that session came a commitment from us to ask formally of ICANN a report on abuse complaints by number per reporter so that we can get some insight into - so it would be a rank of individuals or entities that are submitting complaints to ICANN and the number that they submitted. So I don't think we're actually going to get details on who they are.

We can probably guess in many cases. But it's going to give us some insight into what that compliance load looks like. Is it like 50% of complaints are coming from a single actor? How many complaints are submitted by like

single complaint individuals? So that's something that we need to put forward.

But now I guess is the moment for anybody to weigh in if they have thoughts about compliance, how we're interacting with compliance, how we can start to rebuild some of that. Stephanie and then Fred and then Michele.

Stephanie Duchesneau: On the audit, which was my particular compliance pain point this year, I think there was a common thread in a lot of the issues we were experiencing. And I would suggest that we maybe prepare like a quick post-mortem about what went well, what we thought was terrible, just to have a bit more of a structured conversation.

I think – I don't remember if it was the last meeting or the one prior – we spent a little bit more time in advance of our compliance session preparing some of the issues. And I thought that was really helpful. And I think providing the issues in written form to ICANN – I know they were taking notes – but just to make very, very explicitly clear the items that we expect some sort of response to in relation to that.

I've used the tactic before on individual issues we've worked on with ICANN and I've found it helpful.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Stephanie. And the process we used before the Hyderabad meeting was intended not to be a one-off, that it would be a recurring process. I did ask for feedback on the list and got some, but probably not enough to bake something out of that. And then it was also the holidays in between.

But certainly that is something we should do prior to Johannesburg. It does come up very quickly though that we need to gather that. And the tricky bit

about that process is that it's helpful to get individual ticket numbers, which not everybody feels super comfortable sharing.

In, you know, I guess back to me or whoever is going to be compiling this list of issues that – and it's tickets where – and we can do this for the audit as well – is individual instances where we think compliance is doing a poor job.

When we see that across members now we have a pattern and we can produce this to ICANN and hopefully they can improve those. And so we've done that once already. We now need to go back to that list of things.

We need to assess our collective experience to see if those things have materially improved. And if they haven't, hammer that home again. Take a pretty strong stance on that. So that's going to happen again in the near future. (Stephanie) you got a follow on this?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Quick response, yes. I think we can just treat it like a living document rather than having a single deliverable because we're all busy in advance of ICANN that we prepare for compliance and we go into the sessions. Just make sure we're tracking in a more organized way the problems that we encounter.

We can discuss them on our calls also. And then there's less of a sort of scramble at the end where we're trying to do ten other things and organize our teams in advance of ICANN. If we're just documenting the problems we're encountering as we go, it'll be a lot easier.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Stephanie. That's a – this is Graeme for the transcript – that's a good suggestion to keep that out there and just as a live document. And it is – like I think we've already captured the sort of categories of misspent

compliance time and – you know, where they're looking at things that are outside the contractual scope and, you know, failure to respond, insufficient response, issues like that.

So great, let's do that. Heads up, that's coming, and the more of us that participate in gathering that information, the stronger the case we have. So I would encourage people to help dig in there.

I have Michele in the queue. Sorry I skipped Fred. Fred was first.

Frédéric Guillemaut: Yes please don't skip me on that date. Regarding the audit things the discussion we had on Sunday I really had the impression that everybody is talking about something and nobody understands each other.

So maybe the best thing to do would be to join with compliance, pretend like face to face. Pretend we make an audit and then we can see what their replies are. And we could just tell them that this reply is not sufficient. We can't understand. We don't really know if that is helpful.

Because there was some comments from people that maybe you – that whatever the problem is you get the same answers. So maybe we could just work with them like to establish a workflow, to improve a workflow so that their answers from compliance would be easier to understand.

I know I have offered that last year for the GDD Summit and like you were called that fake audits. I would be ready to work, you know, with compliance on some kind of things even like presenting and being audited.

