

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad
GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting
Sunday, 06 November 2016 at 12:30 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://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme. Just before we really get going and while this thought is in my head immediately. I thought that was a good and productive session with the Board. I think we need to think a little bit about going forward how we interact with the Registries because it seems to me like there's probably other business that we should be talking about with the Registries rather than just our meeting with the Board. And so there's probably other topics that get dropped as we discuss that.

So probably we do going forward is for the next meeting is convene a separate session for Registrars that are interested to work with the Registries for that joint Board session, so that we can work through those topics, figure out who is going to speak and have that ready to go so that we can use that hour we have with the Registries more productively to talk about more issues of common interest.

Started as part and parcel of that, I'd love to see more Registrar participation there. We were little bit underrepresented and it would be nice if we had some more people engaged in speaking in those board meetings so that it's

not quite so Registry heavy. So as we think about Copenhagen in the future, and we look at getting out sort of smaller session together of people who are interested, I'd love to see participation and volunteers for that. I'm happy to take other people's thoughts if they disagree with me. Universal assent. Glad to hear it.

So Marika will be here shortly to talk about GNSO Council issues. I should remind you there is wonderful brochures about the RrSG on our tables, and I believe there's also Chinese and Arabic translations over on the side. So if you don't know who we are or what we do, take a look please and thank you.

Michele Neylon: Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Where did that come from?

Michele Neylon: Over here. Just on the brochure side, it just has Darcy as Tobias and Tobias as Darcy, whichever way you want to look at it.

Graeme Bunton: They're almost interchangeable. Marika is here but she looks like she's still chewing on something so we will give her just a moment. Great, all right, we're going to get started. I'm not sure if this is being recorded already or we need anything formal to get going, but we're going to get going. And thank you very much to Marika for joining us today to talk about policy stuff, especially after our previous session. We appreciate that you still talk to us.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you very much, Graeme. I didn't bring some slides along if you can maybe pull them up. And indeed I was just in the session that you had with the Board, just maybe to clarify because I think Chuck already made that point is while, there is a set of principles in place that deal with, you know, policy and implementation.

Sillies from a staff side I think there is, or there is supposed to be a transparency and clarity over who does what in which parts of the process.

And our GDD colleagues work with us closely when we are supporting the policy development phase. And again, you know, we support them as well when they are supporting the implementation phase. And there is of course a lot of coordination as well between us.

And maybe that's not visible enough to the community and maybe we need to do better on that side. But it's definitely no longer the case that we work in isolation and just throw things over the wall and then suddenly realize that things are not implementable.

But one thing - point I wanted to make in that regard, if you do allow me the opportunity, and I know indeed from a staff side we can often provide input on implementation concerns as part of the policy development phase. But I think it's also very important for you to go back to your colleagues who are or who will be responsible for implementing policy recommendations to get their input as part of the policy development phase because of course they're the operational experts.

From the staff side, we can provide some perspective but at the end of the day we're not the ones that are building the systems or making changes to the systems. So I think it's, you know, it's a joint effort and important to engage all those that have expertise and knowledge in that process.

If we can go to the next slide? So I think I was asked to talk about GNSO issues and motions, although I think some of that you already covered as well this morning in your discussion.

I wanted to take the opportunity here as well to point out that there is a GNSO project list that we update on a monthly basis. So basically ahead of each GNSO Council meeting we update that with the latest information. And again if you don't have time to participate in working groups or beyond weekly calls I think it's a great tool to just, in a couple of pages really see where the different projects are at. So it doesn't only cover the projects that are in the

policy development phase or in the working group phase, but we also cover those projects that are in implementation.

So again it gives you a snapshot of where the different projects are at, and also links like if you want to go deeper into detail there are links to the different websites or wiki pages. And also information on who is chairing those efforts, you know, who is the staff support person for that respective project. So you also have a point of contact to reach out to if you have further questions or need further information.

So as you can see there we have a little table that starts off that project list that provides an overview of which projects in which phase of the process of they're at. We currently have around 20 projects on the way which includes 10 policy development processes that are in the various stages of development. And you see the link here where you can find the project list.

And also if you have any tips or suggestions how we can make that information even easier accessible, you know, do let us know. We're always open for suggestions and feedback.

If you want to go to the next slide? So what I've just listed here, and again, you know, I think this is an open discussion so if you have any questions or comments, you know, feel free to raise your hand or interrupt me.

I think most of you are probably aware of the four policy development processes we currently have in the working group phase. All these initiatives have or already had working group sessions during this week. There is the Next Generation Registration Directory Services to replace Whois PDP; the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures; the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs; and IGO INGO Access to Curative Right Mechanisms PDP.

The first three on these slides, they're still in relatively early phases. I mean, a lot of work is being undertaken and all of them are, you know, of course on track to deliver at some point an initial report for public comment.

On the Curative Rights one, I believe their initial report is expected to be published relatively shortly after this ICANN meeting for comments. So again I think that main point I wanted to share it's important to keep up-to-date on these initiatives, you know, hopefully many of you are participating because we need all the perspectives represented in those initiatives.

Do any of you have any specific questions about any of these?

Graeme Bunton: Not from myself. I think we're going to talk a couple of these later on this afternoon in more detail. But I don't think there's anything. Oh, I see Michele hand.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks. Michele for the record. The IGO INGO Curative Rights thing, what realistically is the path forward with that at the moment? I mean, we seem to be having a kind of staring match with the GAC, which degenerates into a yelling and screaming match at times. Can we just leave it in a status of a stalemate or is there a path forward? I mean, what is it exactly?

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. I mean, there are two separate issues at play there. So on the one hand indeed you have the curative rights one. And at least I think from a staff perspective that is, you know, on a path for initial report. So any input that will be provided there, including the proposal or advice that may come from the GAC in relation to that issue will need to be considered by the PDP working group and, you know, reviewed and analyzed.

And then there is the other issue which is basically there's a still a number of outstanding recommendations in front of the ICANN board as a result of an earlier PDP that looked at the IGO, INGO and Red Cross protections. And basically the situation there is that the GAC has issued advice already a while

back as well that is, in certain extent in contradiction with some parts of those recommendations.

So the question is now indeed how those two can be reconciled. And I think on both sides, on the GAC side and the GNSO side as well, the ICANN Board side, they need to consider how that can or should happen. You know, from the GNSO side there are provisions are mechanisms in the policy development process that would allow the GNSO to modify the recommendations either before the board considers them or should the board reject the recommendations, there's the ability to do so.

But of course the ability doesn't necessarily mean willingness. So I think it's also a question of indeed what is the ask or what is the discrepancy between the two recommendations. And I think based on some of the comments that were made during the session with the Board, I think there is a desire as well from the GNSO side to better understand, you know, what is different from when, you know, that same input was considered as part of the PDP? Has something changed that would maybe result in a different viewpoint from the GNSO Council or from the GNSO community or is it just the same input that's provided that was already addressed and considered?

So I think that the bit where things are at. And, you know, hopefully a path forward will be found because I think most people are probably tired about talking about the subject at every single ICANN meeting.

Go to the next slide. I just wanted to list as well but I think it's also something we will be discussing later, you know, that PDPs are in the implementation phase. And I know some of them were already discussed as well this morning. There's, you know, thick Whois. I think part of that is out for public comment at the moment. Translation and transliteration of internationalized registration data, there's an IRT in place that I think has recently kicked off. And I think is also meeting this week or may have already met, if I'm not

mistaken. So if that's a topic that you're interested in, you know, please join that IRT.

Then there's the protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs so those are the specific recommendations that were adopted. So they're also – there's an IRT in place for that one as well.

And then recently that Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues IRT kicked off. And I think they already met as well, may have another meeting this week. And I actually assumed that many of you are involved in that one. So again I think it's really important that you are involved in those discussions especially from a very early stage on because it's important to identify if there are any issues or concerns so they can be addressed.

And as I noted before, there are, you know, specific processes in place that allow for, you know, bringing back issues to the GNSO for further consideration or working them through as an IRT, you know, to get to implementation that works for all involved.

Go to the next slide. And no hands. So there are quite a number of issues that are on the agenda for the GNSO Council at this meeting. I know that James already covered a few of those during the meeting. I think he already covered the Internet governance one if I'm not mistaken and as well the Bylaws Drafting Team recommendations.

So in addition to that there is also the consideration of the appointment of a new GNSO liaison to the GAC. And the GNSO leadership has suggested that Carlos Gutierrez should be appointed to that role. And there's also a consideration of the GAC GNSO Consultation Group final status report and recommendations.

