

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad
GDD Executive Staff Meeting
Friday, 04 November 2016 at 18:30 IST**

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>

James Bladel: Welcome to the GDD Executive Staff who'll be joining us for an update from GDD to the GNSO Council. Over here we have (Akram), Cyrus, Jen - welcome Jen. Welcome back to the table.

Jennifer Gore: Thank you.

James Bladel: And I'm sorry - could we have some introductions here from some of the other folks please?

Dennis Chang: Dennis Chang, ICANN staff.

Eleeza Agopian: Eleeza Agopian, ICANN staff.

Brian Aitchison: And Brian Aitchison, ICANN staff.

James Bladel: Okay. I think ICANN staff was probably understood. But anyway let's just walk through some of these slides and I think (David), is it you that have slide control?

(David): I think Dennis has controls though.

James Bladel: Dennis. Okay. Great. So if we could start through the slides and then I would just note that we're a couple minutes behind and so if we can leave time for Q&A, that'd probably be helpful. Thank you. Go ahead.

Cyrus Namazi: If you don't mind James, I'll start very briefly. Thank you. Thank you very much James, (Heather) and Donna. I'm sorry. I (unintelligible), also ICANN staff. If you could forward the slides, Slide 1 slide.

So we have a number of updates for you primarily broken into two categories. One is the new gTLD program reviews update. This is what we do routinely. Eleeza Agopian is going to lead that for us.

As you probably know, Karen Lentz has left us for a year to get her Master's Degree and hopefully come back she's told us. So Eleeza has been - has stepped up in filling of shoes.

And then policy implementation updates. We have a number of policies that are in various stages of implementation, as you know. Wanted to give you a brief update on that and hopefully at the end have some time for some interactive discussions.

Do feel free to stop us at any point obviously to ask questions, provide feedback. We want this to be as interactive as possible. So without further ado, let me hand the microphone over the Eleeza to kick this off. Thank you.

Eleeza Agopian: Thanks Cyrus and thanks for having us here. So I'm here to talk to you about the program reviews that are under way. I know that you've received a

number of updates on the PDPs and some other reviews today. So I'll try to keep this brief and talk about the highlights particularly on research and different reports that have been published since the last ICANN meeting.

And we'll have a longer session on this. You're kind of getting the sneak preview version. We have a session tomorrow at 1:45 pm in Hall 2 that will go into more detail on each of these reviews and each of the policy proceedings.

But one of the biggest updates so far is on the CCT review and I'm sure your liaison (Carlos) has kept you up to date on what's been doing on in this review team.

They've received a number of different research products in the last few months that's helping them come up with interim findings that they have put out to the community at this meeting and are planning on publishing their draft report by the end of this year.

But the biggest ones so far have been the publication of the Phase 2 consumer and registrant survey results that were done by Nielson as well as the second phase of the economic study that was conducted by Analysis Group.

And this focused on the competitive effects associated with the new G program and looked at things like wholesale and retail prices as well as non-priced competition (unintelligible).

There are two additional studies that were commissioned that they requested the CCT Review Team that I think would be of interest to you and I think Jonathan spoke about these earlier in his session. Jonathan Zuck spoke about these earlier with all of you.

One is the commission - I say the commission from AM Global on new gTLDs in the global South and why there weren't more applicants from the global South.

We published this recently to the CCT Wiki and it's pretty interesting reading. I'd urge you to look for that and I can put the link to that in the chat after I'm done here.

As well as a survey of all the new gTLD applicants. So we sent out invites to all of the applicants, about a list of 500 unique applicants, which covered all 1930 applications.

The response rate hasn't been great so we would love to have more respondents. So if you think you should have received an invite and didn't, please come see me and I can make sure that you receive an email like or I can provide you the link here.

The more responses we get, I think the better sense we'll have of your experience with the application and evaluation process. This was, like I said, something that was a direct request of the CCT Review Team.

In addition to looking at competition, choice and trust, they're also tapped with looking at the application and effectiveness - the effectiveness of the applicant and evaluation process.