Just to show them are we supposed to answer to the question and then maybe they would understand that they need to improve the clarity of the questions and the clarity of the specifications and answers. I don't know if I am clear.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks (Fred). I think that is a reasonable idea. Compliance's response in that section to improving their responses was that it was too expensive. And you could see that ripple around the room of getting registrars backed up.

(Stephanie) you wanted...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes I have another response to it and it is actually not related to that point. But I actually think yes (Yan) understood perfectly clearly what I was referring to and the response from ICANN was just completely inadequate.

Separate from that I actually disagree that we should have to have things like tutorial audits so that we better understand the questions. In something like a compliance audit ICANN needs to be explicitly clear in what it is asking for and it is not.

And the problem isn't that like we need to have some special training so we can read between the lines and like understand what they are not telling us. They need to be explicit in what they are asking for.

Frédéric Guillemaut: May I – I am not saying we should be trained. I just saying that we should show them what we are – what kind of data we have for answers so that they can improve their questions and answer. I am talking about training them.

I mean we can complain about them being bad or not clear or so on. Okay but what should we do now? This is too expensive to change? Okay but we

could give them a few at a time and it would save us like all those (unintelligible) sometime.

I mean if it doesn't work okay fine. But we should try I guess.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Fred. I think out of the – so we need to spend some more time with compliance. That is pretty clear. Jamie I think offered his time to come and join us and we should certainly take advantage of that and maybe there is a piece of that that can involve what you are suggesting.

I am sure – no Michele was in the queue. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks. Michele for the record. Okay so the contract states that ICANN has the right to audits. And nowhere in the contract does it describe exactly what that audit is.

With other companies, other organizations with whom we have contracts have some kind of audits right as well. So we just went through the one from (Omnium). They went off and they audited us and reviewed us and then following through on various parts of their contract and everything else that has any issues.

And the only time we heard from them was when there was something that they were looking into that they couldn't find the answer for by themselves. They came to us for that. They didn't send us like this long list of questions or vaguely worded things that you don't fully understand. They have their contract. They have certain things in it. They go off and they check them by themselves and then they come to you when there is something that they are unclear about.

It was painless. It was so much easier. Now this is me being logical. Oh my god can you imagine an audit that didn't actually, you know, cause you to break into cold sweats. Now that would be nice.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Michele. Does anyone else have thoughts on this issue, process, problem? Things they need to tackle maybe unrelated to audits? (Stephanie)?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Another issue that I encountered in the audit this year and the same issue has come up in ticketed cases is being asked for information that we are not required to collect per the contract.

And when we pushed back against that and said we don't collect it, we are not required. Can you point to where this is actually required? Getting answers back like other registrars do it. You should too.

Like that just does not belong in the audit. I don't think we are going to find an answer here but I am curious if other people have similar experiences, similar answers. Because – Bob.

Bob Wiegand: I will jump in. Bob Weigand second that. So there has been a number of times where they will say, well this is best practices.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Right.

Bob Weigand: And I will say okay well I conversed with other members of the registrar stakeholder group and they are not doing it that way so it is best practices with who? You know not that I really care. It is not in the registrar accreditation agreement.

We have talked about this before with Allen Grogan. Is to be careful about unilateral interpretation of the accreditation agreement. If it is not a defined term it is open to interpretation.

So and they are good. I mean once you educate them like hey that is not in the agreement, it is not a best practice. Usually it gets them to go in a different direction.

But I do worry that some of the smaller registrars might get railroaded a little bit into doing certain things that maybe they don't have to.

The other thing is that sometimes we will get a follow up saying, oh well that's – you are not doing that. Will you consider doing this? And I am like, well no we don't want to do that.

There is a reason why we don't want to do that. Why are you even asking? It is not a requirement. It is weird. It is an awkward cadence.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Even if it was a requirement – or sorry even if it was a best practice I would argue that it doesn't even matter. Like best practices do not belong in audit. If ICANN wanted to have a parallel set of language beside the audit call it something different.