As you may know, that group was formed really quite a while back to look at how to facilitate GAC early engagement in GNSO policy development

activities. And, you know, some things such as a liaison are actually the result of the work and recommendations but that group has undertaken.

And this final status report and recommendations basically represents the wrap up of their work under the charter that they had. And once if, when that report is adopted the group will close. There are some recommendations in there that's also kind of monitor the progress and were going forward especially, you know, through the coordination and communication between the two leadership teams.

And then there's also the consideration of the adoption of the charter for a cross community working group on new gTLD auction proceeds. Just to note as well there is actually a session later this week that it intended to brief those interested in that effort on, you know, what is in the charter, the expectation is that once a number of ICANN SOs and ACs have adopted a charter that the CWG will kick off and a call for volunteers will go out.

It's very important to note that the CCWG is actually not going to be tasked on deciding or discussing how money should be spent; they will actually be looking at what different kind of framework or mechanism needs to be in place which would then be tasked for allocating or assigning the funds. So I think it's very important to distinguish those two elements because I think there's some confusion or concern that the CCWG would actually decide, you know, who gets what and that's definitely not what the charter foresees.

So Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. Jeff Eckhaus here. So just a quick question on that piece on a - what's it called - on the funds of - on the auction proceeds, sorry. Just for some clarity sake, does one have to go before the other in terms of how that process works? So first that group have to come together and then it has to be completed, and then it figures out the framework of how it could be spent?

So I'm just confused on sort of can they run concurrently or they run independently?

Marika Konings: No, the idea is that the CCWG will actually come up with what should be the framework or mechanism and which, you know, principles or guidelines would that mechanism need to follow. And then once that work is complete that would need to go to the ICANN Board. Well first of the chartering organizations, they would need to approve it, then we need to go to the Board, they would need to approve it. And once it's approved than that mechanism or whatever it is, is created and would actually, you know, put all the processes in place to start, you know, whether it's applications or grants or whatever form it would take to start that process.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay, so once that framework is set in place, then the actual process can begin of whichever method is developed, you know, if it's an application or if it's, you know, a lottery or whatever it could be and it goes to, okay perfect. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Do we have any other questions for Marika on currently what's going on? I think we heard from our councilors this morning in the joint session their perspectives on some of the GNSO activities this week. And we're going to touch on a couple of these other IRTs and PDPs later this afternoon. Cool. I think that's it. Thank you for joining us, Marika, appreciate it.

Marika Konings: Thanks as always for having me. And if there are any follow-up questions or any time, you know, feel free to reach out to me or any of my colleagues. We're happy to assist as we can.

Graeme Bunton: Great. So we're going to talk about transfer policy in a moment. But we didn't actually properly introduce ourselves or do a roundtable. So we will get that started right now. If anybody doesn't know me, I'm Graeme Bunton. I am your chair. Thank you for electing me. This is my first meeting. Bear with me as

chair. Not my first meeting ever. Bear with me as I learned some of those ropes.

The rest of your ExComm is mostly here. We have Tobias who is our brand new vice chair. Also learning the ropes. We have Michele down the end who has just taken over for Volker as GNSO councilor and/or is about to do at the end of this meeting.

Michele Neylon: Something along those lines.

Graeme Bunton: It's a little fuzzy. And we have Darcy, previous vice chair is now a GNSO councilor. Took Jen Gore's seat when she betrayed us all and joined ICANN staff.

Michele Neylon: Turncoat.

Graeme Bunton: I'm sure James is may be in the room? Is James in the room, who is our other GNSO councilor. And we have Ben Anderson, who is around here somewhere maybe. Oh there he is. Hey, Ben. You were hiding. Stealthy. Is our treasurer and Theo Geurts is our secretary and he is not here. And if you haven't met her, everybody should meet Zoe. Zoe, raise your hand. Zoe is our brand-new Secretariat. She is doing killer work this week and helping us get organized, and is super appreciated so we're very pleased to have her around. Be nice to her or I'll beat you up.

Michele Neylon: You're still pint-sized.

Graeme Bunton: I can be very furious. So maybe let's, now that you know who your ExComm is, maybe let's do a little round the table. We can start with Jen over there and we'll get to you people in the back of the room as well.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks, Graeme. This is Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff, Director of Registrar Services.

(Jen Greg): (Jen Greg), GDD operations. I handle the registrar side of things. ICANN staff.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mathieu Weill: Mathieu Weill, (unintelligible) brands.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Heath Dixon: Heath Dixon, Amazon Registrar.

(Suresh): (Suresh), Amazon Registrar.

Greg DiBiase: Greg DiBiase, Amazon Registrar.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Jeffrey Eckhaus from Rightside.

(Tom Keller): (Tom Keller) (unintelligible).

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Lindsay Hamilton-Reid, 1&1 Internet.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Blacknight.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias Sattler, United Domains and vice chair.

Ben Anderson: Ben Anderson, Name Names CSC and Treasurer.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell, Endurance International, GNSO councilor.

Graeme Bunton: Graeme Bunton from Tucows, Chair.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Stephanie Duchesneau with Google.

Zoe Bonython: Zoe Bonython, Secretariat.

Tom Barrett: Tom Barrett, EnCirca and the NomComm rep.

Man: (Unintelligible), open provider.

Woman: (Unintelligible) (CDS).

Woman: (Unintelligible) from (CDNS).

Janelle McAllister: Janelle McAllister from Mark Monitor.

Sara Bockey: Sara Bockey with Go Daddy.

Graeme Bunton: Then let's maybe work our way through the back of the room? I don't know if we have a roving mic? Do we have a roving mic?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: There's a mic coming.

Woman: Hello? Okay I'm going to start down this end. Oh.

(Alex): (Alex) (unintelligible), Tucows.

Andrew Barrett: Andrew Barrett, EnCirca.

(Hagi): (Hagi) from (Envic).

Man: (Unintelligible). (Envic).

Man: (Unintelligible), Go Daddy.

Owen Smigelski: Owen Smigelski, ICANN staff. Director of Contractual Compliance on the Registrar side.

Dennis Chang: Dennis Chang, ICANN staff. GDD services and engagement program director primarily responsible for policy implementation projects.

(Eric Rokabaur): (Eric Rokabaur), Endurance International.

Michael Fleming: Michael Fleming, GMO.

(Claudia Ratunci): (Claudio Ratunci) from the BC.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Dave Varse): (Dave Varse), Google Registrar.

Man: Yes, I'm (unintelligible) India.

Woman: (Unintelligible) ICANN staff, Registry Service and Engagement.

(Patrick Benning): (Patrick Benning) Information Society Department Council of Europe.

(Sobita Reading): Hi, everyone. (Sobita Reading), Media (Exchange) in the Cellular Operators Association of India.

Man: (Unintelligible). Nigeria.

Woman: (Unintelligible) from China.

Maguy Serad: Maguy Serad, Contractual Compliance.

(Jasmine Lu): (Jasmine Lu), ICANN staff Contractual Compliance.

Roger Carney: Roger Carney with Go Daddy.

Graeme Bunton: Great, I think that – oh, almost there.

(Tom Yakabutchi):(Tom Yakabutchi), ICANN staff.

Amy Bivins: Amy Bivins, ICANN staff as well.

Graeme Bunton: Great. I think that's just about everyone in the room. There are still seats at the table. And those in the back should absolutely feel free to join us up here. There is nothing special about it. And if you haven't had lunch and you're a registrar there's lunch in the room off to our side. And you should help yourself.

Great, let's get started. Which, and the next topic I'm actually going to hijack slightly to talk about privacy and proxy. But let's start around IRTP-C which I know many of you are concerned about.

So here's what the lay of the land looks like right now. Implementation is going live December 1. We approached the Council with a letter, and thank you to Darcy and Stephanie for helping me with that. To say that that particular piece of it where there is registrar pieces, causing change of registrant, instead of registrant changes causing change of registrant, particularly around privacy and proxy, which we should carve those pieces out of the implementation going live December 1 and move that discussion into the privacy and proxy IRT.

And that makes considerable sense because the initial change of registrant policy, which is now I think four years old, doesn't address privacy and proxy services at all. And it's an appropriate place to put that discussion. And that discussion is happening currently so it's not like we are trying to push this piece off for forever, so it's a pretty immediate solution.

So the mechanism that I think has worked out is that we get the GNSO on board, so we shared that letter for discussion, and we have been reaching out to various communities within the GNSO. It doesn't feel to me at the moment like we have any considerable pushback. I haven't had anybody approached me directly.