So this survey covers things like satisfaction, experience with GAC advice for example, (PIX) and a number of different questions. So we would love more participation in that.

Finally - not finally. Those are the major ones on the CCT Review Team. The other kind of two milestones that have been reached in the program reviews was a publication of the Trademark Clearinghouse review draft report.

And we received a number of public comments on it and are expecting to publish a revised report early next year. This review was commissioned at the request of the GAC. So Greg Rafter from Analysis Group is here and he'll be presenting his findings to the GAC on Sunday. So if you're interested in a more wholesome explanation of that, I'd urge you to attend that session.

And lastly, the - for short, the root server - the root stability study, also known as CDAR, the Continuous Data-driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability Report was just published last week and it's open for public comment now. We'll be having a session on that on Monday with the consortium that's TNO, SIDN and NLnet Labs, they're the ones who conducted this research for us.

So just real quickly I wanted to show you the timeline to give you a sense of what's been accomplished to date. As I said, I know you've received updates on all the different policy processes. But this is kind of an estimated timeline for where we see things falling and when we see major milestones coming up.

So the CCT Review Team has received a lot of data now and is digesting it and coming up with the preliminary recommendations. We anticipate they'll be done with their work by Q2 of 2017.

The Trademark Clearinghouse review, as I said, is also coming to a close as the Root Stability Study. That should be done around April of next year. And in the bottom portion you can see all of the different policy efforts are under way.

The dotted lines represent kind of our best guess as to the implementation timeline for all of those policy recommendations. And they all, as you see, kind of fall off the map at 2020. So that's sort of the long view of all of the different pieces we see going forward.

And lastly, these are - there's a number of different sessions related to reviews, not just the efforts that I mentioned earlier. There's also the use country and territory names - the CCWG, (Heather)'s going to be speaking on our panel tomorrow about the work that group has done as well as the working group for the RPM PDP and a number of other GAC sessions that are really related to these reviews as well as the - the CCT review as well as the TMCH review. So I'd urge you to attend these if you are interested. And I think I'll stop there.

Dennis Chang: Before we proceed to Thick Whois, anyone have any question to Eleeza? No question noted. So then we'll move on to the next topic. This is the Thick Whois Policy Implementation Project.

So the background, as you know, there was a ICANN Board resolution on 7 February of 2014. And the Implementation Team has been working in coordination with Implementation Review Team and has decided that the implementation would best be served by splitting the project into two outcomes.

One being the consistent labeling and display and the other being the transition from thin to thick Whois for .com, .net and .jobs. So as of today, both activities are in the public comment period. So in October of 2016 we have published the draft policy for public comment. And the - it will be open for your comment until December 12 and 15 respectfully.

And following that we will proceed with our usual summary and analysis report in January. And we'll be continuing to work with the IRT to finalize the policy language and consider any comments that we receive. And our target date for publication for that final policy is 1 February 2017.

And the two efforts have different effective dates. The consistent labeling and display target effective date is 1 August 2017. And the transition from thin to thick for .com, .net and .jobs we have actually two effective dates.

For the new registration we're proposing an effective date of 1 May 2018. And to transition all the existing registration to thick the Implementation Team has come up with a target date of effective date of 1 February 2019.

So that is the summary report for the Thick Whois. And there is a session on Thick Whois on Tuesday. So I invite you to attend and learn more about the Thick Whois projects. Do we have any questions for Thick Whois? Hearing none, we'll move on to the next topic and that is the translation and transliteration of contact information and Brian is managing this project.

Brian Aitchison: Yes. Thanks Dennis. As Dennis said, this is Brian Aitchison and I am leading the translation and transliteration of contact information project or what the cool kids call TNT. I'll just go over some of the policy recommendations in brief and to give you a brief update on the implementation status.

So registries and registrars may voluntarily translate and/or transliterate registration data voluntarily being a key provision there. The policy recommendations do provide some requirements for how registries and registrars may translate and/or transliterate registration data. And the recommendations also require that we work to coordinate the implementation with other Whois efforts.