Where they said, oh by the way these are the actual issues we encountered. We would also like these kinds of things. Other registrars do this and we think it is good practice.

I mean that is fine. They can do that. I might not give it the same caveat but I might not give it the same consideration as the actual problems but they are

totally welcome to do that and I don't necessarily think it is bad. But when those two things are conflated like that is not what belongs in an audit.

Graeme Bunton: Tom?

Tom Keller: Thank you. Tom Keller for the transcript. One of the issues we have seen in the recent audits that there has been behavior as it comes to sending out notices and raising the level of notice. It goes from the first to the second to the third and then it comes (unintelligible).

That was always our impression that as soon as we respond and are engaging that there should not be not the second notice. And I heard that from various registrars so I moved up to a third notice just because apparently ICANN was under the impression that I should (unintelligible).

So, you know, debating that was, you know, helped registrars for others it didn't work. And what I find particularly interesting is that the re-audits that might happen the next years is based on the level and the mind of the third notice.

And this is not only due to the big audit but there is some issue with regular like the (unintelligible) how you can accumulate this kind of notices. And there is absolutely no regime or whatever of they give you second or third notices there is no way for actually for them to take it back.

This is very interesting because this is the unfortunate regime and the unfortunate regime and with (unintelligible) at the end. And the question is whether there are some mediation before that (unintelligible) we talked about that as well and hadn't really found a solution that you can talk to ICANN and stuff.

And then they say well from our interpretation you are in breach so you are in breach. What comes next (unintelligible)?

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Tom. I think there are in general a whole bunch of questions about what that notice process looks like. What stops the clock reasonably what doesn't?

Is there any internal to ICANN escalation? So does management need to get involved to escalate past third notice or into breach? Who is looking at those tickets?

And that is probably a conversation we need to have amongst ourselves to make sure we are clear about what behavior we are seeing. And again maybe we provide those tickets to ICANN and say these things are being done inconsistently.

Can you clarify what your process is? Can you apply that then consistently? They can take a third notice back. We got an accidental one recently. Marta?

Marta Baylina: Hi, Marta on behalf of COREhub. We have gone through an audit process for the first time this year so it has been really a learning process for us. So I am pretty sure some of the things were just new in the process.

But I just want to share that our main concern or our main problems have been the procedure and as you have discussed here how fast it escalated without really feeling that as each.

I mean for example in the first notice there were some things that still were unclear to us given the response. So thankfully I am the one dealing with compliance for COREhub on a regular basis.

And I found quite a different standard between the regular compliance cases where in my opinion is quite reasonable. You say look I am taking care of it. I need more time. This is happening.

And frankly I think, you know, ICANN's response it is reasonable and it allows some I have this question, this follow back. Then you don't normally you get just follow up questions.

We were missing maybe because we were new and we didn't know. But we totally missed or we expected that with some issues especially that were misunderstood because the – for example like in a sentence sometimes it was verification and validation in the same sentence. So you could not really even know whether it was one or the other.

So you would reply and say what is this about? But then if it was like the last day of responding then it would escalate to the next level.

So I guess I agree with what has been said here. But it would be nice first to have the same level of response and standard in terms of positive communication as in normal ticketing.

And have a little more clarity about you know when you have five issues and there is one pending. Whether you escalate on only that issue or, you know, a little bit on the procedure. So that is from our constructive perspective what I would hope for. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Marta. We have about 10 minutes left and so I need to get to our AOB. It really feels like we need a whole bunch more time to talk about this topic to me to collect some of these issues.

And then we need to get probably between now and Johannesburg into a Webinar with compliance and share some of this and talk some of that process out.

And I can see some of them in the room and I am sure they wholeheartedly agree and would be happy to be there. Anybody else have anything brief on compliance?

Lickety-split. Sub 30 seconds. If you are not I am going to just cut you off. Please and thank you. Chris then Joyce.