Which makes sense. I don't think it's a wildly controversial proposal. I don't think anyone has a real, I'm not sure what the metaphor I want to use, a real stake in that's where they would want or not want this to happen. We just need to be careful that, A, we don't make a huge deal out of it. And that we are providing a pretty narrow solution for a narrow problem. We're not trying to reopen the policy.

So the next step is going to be, now that we've sort of informed and educated everybody, that we get a letter to the GNSO that will be from the GNSO to the Board. And that doesn't need to be a motion, from my understanding. So we will write that letter. We will get the GNSO to adopt that letter. So that I don't believe has to happen at a meeting that someone can correct me if I'm wrong on that.

The GNSO will endorse that letter to the Board. The Board, assuming there is GNSO consensus on it, will likely than carve that piece out for us and move it into the privacy and proxy implementation review team.

I think the next Board meeting that that could happen at, assuming we can get it on their agenda and we can get all of this done quite quickly, because I think the letter would have to be done by the 20th, is December 8, which is

kind of interesting. And they might ask Marika or Maguy to answer this question is, if we get a letter from the GNSO, and there is GNSO consensus on it and it goes to the Board, the Board can't address that letter until eight days after implementation of the IRTP-C goes live.

What happens in those eight days? Is contractual compliance going to be leaning on us within that window? Or would there be some recognition that that letter exists? There may be immediate action from the Board on it. Does anybody have any insight or thoughts on that? Nothing from Marika. Sorry to put you on the spot, Maguy.

Maguy Serad: Hi. Maguy Serad for the record. Thank you for the question, Graeme. So it's not like we are waiting at the door, give you a set go, December 1 were going to launch monitoring and an audit of this effort. I hope you all appreciate that.

So at the same time, if and when we receive, you know, the main, you know, change, there's a lot of changes coming with this transfer policy, and mostly we're going to start implementing it asap or not. What I can commit to this team here is if contractual compliance receives a complaint, at a minimum we can initiate an inquiry, not a notice.

And based on what type of complaint it is and how it impacted based on the letter and the concerns, we may make a determination to put it on hold, or you may even have a solution and be able to resolve it. So my commitment is no audits on December 1, no monitoring activities for the new policy on December 1. But I do ask your patience because if we receive a complaint we do have an obligation to at least follow-up and follow-through even if it means thank you for the complaint, there are issues that are being addressed and we will get back to you. Is that fair?

Graeme Bunton: That seems pretty reasonable. Does anybody have any response to Maguy on that? I see Ben.

Ben Anderson: Yes, Ben Anderson, Net Names. I think it would be quite useful to understand what kind of FAQs you're going to put up on this - on the site for registrants if they're querying this policy.

Maguy Serad: Thank you, Ben for the question. I just sat through an earlier meeting between the GNSO and the contracted parties, and I followed you to the Board meeting. And I always listen with heart and mind. So there are two types of things we are working on. The team is in the process of updating, you know, the complaint form we have on ICANN.org. There is a section of it we call learn more.

So we are in the process of finalizing the documentation that's going to be put up there to support educating whoever is coming to finally complaint. But my ask of this audience when we met in a closed session, we presented you a few slides and we have been doing that for a while at any ICANN meeting, whether it's a lesson learned or a new policy coming out how is compliance looking at these efforts.

My ask of this audience is when you have an opportunity, before December 1 if possible, and if not we are happy to entertain the dialogue later. But take a look at those slides. We've done our best effort in translating to you what and how these thoughts at the policy and implementation is going to be addressed from a compliance perspective. And if you would like to invite us to a call or a meeting with you or a subset meeting we are happy to accommodate that so we can align and proactively avoid not frustrating Stephanie, but frustrating the whole world. Okay?

Graeme Bunton: Great, and thank you. We will follow up on that. I've got another question from Ben.

Ben Anderson: Yes, I just want to follow up on that. Thanks very much, Maguy. I think, you know, from my point of view and from many of the Registrars, I think there's just going to be an incredible amount of complaints about domain names

being locked after something has happened. And I think we need to be proactive in limiting the amount of compliance complaints that you get, but you need to send on by actively asking questions about, did you opt in or opt out. I just want to limit the amount of time that we all have to spend on something that should be very clear.

Maguy Serad: Thank you, Ben. We plan on doing that, asking the reporters up front as much questions and possibly anticipation to avoid sending it your way. And while we are all learning this, now this is a new policy to all of us, and we all know new policies will bring opportunities. I don't want to say issues, opportunities. So while we learn this and you face these opportunities and we have not caught them please let us know, we will make sure we work through that. And we will just take one day at a time.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Maguy. I should point out here that there is no guarantee that the process we're doing right now with the GNSO and the letter to the Board and to make that happen, that that will work. So if you have not started trying to implement IRTP-C you need to do that. I wouldn't - not rely on this working. You need to be out in front of this. You would be insane not to be out in front of this. And it's quite a bit of work. So we're working on trying to make a piece of it better, but that whole thing is coming and don't think it's not.

Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I would actually reframe that a little bit and say that we are just working on a little piece of it, not that we believe it's still open for interpretation, not trying to challenge implementation of the policy on a whole. So from my perspective I would just echo what Graeme said with that in mind.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Stephanie. So that's kind of where IRTP-C sits at the moment. I know it's been problematic for many people. Tom.

Tom Barrett: Yes, just one clarifying question. Do we have a sense whether the GNSO will go for that or are they going to endorse it or not?

Graeme Bunton: My sense right now is that they will. I haven't heard any strong pushback or people pulling me aside personally and saying not a chance. So I think there is a reasonable shot. But again it's that narrow piece and it's not guaranteed. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just to Tom's point, and Michele for the record. This is something that we discussed at the GNSO already in the last couple of days. And, you know, the first issue is to actually explain to people what we were talking about, and then there's several groups said they would need to go off and discuss it within the room groups.

As Graeme says, we haven't had anybody come to us and go, hell no, we absolutely totally disagree with you, you know, hell will freeze over before we agree to it. But we haven't had a ton of people saying yes, yes, yes, we're going to 100% back to this. So I think we will have to wait and see.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. I saw Heath.

Heath Dixon: Heath Dixon. I appreciate that we haven't heard anybody say no yet, but from the conversations that I've had with folks on the IPC and the RySG, it sounds like they haven't even been talking about it. And so my concern is given the short time frame that we have, not hearing a negative reaction isn't enough. You know, if they want to table it, they want to further discuss it, were going to get into trouble from a timing perspective. So have we thought about what steps we can take to get it on their agendas and get some affirmative response from them?

Graeme Bunton: So I don't think we have a mechanism to formally get it on anybody's agenda. It's mostly back channel conversations. Darcy.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell. So it was on the GNSO agenda and we actually did discuss it but there's a little education involved there, like Michele said. I think the IPC in particular has asked a lot of questions. I actually feel pretty good about what they've said to me so far. But nobody really objected. I think it's been on the agenda and everybody understands that there's going to be a more formal letter coming that we are going to ask the Council to forward to the Board. So I don't know how we get it any better on the agenda. It was definitely on there, and nobody raised a red flag.

There's probably a little bit more education to do that we should be able to do that very easily in the next three weeks.

Graeme Bunton: Anybody else have questions on that procedure, where we're at? Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: In response to Heath's question about how we get it on other people's agendas, at least speaking for the Registries, it was one of the issues that was outlined in the documents that I circulated to the Registries and that Registrars both in advance of the Board session. And I know we're planning on turning that into a more formal correspondence to the board to follow up on the session that we just had.

So there's probably an opportunity there also for more substantial conversation within the Registry Stakeholder Group around how even if it doesn't necessarily affect them directly from a Registry perspective or from an implementation perspective, how the process issues are similar and how this is something that we should probably be reaching across for and providing mutual support.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Stephanie. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just very briefly, to your question about getting it on people's agendas, if there's a document circulated to the GNSO Council and people are asked to sign onto it and endorse it, that I would assume that they would take that

back to their respective groups. So I suppose in some way the letter, the document kind of answers the question in some respects.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thanks, Michele. So we had carved out an hour for this particular conversation because I was worried it might take a lot of time, and we still have 40 minutes. I'm going to bring up another issue momentarily, unless anybody have more questions or thoughts on IRTP-C that they'd like to share. Nothing in the – oh, Tom. And into the mic please, Tom.