As far as the current implementation status, we are in the early stages of discussing the requirements for the scope of the policy implementation project. And we're - GDD staff and the IRT are currently in the early drafts of looking at policy language.

We will have a meeting on Tuesday the 8th at 2 o'clock. And that's where we'll be reviewing that policy language. So thanks very much. That's the update. And I'm happy to take questions.

Dennis Chang: Any questions on TNT for Brian? Hearing none, we'll move on to the next topic. For this project is IGO/INGO identifier protection policy implementation. I know that there's a lot of...

James Bladel: We are super excited to talk about this.

Dennis Chang: Yes. Yes. We...

Woman: (Can we) solve the problem?

Dennis Chang: We do have a session on Monday on IGO/INGO where I will start out with explaining the three different activities and the scope of which this implementation project is based on.

I think you've heard a lot about the term not inconsistent. And when you hear that, those items that are not inconsistent have been approved by the Board and staff is directed to do the policy implementation.

So this covers the reservation of Red Cross, IOC IGO reservation in the second name and the INGO gets (a treatment) called claims, (I mean) their claims process, not a reservation. But it could get confusing but if you come to our session, I will explain this to you in detail.

Where we are is developing the draft policy language with the IRT and we're very, very conscientious about how we present this policy language to you so that it doesn't get misrepresented or misunderstood. So we're very - we're working very hard on that.

Our target for publication for public comment is 1 February 2017. Until then we have to solve several implementation items such as getting the authoritative list correctly from (uendessa) and figuring out how the claims system would work in coordination with the registry and registrar and what they're duties might be in such implementation.

And the target effective date is 1 February 2018 for this policy implementation. And by that time many things could happen. But the Implementation Team is focused on doing their job of implementing what is within their scope. Any question about IGO/INGO? Silence. Excellent. We'll go to the next topic.

Man: We have one question.

Dennis Chang: Oh we have one question sir. Go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Dennis. It's Donna Austin. This isn't necessarily about this particular issue but it's more a general question about the IRTs and, you know, we all hear about volunteer fatigue and all the rest of it.

So it's just a general question about what kind of participation you are getting with the IRTs and if it's, you know, sporadic or it's not as good as you'd like. Is this anything that we can do to try to help that?

Dennis Chang: Actually with this particular policy implementation project, the Implementation Team meaning the staff is doing majority of the work. And when we do the design and present it to the IRT, their role is to really gauge the alignment from with our solution with the recommendation.

So their workload is rather light. Unless we run into something that we really need their expertise, I don't see that this particular implementation project requires a lot of work by the IRT. It does require a lot of work by the staff just to be clear, so. Any further questions? No.

We'll move on to our next topic. And that is privacy and proxy accreditation implementation review. Jen, take it away.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks Dennis. Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff registrar services. So the privacy proxy accreditation implementation review kicked off the end of October for the IRT.

Today we had an update session. We have a working group session on Wednesday at 11:00. So we welcome those of you that are participating in the working group or would like to participate or I'm sorry, participate in IRT or would like to participate in the IRT. Please join us for that session.

The final recommendations were adopted by the GNSO Council this past January and approved by the Board in October. In reference to your question Donna related to participation, we actually have an overwhelming percentage now where after the session today we have three more additional IRT members. So we have over 40 IRT members.

Similar to what Dennis was saying is this is going to require an exorbitant amount of work from staff but I believe it will also require quite a bit of work from the IRT as well.

So roughly half of the IRT members are registrars and we also have members from the LEAs, IPC and various governments. And then the first, as I mentioned, the first kick off was in October.

So the proposed (framework) that we put forward and the response that we've received back thus far from Graeme Bunton, the Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, was in regards to the alignment of the registrar model from an application and accreditation program.

We have a Wiki page that outlines three different options that are going to be discussed with the IRT. And we've received initial feedback on those models thus far, which includes the lifecycle - the proposed lifecycle of a privacy proxy service provider.