Chris Pelling: Chris. Maybe might be worth finding out how much KPMG are being paid to bring it in-house. They also (unintelligible) data being sent between ICANN and KPMG and all be it they mentioning (unintelligible). Mentioning about what security really is in place.

And actually taking it away from KPMG, bringing in-house, getting staff and taking the anxiety away of waiting three months before a single reply is done on audit data that is supplied.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks. Thank you Chris. I am going to keep that thought to myself. Joyce.

Pam Little: It is Pam.

Man: Sorry Pam.

Pam Little: No problem (unintelligible). So I was wondering whether this audit have actually been really achieving what they were intended to achieve? This is the fifth year we are going through those registrar audits. The first three years was about I believe the first three year cycle on 2009. Now we are going to 2013 RAA audits.

Instead of doing the whole contract audit within the scope I wonder if we change to say just audit everyone on a particular chunk of obligation. For example who is verification and then we can see whether who is really doing verification or doing suspension and all that. Would that be more helpful and be effective?

Rather than doing audit this registrar and to see whether you are from A to Zed or in compliance. And it appears to me it is not really all that effective because we still have 75% of who is (unintelligible) compliance they are processing every year, 15% of transfer issues. So what are we doing with these audits? Is it really useful or effective?

Graeme Bunton: That is a good point thank you. All right AOB time. And I hope everybody feels what I feel right now which is we have had some very good discussion so far today.

You know there are clearly more to be had and so we do need to resolve the timing function that we have here that we just don't have enough. And here I am droning on instead of (unintelligible).

We have got a few things that we are going to try and tackle in six minutes. Public comment triage team, RySG issues. I am going to go first with RySG issues which is – does anybody have anything on their radar that is not the board meeting?

That is not (BTAP) or bulk transfers sorry that they want to discuss with the registries in that session?

Man: In that session no. With registries in general yes. Which would be around prepayments.

Graeme Bunton: Around what sorry?

Man: Prepayments.

Graeme Bunton: Okay.

Man: It is an issue for a lot of us. Do I have to explain that? Well this is the problem everybody keeps saying, punt stuff to GDD but there is only going to be so many hours in GDD as well which is...

Graeme Bunton: Sorry there is some off mike talking. Michele has raised the – and Bob are discussing about what topics are we pushing into the GDD Summit in May? And is there time in the GDD Summit in May?

And I actually got a reminder to make a point for everybody to go look at the draft agenda for the GDD Summit. If you are planning on attending go look at that and...

Michele Neylon: Where is this?

Graeme Bunton: I am sure if you search for GDD Summit ICANN.

Michele Neylon: So it is on the ICANN Web site is what you are saying.

Graeme Bunton: It is on the GDD Summit Web site which is somewhere. Because – what?

So go look at that because there are priorities and there are issues that we want to tackle. And maybe it is best there. Maybe we don't have time there. But we need to set some priorities on that list. And so definitely go look at that.

Does anybody have anything else for the registries? Fred was that...

Frédéric Guillemaut: I just wanted to say that we send the link of those drafts of the GDD to the registrar.

Graeme Bunton: I think it has gone out. We can send it out again for sure.

Okay but no one else has any registry specific stuff for this next session. Dynamite. All right five minutes left.

Public comment triage team. Actually before we get to the public comment triage team I would like to say thank you to everybody who has participated in the RAA amendment team.

I know (Neil) is in there. I know (Seaman) is in there. I forget who else is participating in that. I think (Jack Newman) has done some work in there too. Apologies if I have missed your name.

You guys are doing good work. There is a lot of those coming through. It is I think a pretty reasonable process and I think adding – I think reasonable value to members of the stakeholder group.

They are seeing those summaries that come out and they can make some choices from there. So thank you to everybody participating in that.

Public comment triage team update. Who is doing that? Is that you (Zoe)? Please.

Zoe Bonython: Hi this is Zoe for the transcript. I am going to kick it off. I was going to start with describing the process of how we are doing things but in the interest of time because we have some actual questions to put to members. I am going to go directly to – well (Stephanie) and (Eric) you want to start (Stephanie)? Thanks.