Tom Barrett: Yes, not so much about the IRTP-C part itself, but what we've seen over the last couple of years that we went through various endeavors to change transfer policy, which made it a frigging mess, what is now. And the question is whether we should, as a group, maybe together with the Registries, sit down and formulate something that we might want as a transfer policy. Because what we have now is awful and doesn't get any better.

And I can totally understand that we as a group don't really like to run another PDP, but since this is really something of our core business, I think it would be good for us to actually go through the various policies and come up with something sensible, including some of the viewpoints people out there have in terms of registered protection and stuff like that. But if this is going any further, you know, this will be unmanageable at the end of the day.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Tom. I think you raise a good point. Transfer has caused a lot of tickets. They're clunky. They're slow. The policy on them is in many places archaic. You can do it if there's privacy on a domain name meaning people have to expose themselves in the public Whois if they want to transfer.

And we talked a little bit about this on the list around whether we want to open up like a new transfers PDP and there was some disagreement. And so this is probably a good place to have that conversation. You know, starting out and you transfers PDP, whether it's like the equivalent of the RDS PDP or something where we look at transfers vary holistically, we could solve a lot of

problems but then we also open up these things to the rest of the community and who knows what else ends up in there.

You know, I generally think there's lots of problems to be solved in there. I don't know what the right solution is or maybe there is another method which is we talk to the Registries, we talked amongst ourselves, we figure out, you know, a sort of concrete fundamental way like actual implementation of how transfers could be better and then we can bring back to the community and use that as a starting place for that discussion.

I see Marika's hand raised and then I see (Alex), and then I have Michele in the queue.

Marika Konings: Yes, just to note that actually one of the IRTP Part D recommendations, and I just quickly looked it up because I have a recollection there was something in there that basically says once all IRTP recommendations are implemented, including IRTP Part D and the remaining elements from IRTP-C the GNSO Council, together with ICANN staff, should convene a panel to collect, discussed and analyzed relevant data to determine whether the enhancements have improved the IRTP process and dispute mechanisms and identify possible remaining shortcomings.

Graeme Bunton: Great. So what sort of baked that we tackle that. Alex.

Alex Schwertner: Yes, I share the concerns that while we open – or once we open up this process to the PDP that we end up with all the feedback that led us to the IRTP-C. And that would be a pretty disastrous outcome. That being said, if there is this provision to revisit all the IRTP PDPs, I think we should start in getting something together where we feel comfortable that this may be a good option. And then once we have a document on the table, then decide if it's good enough that we feel comfortable to get this through the process or not.

So I think we shouldn't be sold on starting a PDP but getting together a document and a policy that we like, I think that's a good next step.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, (Alex). I've been terrible at this, this is Graeme, for the transcript. We should probably be saying our names because there's people who don't know each other so let's try and remember to do that.

I'm going to interject myself before Michele briefly. It sounds like there's interest in talking about this a little bit more. And I don't know if that's going to, when we want to do that. But if there is some sort of sub team transfer sub team that we can spin up within the Registrars to talk about this, and maybe we can do that in the - maybe after Christmas sound like a better time because I think we're all heads down getting IRTP-C in place. But maybe we can set that up if there's people and resources to do that.

In fact that's another point about before we start a PDP, to your point, we would need to have a lot of registrars in there. They would need to be able to commit for a long period of time to go through that process. And IRTP-C is a good example of where we just didn't have enough bodies in the room to figure out what was going awry. And that's a very dangerous place to get to, again. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Graeme. A few things, first off it's within the IRTP-D recommendations, does that review thing, I think that's good - I guess that makes sense to go back and look at what's happened out of four different PDPs. But the idea that we would come up with a completely alternative mechanism or something to handle transfers seems a bit backwards because ultimately that goes against everything that we keep on fighting for here. So I think using the review to review what has been implemented might be a better approach.

But as you said, we need to have bodies. And at the moment there are multiple reviews, there's multiple PDPs that have taken all the bodies. So

either, one, you need to wait several years before we can do that; or, two, you need to bring more bodies. And so for some of the larger registrars, as a small registrar I'd look to you guys and go look, would you please please talk to your bosses, talk to the people who control the purse strings to maybe get more resources. Because those of us at the smaller end of the scale simply can't.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. It's a sort of classic registrar problem. So maybe there is a, I think you raise a good point there but that is maybe a little bit backwards in approach. But perhaps there's still room for that discussion to figure out, we will convene from people probably after the holidays to figure out what approach is best and if we want to build a strawman and gather input on that.

So, transfers, IRTP-C, any other thoughts on that? Great, so we still have half an hour on the schedule in this spot. And there is something that should have been on our agenda and I forgot completely about it but we need to have a discussion.

The interim spec on privacy and proxy expires January 1. That's in the RAA. We're going to talk about privacy and proxy IRT a little bit later in the afternoon under any other business. But it's likely at best that wraps up January, or sometime in 2019, I think it's entirely possible he goes longer.

ICANN staff have reached out to us about extending the interim spec. I think the pitch was 2.5 years, although (Jen) can correct me on that. And so we need to decide if we want to extend that interim spec on privacy and proxy. And we have options here.

We do not have to extend that interim spec at all. We could just let it drop and at that point there are no rules for privacy and proxy services. There are probably people within the community, if I'm guessing, that would find that unpleasant. And that may gain us ill will. I'm not sure that extending the spec gains us the equivalent amount of goodwill.

We certainly don't have to extend it for the period requested by ICANN. We could do six months, we could do a year, we could do whatever we felt like. And so, A, we need to think about this. And I brought this up on the list below while ago but I'm curious to see or hear anybody else's thoughts on this whether you feel like we should extend that interim spec or not, whether we should leave it as-is and let it lapse.

Don't all jump up at once. It's a pretty a important topic. And we will have to vote on this. I see Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Graeme. Michele for the record. Just because we've got the option to do something doesn't mean we have to do something. I'd be wary of letting it lapse completely because even if in practice and in reality a lot of people would probably continue to follow what was in the 2013 contract, I can easily envisage a rather awkward situation involving members of the IPC and some other groups getting up in our faces again. And after spending, like you, a couple years on that PDP I could really do without it.

So, I mean, I think you're right though when it comes to the extension that we aren't obliged to extend it for as long as ICANN has requested so extending it for a shorter period might be a better compromise. I mean, obviously the rest of you please, you should weigh in on this. As I say it's a big thing but that's just my personal view.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Stephanie Duchesneau. I would just like to open up the question as to whether anyone thinks that there's any actual advantage to extending the interim specification. I think Michele is right, but there are considerations we have to talk through about not doing so even though it's likely that most people are going to change their models overnight once it lapses.

But I do think that the one thing that's not extending it would gain us is that it does put pressure on the implementation review team to actually move forward, compromise, accepted the recommendations versus feeling like that that can be stalled, given that, you know, we have an interim spec that's going to go as long as 2.5 years unchallenged.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. And I see Heath. Anybody else want in the queue? Jeff and then Michele.

Heath Dixon: Heath Dixon. I think that's a good point. One other thought that occurs to me is we're all thinking about this from our own perspective I suspect, and none of us would do anything to change in a negative way. The question that occurs to me is are we concerned that there are some registrars out there who would take that as an opportunity to take some pretty bad actions that would reflect very badly on us as a group, and that might undermine our position in the IRT that's going on? So I don't know the answer to that but that's what occurs to me.

Graeme Bunton: Sure, it's part of this discussion. It's a consideration. Yes, none of us in the room, the people who attend this meeting, are going to be like de-engineering our privacy services to take advantage of no rules, but there may be some. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. Jeff Eckhaus here. So, you know, for me my thought is why would we burden ourselves, I would say with additional, not additional rules and regulations because we've already put these into place. But we are not subject to compliance based upon this privacy proxy spec. So it would, one, I know probably less than everyone's tickets that they would receive. And I just, for me personally I see no reason why we would I guess subject ourselves to additional scrutiny and rules and regulations, even though they're in place now when there's no benefit to it at this time.

And the other part is sort of maybe a way for registrars here, for us to actually prove like were always like hey, there are good actors, you know, and bad actors in the same hey look, nobody changed it; people have kept it in place even without the rule and that registrars are good actors and good parts to the community.

So I think that there's a lot of benefit there in letting it expire because, I mean, just the elephant in the room, it gives us leverage as well and let's just be clear about that. So me personally unless, you know, I could be convinced in another way which probably just, you know, if you grab me and talk me into it I would probably switch sides. But I see no reason to extend it without any sort of additional carrot to do so.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jeff. Michele.