James Bladel: Sorry, TPP.

Jennifer Gore: Sorry, go back.

James Bladel: If you go back one slide. A registrar reseller TPP.

Jennifer Gore: Registrar reseller - yes, I see that. Oh, it's - I'm sorry. It's an internal term that we use as far as related to the privacy proxy - there's three models as outlined and I can walk you through that as far as what it is.

I can't remember off the top - I'll have to refer to Amy Bivins on that one or go to the next slide to see if we have a reference point on it - on the options.
(Howard), thanks.

(Howard): I think the TPP stands for third party provider.

Jennifer Gore: Third party provider, yes. Sorry. Apologize for that. And then we've outlined a proposed timeline that's been presented to the IRT. And we have initial feedback on this timeline. And we'll be working amongst the group to ensure that we can work towards this timeline, that it's feasible or look to expand it if required. So any questions related to privacy proxy? Okay. Moving along. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Dennis. Donna Austin. So this is probably an observation but given the numbers of volunteers that you have for the IRT, I expect this is - that it was a contentious PDP. So I assume the implementation is going to be just so as well. Is that probably - I don't want to put you on...

Jennifer Gore: I wouldn't say it was fairly contentious. I would say it's going to be very high interest and it's going to involve - it's going to involve a great amount of participation.

Donna Austin: Okay. That's a nice way to put it. Thanks.

Jennifer Gore: I guess it depends on what side of - or what your affiliation is as to whether or not it's contentious or non-contentious. Okay.

Michele Neylon: Michele actually. I have a question.

Dennis Chang: Go ahead. Michele, did you have a question?

Michele Neylon: I do. I'd actually go back to what Donna said. Michele for the record. It could be quite contentious. It's the - the working group itself lasted I think into two years. And some of us had pretty much full heads of hair when we started. We don't now.

I suspect some of us will probably kind of die in the process of going through that working group. If the timeline that has been proposed I - it's aggressive, which is good. But I suspect it will probably take quite a bit longer.

I mean there are certain parties who did not -- how do I put this -- did not participate fully in the policy development process where I suspect may be trying to push for certain things that have already been discussed. It was take quite a bit of work to keep - make sure that they do not have an over influence on how things are implemented. I'm trying my best to be really diplomatic here.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Cyrus Namazi: This is Cyrus Namazi. And your points are very valid. I think we all know that this is a highly sensitive policy that obviously took some time to put together and a substantial part of the community actually has been interested in it. And that's what makes it I guess more or less more sensitive than some of the other policies.

And the fact that as Donna mentioned, we have so many volunteers sort of volunteering to be working with us in the implementation sort of speaks highly to that.

I mean overall and (it's that's) like we're sort of trained in some shape or form to actually help resolve these differences so that they don't become contentious. Is it going to take time to implement this policy? Yes, it's going to take a lot of time. There are some unresolved issues that need to be discussed and debated. But we're holding firm and we're going to go do it. Thanks.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks Cyrus. And Michele, your point's noted about the timeline and the feedback around it being aggressive. And receiving feedback today during the session on privacy proxy it was noted in the audience as well that the timeline may require expansion and we've baked that into our plans as well.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Jennifer. Michele again. No, just very briefly. I think the - one of the things I think is something that we will be - several of us will be raising at various places is the number of registrars who are able to engage actively in all of these different workgroups, IRTs and everything else.

I mean there's a finite number of us. And most of us have day jobs as well. So, you know, the - it's we prefer to see things being done properly rather than done in an overly aggressive time table and then you end up in a situation where six, nine months down the road we realize that something has gone quite far off track and then it becomes much more contentious sort of may - we could have been, you know, a certain degree of contention could have been avoided let's just say. So I think just - that's the only point I wanted to make on that. Thanks.

James Bladel: Just - yes. Just to build on that, you know, keep in mind that at the end of an IRT that kicks off the beginning of an internal development project at every

one of the registries and registrars. And in some cases like this one could be fairly extensive.