And just to say, what I can do is if people are interested I can put on the list what our process is at the moment. Thanks.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Sounds great and I am covering the – I guess the eldest two topics of the public comments that are currently open. Being the at large report and the IGO curative rights report.

We are not at the stage of having a current draft for either of these on the at large report side. My recommendation and I participated heavily in drafting the registry comment which is now being published is that we submit a comment with similar positions to that.

I think the central thesis of that comment is that end user participation in ICANN is very important. We need that feedback. But right now the mechanism we are getting it through is broken.

And we are generally supportive of the fact that the report is taking – going to a lot of lengths to try to propose pretty structural reforms to the at large that

we would think would make improvements but some further suggestions for items that we think could be addressed.

Usually I would think that this is a good comment for registries and registrars to just submit a single statement because I would imagine we would be closely aligned on that point.

But in this particular context since it is through an external contractor I would suggest that there is value to having separate independent support statements. So please take a look at the issues I have raised and a summary that went out to the list.

And thankfully Reg has volunteered to help I think reframe a draft that could go out from the registrars.

On the IGO list I don't necessarily know that there is value in us filing very, very lengthy individual comments. But Darcy and James and others on the list noted the importance of supporting the work coming out of the policy development process and emphasizing that we as a stakeholder group stand behind that work.

I think that is important and I also think that we should take opportunities to reach across the aisle when there is pieces of work like I think what we have seen come out of the IGO report that we can all agree on.

I would strongly encourage now that we have had somewhat of a deadline extension to – and I can take the lead on working on this. A very short statement of support for the proposal that we could potentially shop around to the other stakeholder groups and have a comment that was signed off jointly by many of the different stakeholder groups.

Because conversely I think this is one where it is more important to show solidarity within the GNSO than to get individual words in. I think we just want to be supportive of the proposal.

But if there is anyone who is not supportive of the proposal we can raise those comments now.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Stephanie for that update. We have got a minute left.

Zoe Bonython: Thanks (unintelligible) sorry we have got one more from the triage team.

Graeme Bunton: Oh real (unintelligible).

Zoe Bonython: We have got five minutes so the tech has given us five more minutes.

Graeme Bunton: I think people also need a bit of a break too before you carry on for the rest of the afternoon.

So I guess maybe we can talk about it from a slightly higher level which is that the public comment triage team exists. It is doing good work. They are looking at the stuff that is coming through the public comment period.

They are doing a quick review to see if there is a place in those things for registrars to comment that it is appropriate that we do so. And then providing a summary to the list.

And then from there we are going to be picking people or hopefully having lots of volunteers to begin drafting the larger comment. So that is the process we are trying.

The goal is that we are going to be more effective in communicating with the larger community and that we are putting out more public comments as we should be.

We are also still investigating support from ICANN on drafting of those comments because that does exist. And taking advantage of that will lessen the responsibility on individual registrars.

So that is what is happening there. Clearly there is more content that we need to cover on that but I think we are about out of time. So pay attention to the list on this and I guess that is a recurring theme of today which is there is a lot of reading to do. Do as much as you can and we can all contribute more. But we get it. It is a heavy lift.

We are moving now to the RySG meeting in Hall 3. That will be at 2 so we have got 14 minutes from now to get there. Thank you everyone for coming and participating today. We have got one last note.

Zoe Bonython: Yes just one last note because that meeting is going to kick off with a presentation from ASOP so we really appreciate people being there on time to be present for that presentation for the award. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Great thanks Zoe. And last but not least it is Frédéric's birthday. Happy birthday. Thank you for sharing that.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: I am sorry where is the presentation? The ASOP Presentation?

Man: It is A3. It is in the registry room.

Graeme Bunton: Starts in...

Graeme Bunton: That is starting at 2. That is at the beginning of our joint session with the registries. Thank you all.

END