Michele Neylon: I think, you know, I think we all agree none of us, in this room who have implemented the policy as per the contract to go back and undo it, I just would be very, very wary of removing it completely because, I mean, being blunt about it, I don't get tickets about this for my own registrar. But I do end up in a situation where like I said, yesterday with the DNS abuse high-level topic thing where, you know, registrars in general were all beaten up on various topics.

And give the entire thing around this policy was to address issues are concerned that those in the security community, and a lot of the brands and people like that were having, were completely nonresponsive privacy services and nonresponsive registrars. You know, the reality is those people out there exist. They're the bad actors. They're the ones who are causing headaches for the rest of us.

Just to reduce a few tickets here and there do we really want to, you know, give them the ability to have complete carte blanche to do whatever the hell

they want, even if it is only for a short period of time? You know, just playing devil's advocate, guys.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Contrary to that I think, you know, that rule or not isn't going to change how the bad actors and in this space are operating. I think they're going to do what they're doing regardless of whether those rules exist or not.

Chris had a question in the chat, what's the worst that could happen? Theft of a domain? My response is, is that's the sort of – I'm not sure that's even a practical problem with this. I think it's more what we're talking about here is the impression of the Registrar Stakeholder Group as a whole is really the upper downside of this and how we feel that that might impact us.

So we're clearly not going to solve this particular issue today, but the January 1 deadline is coming up very shortly. I know I can staff was hoping for a decision on this in three days, which is not going to happen because our voting structure wouldn't even allow that to take place because we haven't had a chance to really have this conversation out in the open yet.

I'm still looking for more input. I don't have a, you know, the downside of being chair, I will share this with all of you, is that it's rare that we get a strong mandate from the stakeholder group to make a decision on this. And ultimately it's not going to be my choice, it's going to be all of ours when we have a vote. But I want to make sure everybody is informed and up on this because it's important. Tom.

Tom Keller: Thank you. Tom Keller. If we can't really find a benefit for us, if we can't really find a benefit for all of us that makes it worthwhile extending this thing, there's no reason to do it. I mean, this is really just a, this policy was imposed on us without - we had to accept that an a point of time, in the negotiations, it was sensible in some way. Now it has to be extended. If you can't find any better fit that serves us, let's not do it.

Graeme Bunton: Cool. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just going back to the thing around to get sand volumes and all that, there is data. I'm looking at the data on the compliance – look some that compliance has released for the period of September. There were three complaints related to privacy proxy. There were 4980 related to Whois inaccuracies. So the volume of complaints in terms of something using that part of the contract is negligible. And a lot also the second, getting the mandate from the members, welcome to my world. I used to have fun with that too.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Michele. It's the most interesting thing I've learned so far. I've got Darcy.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell. To Stephanie's early point about the IRT and kind of holding the IRT feet to the fire, we've only had one meeting so, you know, as you know when you do those things it's pretty much an overview and an introductory meeting. We haven't even figured out how often we're going to have our meetings. And that's going to dictate how we get through a work plan.

But I think it's a good point because we only have I think about 40 folks in there. But there are people in there who there has been a suggestion, may want to try to manipulate the policy that was put forth. And if that's true, which, you know, again only one meeting, we don't know, but if that's true I think Stephanie's point is a good one that least having some sort of interim spec, maybe not 2.5 years, that some sort of interim spec may help put pressure on that to move forward and not deviate from what the policy says.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Darcy. Tom.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller speaking. Just a point of process I guess. If we say no to it now does that mean that we – it's a no forever basically, until a new policy comes

into play? If we say there is unwanted behavior then we can oh we're going to extend it now for whatever period of time?

Graeme Bunton: That's a good question. I'm not sure what the mechanic is so if we let it expire can we re-up where we – we give it six months and we go, oh, man people are doing terrible things. Can we bring it back? I don't know what the answer to that is. Does anybody know? (Jen), do you have insight on that?

Jennifer Gore: Thanks, Graeme. This is Jen Gore, ICANN staff. In anticipation of this question, we posed it to ICANN Legal and are expecting a response but I have not received it yet.

Graeme Bunton: That response would be greatly appreciated because it may inform how we decide to move forward. I saw Theo's hand up, and then did I see you, Heath, in there? You're still thinking about a question? We'll come back to you after Theo. Theo is remote. Give it a go, Theo.

Theo Geurts: Hey good morning. How's the line?

Graeme Bunton: Good morning.

Theo Geurts: Okay...

Graeme Bunton: You have a question?

Theo Geurts: No, I just have a comment there. This is basically when it comes to the PPSAI, it's basically consensus policy. So even if we do not have something in the contract or there is something in the contract, it doesn't matter because at some point we have to comply with it anyways. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Theo. Heath, did you have something?

Heath Dixon: Yes, this is Heath Dixon. Now that I'm thinking about it more especially in the question of what will we do six months from now if we don't extend this, I'm not sure that we have the authority to -- I mean this is like a contract amendment basically. And so I'm not sure that a Registrar Stakeholder Group vote is the right mechanism for this. And if it is, I'm wondering what kind of precedent that would set for ICANN coming to us with other concessions that they'd like for us to make and negotiate outside of the normal RAA negotiation process.

So actually now that I think about this, why am a little more concerned about the precedent this will set, so we should definitely think about if we are going to agree to this, how -- what the mechanisms is that we want to agree to it. In particular because, as the ICANN Compliance team can attest from yesterday's meeting, there has been concern expressed some other members of the community about agreements being reached between two groups within ICANN that are going through normal processes. So I think we should definitely think about the how of this as well as whether or not we want to do it.

Graeme Bunton: Sure, that's a good point, Heath. Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. Jeff Eckhaus here. So just two points on that. One, even though I was part of the negotiating team for the 2013 RAA, I cannot remember about what the process is on if we don't come to this agreement. But I think one of the things that I think is just going to pivot quickly on that is that we're saying oh we asked ICANN staff and ICANN Legal to get us a response of what we think the rule should be, and I say to us, we should probably look at it ourselves as the two-party agreement. We should have our own sort of -- our own legal opinion on it.

And, you know, I think that yes we'd like some input from ICANN Legal of what their point is but I think it would be worth it for us to get our own opinion on it, just in case we want to because relying exclusively on them means that

they're the ones who set the rules of what they believe it is where again a two-party agreement we both sign it, we both negotiate it so I'm not asking us to get, you know, saying to get a full opinion but for us to have at least, you know, I'm not a lawyer but if some others in the room to take, you know, to take a look at it and say we might not be in agreement with ICANN Legal's response.

And, you know, it's when Jen and the team come back to us with their response we may say oh, you know, I agree, I concur, we're in agreement with it or we say no, that's not our interpretation. But I think we should be able to have that optionality on it and look at it besides what staff or, sorry, what ICANN Legal believes it is. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Cool. Thanks, Jeff. So I think what I'm just learning now is – and this is from Jen, thank you, Jen, is that this is not a RrSG vote, it's an all accredited registrars vote. In some ways I think the number of creds owned by the registrars in the room might make that pretty similar outcome assuming. But you're right, we should maybe get some – have either someone internally who's a lawyer, want to look at this and have a think and we'll get that input from Jen as soon as we possibly can. And that's going to inform the choices we make a bit. Michele.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele again. I'm looking at the contract and I'm looking at that. There's a couple of clauses within the 2013 contract which state specifically that something has to be agreed between ICANN and all registrar and other areas where the only parties are the stakeholder group or in particular the chair of the stakeholder group and ICANN.

In this particular clause, there seems to be a certain degree of ambiguity. It does not say that all registrars have to do this. The wording is, "Provided that ICANN and the working group may mutually agree to extend the term of the specification." Now the working group is not defined. Where?

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Where? Sorry, don't mean to yell into the microphone.

Jeff Eckhaus: So the working group was – I believe the terms were the negotiating team. Yes, and it is ambiguous because it doesn't mean we bring back like bring back the gang like me, James, Matt, Rob, you know, and Becky and the initial negotiating team or does the Registrar Stakeholder Group nominate or put forward a new working group. But it's basically the Registrar-sponsored, or whatever you want to call it working group that they put forward. So we could decide whoever that may be and that's sort of who the working group is.

Michele Neylon: Okay sorry, yes, just actually brought up the wording so Jeff is correct and incorrect at the same time. It's not all registrars, it is the – it is a group of registrars and it's the Registrar Stakeholder Group who decides who essentially, but it's not all the registrars or even all the – not even a vote of the stakeholder group itself, which is even more bizarre.

So essentially we could say Jeff and Graeme are the only two people who decide on this and you hold our fate in your hands.

Jeff Eckhaus: That's correct.