So I think I, you know, I would love to get more developers and operational type folks involved in IRTs if I knew that we weren't going to be reopening or revisiting policy decisions.

I would feel like okay, it's safe to bring in, you know, like because otherwise I feel like we send the wrong people to an IRT and then we come back and then all of the developers are like well why did you agree to this. We can't make this work. You know, so it would be better if we could get the right people involved at the right stage of the process.

I just wanted to note also that we're about halfway through our time and I don't know how many more of the IRTs and then we have other topics as well. And I think we've got Heath. If you want to weigh in on this topic Heath, the privacy proxy thing.

Heath Dixon: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay. So let's go to Heath and then we'll go to the final IRT.

Heath Dixon: So Heath Dixon from Amazon Registrar. And Cyrus, I wanted to follow up on something that you said about there being open issues to be resolved and the staff understanding that.

That makes me a little bit nervous given what James was just saying about the difference between resolving policy issues and implementation issues. So could you clarify what you meant by open issues that the staff is anticipating?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you. Yes. I'll be happy to explain that. This is Cyrus Namazi again for the record. Any time we actually have a consensus policy that's adopted and

comes to us for implementation, there is different parts of the community that come in with different agenda items. I'll be very frank with you.

And in terms of how that consensus policy actually gets translated into implementation is there's various opinions and ideas on how it needs to be done. And this is a part of what - why it actually takes so long to end up actually implementing it.

It was by no means a reference to us interpreting or changing what the policy intended to do. If there's questions like that, then we'll have to go back to the people that actually make the policy and have them clarify for us.

We don't see ourselves in the role of actually changing policies or revising policies. That's not the intent. That's not what I was trying to say. So rest assured.

Heath Dixon: Thank you.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks Heath. So just quickly, the inter registrar transfer policy summary, just a quick update that the implementation date at this point in time is December 1 of this year. So less than 30 days away for the implementation of this policy.

It incorporates key elements regarding a new defined term and mechanisms in which registrars will have to receive consent in a secure manner - active consent from the prior to the new registrant for transfer as well as triggered events - defined triggered events related to change of registrant.

And the following is just the policy events summary as to how we've gotten to this point as far as where we are from the date in which the policy was published to the current implementation date of December 1.

We are aware of the submission of the letter from the Registrar Stakeholder Group to the GNSO. And we look forward to the GNSO and the Board.

James Bladel: Darcy?

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell for the record. So yes we did share a letter with the council following up on a lot of the conversations that (Graham) and I had had with Cyrus and you and other staff members. And I think, you know, our conversations earlier were clear that we're not challenging the policy but, you know, during the IRT I think that we're seeing some areas where implementation and all of the challenges that come with implementation of any policy maybe didn't foresee that this particular challenge relating to privacy and proxy services.

And it is clear from our conversations with staff that you perceive a change of registrants to include turning off a Whois privacy service or turning it on. And so this is a significant challenge. It's a problem with for how registrants interact and experience the management of their domain names.

And as we've continued to look at how we're implementing because we have the deadline coming up and we're all working on it, you know, I think it's clear that we have sort of two different policy issues overlapping. And one is the transfer policy itself. But then another piece of it is the privacy proxy and we have this privacy proxy program accreditation program in development.

And it seems at this point that we should consider whether or not we can take the privacy proxy piece. It's already been considered at the PDP level for privacy proxy and will also be discussed in the IRT but that's maybe a little bit more of an appropriate place to put that for right now and get into a better position where we have an operation that works.

Woman: Thanks Darcy for your feedback on that. And we at staff also agree but we were to make sure that the policy works in the functions for the registrars.