Michele Neylon: That's a really scary thought but okay.

Graeme Bunton: Interesting. Well that's good insight. I wish we'd had this conversation earlier because that now makes the timeline of December 1 – or January 1 very soon if we're spinning up working groups and making choices like this. I feel like Jen's got some input over there.

Jennifer Gore: I'd just like to say that obviously there's interpretation on both sides of the agreement in which once when – once I get the clarification back from Legal I will share that and have requested that we get it sometime this week.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thanks, Jen. Right, that's a very interesting discussion I think we just had. Does anybody else have more thoughts on this before we I think pull it back and we have to take a look at the actual language in there and make some choices ourselves. Lindsay is nodding vigorously. She's a lawyer. That's wonderful of you to volunteer like that. And we'll get some input back from ICANN and then I guess that's – this is probably notice for everybody in the room that it may be us making this choice.

And we may need to spin up a working group or something like that and we are going to have to do that in relatively short order. So I would encourage you all to these issues home, this issue home, think about it carefully. You know, the implications of doing this or not. And be prepared to share those back again with the stakeholder group and we can have that discussion again on the list in the very near future because we're going to need to get on this very quickly.

(Connie) had a comment in the chat about the aftermarket. And I'm not sure around IRTP-C – specifically in China and the impact on the aftermarket and transactions. I'm not sure there's an immediate answer to that question, that's more operational and I'd probably leave you to talk to other aftermarket providers and how they're dealing with IRTP-C. Because I don't think that's a question we can answer here today.

We're doing pretty well on time at the moment. Is that a new hand, Michele, that's an old hand?

Michele Neylon: It's an old one, thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Great. I'm going to close this off and we can move on unless there's any other insight or input here. Great, so that's extension of privacy and proxy and IRTP-C sort of closed off for the moment. Next up starting at two, and

we're running 12 minutes ahead, which feels like a minor ICANN miracle, I'll invite Jen Gore to give us an update from GDD.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks, Graeme. Zoe, do you have the slide? I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce some of my fellow ICANN staff members. If you could please come up to the front I think we should probably, if you don't mind? Thanks. So realizing that we only had about 45 minutes today, there's many activities that are going on in the Registrar Stakeholder Group – or related to the Registrars, that have obviously not come to fruition so you're not feeling them yet in my third month in tenure.

But there's a lot of work going on in the back but the one initiative that I wanted to highlight today is related to the Registrar portal and kind of walk you through the portal and what we believe the features should be and want to put out a call for volunteers for a portal users group.

But before I get started I just want to introduce my team behind the creation, development and implementation of that portal. So we have Chris Gift who's the Vice President of Product Management. Right?

((Crosstalk))

Jennifer Gore: Got (Bob Schumaker), who's going to be responsible for the design and implementation. And (Gary) is responsible – sorry, (Gary Peiser) is responsible for the development efforts.

Man: (PMO).

Jennifer Gore: (PMO). Also, all of the above, right? So let's quickly run through the slide and again, I just want to point out this is a collaborative effort in which we're seeking volunteers. And we'll be sending out an email to get those volunteers and hoping that we can get geographically-based and various models – very registrar models to represent and participate.

Sorry, the slide is kind of small. So it basically runs through one slide here where the portal is – we're starting from the ground slate and the latest version of Salesforce. I know that you've heard about various other initiatives in the past but this one is new to ICANN and new to the contracted parties. Thank you, Zoe.

So in talking about the portal regarding daily interaction with the registrars and with my personal previous experience as a registrar, I kind of went through the wish list of what I believe was important to incorporate into the portal and upon opening or single sign on with two-factor authentication, I was perceiving a dashboard, which basically would be a help page rollup summary of topics of your registrar or registrars. And in that there would be avatars that would provide you information on compliance, your previous radar contact information, upcoming news and announcements, anything that the advisory panel wants to provide input on.

I don't know how many of you will have gone through the application process to become a registrar recently, but I can tell you that that application has not changed for quite some time. So we are moving forward to an application that's going - process that's going to be electronically based and take advantage of DocuSign to execute agreements.

And then around the contact management system, so this is essentially the sunsetting of (Radar) and bring up a content management system with inside the portal where users will be able to apply changes to all registrars or just select the group of registrars to apply a particular change. This will come in handy when you for instance want to change your compliance contact or your abuse contacts, you don't have to drill down in each of the accreditations in order to apply the change or revise or to confirm that your information's correct.

Any questions so far? Okay.

So as I mentioned, you know, security is one of our pillars as it relates to this because of the amount of privacy and information that will be listed in there, so we want to make sure that we provide two-factor authentication, and we will provide you options as far as what method you would like to use for two-factor as well.

And then obviously given the amount of daily interaction with the Compliance Department, you'll have a view inside to all your tickets, you will be able to determine where the tickets - the status of each ticket, whether you owe information or we owe information back to you so there's a clear transparency here outside of relying on e-mail communications, which we all know is not the most reliable or effective form of managing your compliance activities on a daily basis. Graeme?

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jen. I think we're all very excited to see this. It's been a long time coming. Do you know if this compliance piece is going to mean also Compliance is switching ticketing systems, because I know we've all had headaches with that in the past, or whether it's a - so whether they're porting that into the portal or whether there's no whole new system for ticketing system for Compliance in there?

Jennifer Gore: That's a great question, Graeme, I appreciate it. So I should have said in the beginning that is not necessarily just a rollout to external parties, meaning contracted parties, but we're also rolling out this tool internal. So the same platform will be used internally as well as externally. So to answer your question directly, the (Kyoka) platform will be sunsetted and our compliance organization will use the Salesforce platform.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jen. I think we'll see some very happy people in the room about that.

Jennifer Gore: Along those lines too and given a registrar experience, there's only so much tracking you can do with inside a third party portal, given the size of the

compliance organizations with inside registrars. The - one of my key areas to note in the requirements document, the proposed requirements document, includes the ability to download the raw data and to be able to upload it with inside the registrar's portal or content management system to manage your tickets accordingly.

And then there'll be multiple versions of the format in which you can download those reports. That's not only based on the compliance tickets but you'll be able to download all your contact information by each individual registrar.

Okay I just want to make this one point very clear. So as we're also rolling out a Salesforce system for our contracted parties, we are rolling out an Oracle system from a billing perspective, and those two systems are being rolled out simultaneously. Now there's additional work that will have to happen on the backend to link the two, so I foresee or propose to the upcoming portal users group is a prioritization around online.

So that necessarily won't come out in the first phase, given the additional work that has to take place, but I'd like to propose it comes out in a future face or shortly thereafter.

Graeme Bunton: Briefly, I might have missed it, but do we have a sense of how far away this is and you'll pardon my cynicism but what does shortly thereafter mean?

Jennifer Gore: Understood. So let me just finish up before I address your question, if you don't mind. So - and I just don't - I don't want to leave the discussion without saying that we are researching right now the self-certification process with EU and U.S., knowing that the privacy - our privacy shield, knowing the information will be transmitted and we have to make sure that we're in compliance with this policy.

So, Graeme, I hear your question related to a timeline, and the first thing I'd like to say in regard to that it's kind of 20/20, so I'm going to attempt to answer it and then I'm going to turn it over to my good friend Chris here. So there's multiple ways we could do this, so let me just start with that methodology.

So if we wanted to roll out phases where we essentially where we just roll out the content management system first, we could roll that out sooner rather than later. But if the portal user's group determines that they'd like to have greater functionality that includes the compliances pieces as well as the content management, given everything that we've proposed up here, obviously the timeline would increase given the functionality that needs to be developed.

Now phase one of this is in the process of rolling out for the registries in the coming months, and then the development team will quickly thereafter switch over to the development of the registrar portal. Now with that in mind, I see it not necessarily as a siloed portal and see it as a portal when registries are also registrars. And then we're also taking into account as we're going through the privacy proxy IRT right now that there's user stories and requirements built in for privacy proxy accredited service providers.

So thinking more advanced of the type of users that we'll support within the portal will be registries, registrars, data escrow agents, privacy proxy service providers, and registry operators. So that's five different profiles. And if you are a contracted party for more than one, you will be able to manage your services through a single sign on for all of those different relationships that you have with ICANN.

You're welcome. I've kind of been down this road before. (Unintelligible) So I'm going to allow my product team to turn it over - to turn over the question to them regarding the timeline and understanding your cynicism.