James Bladel: So could I ask Jennifer Gore what do you need - what does staff need to happen to make that change to move this very narrow - and just for the folks maybe that art is familiar with this there we're really under the hood now. And I know the folks who worked on the transfer issue and works on the privacy proxy issue see the overlap. But what is it that you need in order to say yes this piece does not belong in the transcript piece, this piece belongs in the Privacy Proxy Implementation Group which is, you know, a different group because it's more relevant over there. Do you need just a letter? Is it do you need - what needs to happen because we're looking at December 1 I think to your point. We're less than 30 days out before compliance starts flagging us for this and our developers are throwing up their hands and say there is no way to make this work?

Man: Thank you. It's - Jennifer Gore if you don't mind I'll answer then you can chime in. This actually goes back to the concern that was raised by Keith which is, you know, staff is not in the position to actually sort of revise what's already become the policy. So the process we think that needs to be followed is if the council agrees with what the registrar stakeholder group is asking for then the council needs to sort of informed the board of this change and then the board has to direct the staff to make the change and that's sort of the process that needs to take place. Staff is not empowered to change the policy.

James Bladel: Okay so if we were to follow that recipe then and quickly apparently then that would be acceptable to staff as far as we now have a sufficient basis to change that particular element of this implementation, this transfer of elements? Okay.

Woman: James also to follow up on Cyrus point I - I'll take the action item to pull the actual section out of the new bylaws that allows the GNSOs to have those tools at their disposal.

James Bladel: Okay I guess Keith?

Keith Drazek: Yes thank you very much, Keith Drazek for the transcript. You know, I think one of the important elements of the communication to the board and ultimately to staff would be say while this is being figured out please instruct compliance to not start dinging the registrars on that particular topic right? In other words so if they're, you know, this is going to take some time to figure out. I think there needs to be a bit of a waiver right -- something like that.

James Bladel: Thanks Keith and this is James speaking. And in fact we did raise that as an option in Marrakesh is whether or not we could get them to agree at least on this particular point to what we called soft enforcement where it was more of a notification that this was, you know, and we were informed that that wasn't a decision that they could make unilaterally. So it sounds like what we need just going back off what Cyrus was saying is to put this letter together and to, you know, table it, discuss it as a council. We can discuss it on our list. I, you know, I may be missing something. I'm probably biased as a registrar because I'm getting it from in both ears when I go back internally. But it seems like it's fairly noncontroversial but it is something that we need to move on fairly urgently. So let's just take that as an action item to follow from this meeting. Thanks.

Woman: Thanks James.

James Bladel: So was that the end of the IRT and implementation? Okay so thank you for those updates. Obviously a lot of work for you guys but that's just the beginning of the - that's just the tip of the iceberg or the tip of the spear before the - for the work team flow downstream. Okay so next - what's next on our agenda is continued interaction with GDD on other topics or is this - was this it? We have three minutes left in this particular timeframe to allocate. Any questions from the table while we have Cyrus and (Akram)? Is there anything you'd like to beef them up on that's not related to implementation review? Yes Heather. Oh, Heather you're in for it now Heather?

Man: Heather just warmed up in the GAC vision for us.

Heather Forrest: Which is what I want to talk about. I'm, you know, I'm - Heather Forrest for the record. On that topic I'm - (Akram) and Cyrus and I walked into this room together and were grumbling about that. So you guys clearly heard that discussion. I'm what could you - are you in a position as staff? If you're not then that's fine but are you in a position as staff to give us your impression of that discussion that we just had about the role of the GAC and GAC advice and GNSO recommendations? And do you have any insight for us given your role in the organization as to what we might do to tackle misconceptions and so on? Thanks.

(Akram): Thank you Heather. I hope the time expires before I start talking but it didn't.

James Bladel: I'm going to go ahead and keep the clock open just for you (Akram).

Man: But I'll keep poking you from over here (Akram).

(Akram): So actually the board has this in front of them. They are looking at this. They might not be able to get through this issue this week or while we are here in Hyderabad. But they plan to review it as soon as possible, probably within two weeks after we leave Hyderabad if they don't get to it here. So it's something from the board and they have been considering all different options and the debate is going on. It's not up to staff actually decide or, you know, influence one way or another how the board is going to decide on this.