Chris Gift: Hi this is Chris Gift, Product Management. I think what I'd like to - I think Jen answered it well in terms of when it would be. We're still finishing up the registry piece. We will have a webinar before the yearend that'll be - in which we'll discuss more specific dates and timelines. We're just not prepared to do that today.

It also is dependent on the requirements. We have a good set of requirements -- excuse me -- from Jen and from the compliance team and from our internal operations as well. But obviously you guys need to vet that and add to that. So that is a process we do need to go through. And then as Jen said, we'll have to decide what's, you know, what's the minimum viable service we can launch with and then when do we have subsequent releases.

So the when sort of depends on a lot of that. And I agree, I understand that's very vague and I apologize. But I would like to offer to help mitigate against this vagueness is that we work on project plans together and that we keep them published so that you can see status and updates on an ongoing basis and that you can see when we're completing feature sets. We'd also like to work with you to make it - make the service available as early as possible so even if it's not actually in a functioning state that you can still see it, you know, look at it and then get a real sense of how progress is being made.

And we'd like to work with the portal group on that on how that can happen and also with the wider registrar group as well. And we're hoping doing those kinds of things will not only involve you more directly but give you comfort about how progress is being made.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. This is Graeme. Do you think we could commit to like monthly updates on this? Because, you know, we get them right now three times a year, and probably as we're getting closer, it'd be appreciated to have some more insight with them.

Chris Gift: Yes for sure, the portal users group - yes, monthly at the very minimum. I think we're going to have, given I hope the speed at which we move on the registrars once we start it, it'll probably maybe even have to be more than monthly for the portal users group. I wouldn't be surprised if we have to meet every other week. But as for updates, it's not just monthly but I would also propose that we just put that at a public place, whether it's the community wiki or some other public place, so that you can get the status, you know, whether it's weekly or every other week. Because we actually work on two week sprints. I'm more than happy to propose that we just publish things on an ongoing basis.

Graeme Bunton: Great thank you. Right, agile. My guys don't want to give me timelines either. Darcy?

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell. Do you have any sense of - are we talking two years, four years for a phase one or what - because we've been talking about it for a little while so I'm really curious about just a general timeline.

Chris Gift: Less than two years.

Darcy Southwell: All right, a little bit more specific would be great.

Chris Gift: We could keep playing this one. Less than, you know, more than six months, less than a year. You know, I'm definitely hoping within the next calendar year would definitely be my goal.

Graeme Bunton: I've got a hand from Michele over there.

Michele Neylon: Yes, same question. Michele for the record. I mean the reason why it's the same question is simply because we were told two years ago that the portal for registries was priority number one and the portal for registrars was priority number two and that will be happening within about 12 months. And that was over a year ago.

So the thing is that ICANN has spent a large amount of money on all of these different projects but those of us who are actually having to deal with these things are still having to print out documents, sign them manually and send them back via fax or struggle with lost compliance tickets, lost other things, and we're the ones who have the contracts that are actually in jeopardy because of this. We're the ones who are going to pay for this. It's like you really need to do a little bit better than a vague commitment like that, and we would urge you to please do so. Thanks.

Chris Gift: This is Chris Gift again. I understand the pain and we do understand the pain, and we are sorry that we are late on the registry portion and therefore late to begin the registrar portion. I do agree that we need to do better on the date. And my only hesitation is just today or at least within this week, we do promise and commit to have a webinar before yearend where we will give you dates. We will definitely do that, and those dates will be something that you can hold us to.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. Rest assured, we will.

Jennifer Gore: As the owner of the service -- Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff -- as the owner for the service delivery, they'll have to hear me following up with them as well as being very persistent, as you well know.

So I just wanted to follow up on the portal users group and the timeline for implementation of that. So the e-mail will go out today in the hope that we can kick off the initial portal users group, assuming that we get a substantial amount of volunteers, at least the kickoff meeting to have initial discussions -- and obviously we're always open to additional volunteers at any point in time -- in the next two weeks.

And I have developed a document that walks through various user stories and (unintelligible) that I'd like to provide to the users group and that we will

also post that on the wiki page for the purposes of transparency that Chris was referring to and then start finalizing those requirements based on that. We'll submit that to our engineering development team and get a level of effort back and be able to then finalize the timeline that Chris was referring to.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jen. If I may, just so I'm clear, development actually hasn't started yet? You've got specs and sort of wire frames or whatever that is, but the actually building of things has not...

Jennifer Gore: So for the actual service delivery for the registrar portal, no. However, for the implementation for phase one, which focuses on the registry fees, we're very long - far along in that process. And some of that development work will be applied on the registrar side. So I'm not saying that we're starting with a clean slate but I'm saying that there's features and functionality that will be coming from the portal users group that will have to be built on top of what's already in place.

Graeme Bunton: Okay thank you.

Jennifer Gore: Any other questions related to that?

Graeme Bunton: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes just -- Michele again -- and, you know, it's nothing personal, or maybe it is I don't know, no it's not. Ultimately I suppose the question I have is what are the penalties for late delivery and if it's simply a case of more emails from Jennifer to other ICANN staff members I wonder but, you know, what are these - is it late delivery something that's going to impact a department's budget, its KPIs, some other kind of metric? I mean is there some kind - some penalty if you don't deliver?

Chris Gift: Yes there are penalties. They are tied to our departmental and as well as personal KPIs, which, you know, I don't know how much I can say about -

well I can just say our KPIs are tied directly to how we're paid. So if we miss dates, we get paid less as individuals, and obviously there are additional penalties in terms of our performance within the organization and our perception of our ability to get our job done. I think anything beyond that, you really ought to talk to my boss.

Michele Neylon: Who is your boss?

Chris Gift: (Akram).

Michele Neylon: He hates talking to me but thank you.

Jennifer Gore: Please feel free to talk to him, Michele.

Michele Neylon: You really want to make him suffer don't you?

Graeme Bunton: Okay.

Jennifer Gore: No not today. Thank you though. Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff.

Graeme Bunton: Next? You've got more for us?

Jennifer Gore: That was - I was anticipating more questions from you related to that.

Graeme Bunton: I think you'll get those questions when there is something to look at.

Jennifer Gore: Understood.

Sophia Feng: Sophia from DNS. I'm very exciting to note about this naming service portal is going, you know, really on its way. So my question is will this portal reduce the amount of e-mail we got? Is the purpose, one of the purpose to having...

Jennifer Gore: So being on the other side of that equation, I'd like to first say yes. I would like to use it as a primary communication tool so the information is pushed to the portal. There are user stories that we're working through that will require e-mail communications in addition to what we push to the portal for time sensitive information to make you aware of it. We'd like to communicate it through two mechanisms or possibly even three.

When information is put on to the portal where it's time based and sensitive, we'd like to extend an e-mail addition to what we put out on the portal. So it won't technically eliminate all e-mail but it will drastically reduce the amount of e-mail that you're receiving today. And obviously the users portal group will help define and clarify those scenarios when they'd like to receive additional communications versus not.

Sophia Feng: And through all the communications to ICANN with a compliance issues or the other issues we're facing, you can - we can communicate through this portal as well?

Jennifer Gore: Yes, it'll allow for push and pull technology. So you can provide input, you can upload documents related to compliance tickets. You can check the status of your tickets. You can pull up reports based on type of ticket versus the status of the ticket versus which registrars are associated to versus the entire family of registrars. So as I said, you know, there is, you know, multiple user stories that we're walking through that we want to review with the portal users group to see if we're heading in the right direction and we can confirm that the user experience will be a positive and a useful one.

Sophia Feng: Yes so another question from me is the online invoicing, because currently we gather invoice for the registrar from ICANN but easily three or four months later and then the accounting team would tell that you didn't pay but actually we'd never the get the e-mail, the invoicing. Would that also cure these problems that we have?

Jennifer Gore: That is the intent. So again, I hate to keep going back to the portal users group but, you know, this is going to be a form in which we gather all of your requirements as registrars, contracted party and be able to put them in a document. And together, we will prioritize the features and functionality set. As Chris mentioned, you know, it's an agile approach so we're looking to make updates to the system every two weeks.

With each functionality, there's a level of effort that goes into it based upon the complexity of delivering, testing, QAing, and ensuring the user experience is - it meets the intent of the registrars. So I understand that is a situation, a frustrating one that occurs today, but in my mind, I propose that the way the functionality would work that you would receive your invoices through the portal.

Sophia Feng: Okay thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Did anyone else have questions for Jen on the portal? Okay. Do you have anything else for us, Jen?

Jennifer Gore: We can open the floor questions at this point in time if you want to, Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. Like if there's generic GDD what is Jen Gore doing with herself questions?