But I think it's the board is very conscious of the issue and they are looking at being in-between a GNSO policy and a GAC advice and how to figure out to get the right thing done. And that's what they're looking at and hopefully we will, you know, the board will convene on this issue and come back with a decision shortly. It's not going to take too long okay? And there is a board GAC session where I'm sure the board is going to have to discuss that with

the GAC so that's another place to get a sense of where the board is.

Thanks.

James Bladel: Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks James, Don Austin. I just wanted to make a note we've had a little bit of a discussion around the scheduling for this meeting. And while the board is having the conversation with the GAC on IGOs we actually have our GNSO Council meeting which is unfortunate timing, one of many unfortunate timings.

(Akram): We will make sure to cut and paste records and send it to you so you can see what happens. Yes I mean this is as long as the meeting is we still find ourselves having problems scheduling things. It's amazing how many parallel sessions we're having. Our meetings team I mean part of the biggest problem of where we defined locations for meeting is not the size of how many people attend. It's really how many tracks we have. And that's a problem that is going to continue it seems to continue to grow and we need to figure out a way around it.

James Bladel: So I think the mistake is looking for hotels when we should be looking for high schools. Okay thank you (Akram) and Cyrus. Any other questions from the floor on any of the implementation or the subjects that we were discussing relative to meeting schedule or IGO? Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks Michele for the record, just very briefly on the implementation and stuff in general do you have any kind of - are you tracking the amount of time between when the policies are approved at the GNSO/board level and these IRTs are kicked off and what is it at present and is it an improvement on what it was 12 months ago?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Michele. This is Cyrus for the transcript. In fact I was just sort of briefing (Akram) that we just sort of did an analysis of all of the policies that

we have implemented. I don't remember how far back it goes -- a number of years. And in terms of from the start actually when the PDP was formed to the time that it was adopted and then to the time that it was implemented and the trajectory actually is quite steep going up in terms of the time that these policies are taking from inception to implementation.

And I am hoping that once we actually sort of clean this up to share that with you and the rest of the community I think this is interesting information. And one of the things that jumps out at me is that there seems to be actually a spike in the time that it takes for us now to get to the implementation date and it really coincides with the fact that there is a lot more IRT involvement in policy implementation that didn't used to be as such.

And I'm not suggesting that's not a good thing but the fact that we just have more voices and more people around the table debating and discussing these things and perhaps maybe there's also a heightened level of sensitivity to the newer policies with the new gTLD program and all of that. So despite it's quite steep. When we go back from ICANN 57 I'll try to clean this up and share it with you. I think you'll find that very interesting.

(Akram): If I may when I looked at that graph actually one of the things that I couldn't get from it is whether over time we're dealing with the harder issues. So as we move forward in time are we getting nastier issues that we're dealing with and therefore thus why things are taking longer or is it just because, you know, we're for another reason that, you know, we don't have enough people on it or it - I don't know but there's the question of as we move in time don't all the problems become that we're trying to solve become harder and harder and so we need to take that into consideration as well?

Michele Neylon: Thanks (Akram) but I think you misunderstood my question. It wasn't the length of time the IRT took. It was the gap between when a policy was decided on and the IRT starting because that's the - because the issue with that is that -- and I'm sure others here can back me up on this -- but the time

we start the implementation of policy one we're already halfway through the workgroup of policy three in a series of four or five. And the people who are working on policy one, two, three, four and five are well basically the same people. So it becomes you end up with a bunch of different issues. I was trying to see if you actually had some data on that.

Cyrus Namazi: Thanks Michele. This is Cyrus. I don't remember that particular piece of data. Let me go back and look at it and report back to you on it. I don't know if I have it or if I just don't remember it.

James Bladel: Okay thank you Cyrus. Thank you (Akram), Jennifer Gore and (Lisa) and was it (Brian)? (Brian) yes and (Dennis) left so thank you everyone for your time for your update and for entertaining our questions. We'll adjourn this session and if we could please stop the recording.

Woman: Bye. .

END