Jennifer Gore: Yes. And I welcome Cyrus. He's right behind you too. And (unintelligible) back there as well if you want to discuss anything - I'll throw everyone under the bus. This is our opportunity to dialogue of course with the registrars.

Graeme Bunton: Your wish has been granted. Tom Keller?

Tom Keller: Thank you. Tom Keller speaking. Is there already any concrete planning around the GDD meeting we're supposed to have for next year?

Graeme Bunton: That's a good question, Tom. So my latest insight is they don't have a location yet but maybe staff has something fresher than that.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you very much. This is Cyrus Namazi from the GDD team of ICANN. So we've been trying to actually sort of like what we did in May of 2016 to try to coordinate our next GDD summit to be sort brought up against the board retreat meeting because I think everyone, at least most everyone, found that to be a useful added benefit.

We almost had it nailed down but for whatever reason, the board meeting actually ended up moving so that reset a whole bunch of things. And that timing in May, which is mid May is what we're shooting for, and the location is going to be in Europe, based on the survey that we ran, somehow space of the size that we need to accommodate 450 people, which is a number that we had in Amsterdam is difficult.

I just came from a meeting with our meetings team. They have actually narrowed it down to a location in Madrid that can accommodate that many people. They've gone back now to sort of negotiate with them and make sure that we can have a contract before we actually announce this. The dates that we're looking for I believe are May 9 through 12, and as soon as this all said and done and cast in concrete, we'll send you a save-the-date e-mail with all these - the relevant information in it so that can you have it.

It's really taken us a bit longer than I had hoped for but it was this dependency on being able to actually be in close proximity in time and location with the board that sort of made it a bit more complex. We've done away with that. I think the board is actually going to be in a different location in Europe, and that location does not have the space that we need in terms of size and the timing of it to accommodate it. So they're going to be I think in a different location in Europe. We're going to be not too far from it, still a flight. I'm still hopeful that we'll get some participation with some of the board members, which I think would be beneficial for all of us. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Cyrus. Does anybody else - (Sophia)?

Sophia Feng: Yes. Hi, Cyrus. I have a question. Sophia from DNS. Is there any plans for GDD to hosting Asia sometime later?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, (Sophia), and it's good to see you again. We sort of left the choice of location of the GDD summit to be decided based on a survey that we ran. I don't have any particular preference. I like going to Asia as much as I like going to Europe. But the results of the survey that came back for this particular one in May of 2017 somewhat overwhelmingly suggested Europe would give us the best and highest level of participation, and this is how we ended up with that location.

After the May of 2017 meeting, perhaps we can do another survey or I think within the stakeholder groups or registries and registrars, you can decide and tell us where you think it'd make sense to host the next one and we'll be happy to do it. We don't have a preference from the ICANN side.

Sophia Feng: The question I asked and I believe I asked the question is because I think GDD will be a good platform for the Chinese registrar, the Asia registrars to participate. However it seems the participation rate on the members - number of members in our RSGs from the Chinese community or the Asian community is less represented. So they probably won't be able to vote on the locations.

However, when we host in Asia I think that would increase the participant rate from the Asian registrars significantly. So there's just one - just one element that I think the GDD team should take into consideration because I do think that many Chinese organizations would like to support, to host or support the GDD meeting held in Asia. Thank you.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you, Sophia. I full understand that. So one clarification for everyone here. When we issued the survey to ask, you know, the preference for the location, we actually e-mailed the survey to all of our contracted parties. So every accredited registrar, every contracted registry received a notification to participate in the survey. And I think, if I recall correctly, we had about 160 responses. We published the results of the survey, Jen, I think?

Jennifer Gore: We did publish the results of the survey.

Cyrus Namazi: And I guess to clarify, just to repeat that, we did send it to all of our contracted parties. Like I said, we don't have a preference whether it's in Asia. I totally agree with you. Obviously if we had in some place near China or some place in Asia, there would be more participation from that region of the world. I would suggest that, you know, the ExCom of the registrars and the registries sort of have this discussion and then decide which way you want to go, and we'll be happy to consider that and comply with it.

Sophia Feng: Thank you for the clarification. My bad. Not, you know, (unintelligible) a little bit. But I think from statistics, the 160 that you mentioned, maybe we should look at the statistics how many actual Chinese registrars responded or the Asian registrars responded.

So I think maybe - I mean from my experience, a lot of registrars receive e-mail and they probably - if it's English, they just ignore it and probably don't look at it and we don't know what the GDD is sometimes, what - so probably the awareness of the GDD summit and its purposes and the benefits of the GDD summit is probably is under-awareness among Chinese or among Asia registrars. That's just personal observation.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Sophia. You raised some good points. I see a hand from Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks. Michele for the record. I think (Sophia)'s point is well made. It's a bit of a Catch-22. I mean the registrars who do not actively engage with

ICANN are going to ignore a lot of the emails from ICANN, so getting more data I mean via our engagement people in the Asia Pacific can they at least talk to those registrars, find out did they get those surveys, did they understand what the survey was about.

And Cyrus, with all due respect, punting it back to the ExComs of the two groups that are actively engaged won't help because the issue we're facing is to a lot of registrars, specifically in Asia Pacific, not just in Asia Pacific, who don't engage. And it - trying to improve that engagement is something which we have to kind of do it collaboratively between both the registrars and ICANN GDD. It's not going to be a CPH thing as a much as registrar stakeholder group with ICANN GDD and the engagement team or something.

Because it's the registries tend to be more engaged, generally speaking, I don't know. I think Graeme may be able to speak to this a bit further because we are - have been doing stuff within the stakeholder group to work on them, and people like (Sophia) have been kind of helping to bridge that gap, but we have a huge cultural and linguistic divide.

Graeme Bunton: It's probably a good time to point out I think we actually have translation services available today, which is a first for us and I think a really good step forward in especially trying to engage Chinese registrars. And brochures, by the way if people didn't catch that, have been translated to Chinese and Arabic. Cyrus wanted to respond and then Jen, was it, did you have your hand up?

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you. I just wanted to I guess respond to what Michele is saying. I'm not trying to punt it back to the ExComs. I had every intention to actually rotate the locations at which we host the GDD summit following the format that the ICANN meetings team follows. It was the request of the two ExComs to me to actually consider having it in Europe and I made it conditional upon having the survey. So it wasn't me who decided to do this, it was really your request.

So that's why I was saying that if you'd to like change that, I'm very open to it, but have the discussion among yourself. And we want to make this for you. This is your GDD summit. And you're right, it is a Catch-22. If we don't go to Asia then we can't engage with people that we want to have more engagement with us, I understand that. But I also wanted to share that I accommodated the request that came from the ExComs.

Michele Neylon: I mean ultimately, Cyrus, no matter what you do, we're going to pick on you anyway, you know that. That's part of your job title, punch back.

Sophia Feng: So I just had one probably recommendation or suggestion because you know (unintelligible) is working the registrar relation thing in for ICANN in Asia, who is doing a really good job, so maybe if he can actively invite in registrars to participate in the survey, that would definitely help the results. Eventually if all Chinese registrars would love to go to Europe for a summit that, you know, and it makes sense as well, right? So.

Cyrus Namazi: I'm sorry to drag this. This is a very good suggestion, (Sophia), and we'll definitely do that. The other thing actually that I wanted to highlight is that for the May 2016 GDD summit, even though it was not budgeted, we - I managed to go find the money to actually fund ten travelers chosen, five by the registrars and five by the registries, and I strongly suggested to the leadership to consider actually funding people who would not normally come to the GDD summit.

Supposedly we'll do something similar to this for the upcoming GDD summit, and maybe this is another sort of incentive to use to have people who are not either familiar or don't want to make the investment of coming to Europe from a remote place like Asia or other places, give that more consideration. Because I don't think in Amsterdam we actually had very many coming from those areas that actually we had provided funding for, for what it's worth.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Cyrus. I've got Jen, and this is Graeme. I was just getting reminders that we all need to state our names.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks. Jen Gore, ICANN staff. Along the lines of communication and reaching out in your local languages, that's one of the areas that we're expanding our strategy and communicating with registrars. The What's Up communication that came out for registrar sessions for ICANN 57 was translated in the UN languages and did go out to the respective registrars within that region, and we plan to continue to offer services in language moving forward related to important surveys and communications of that nature.

And that feedback regarding the GDD summit and offering that in language for the survey actually did come from (Howard), and we have that noted for the next iteration of the survey.

Wen Zhai: Hi this is Wen from (Carnac). Nice to meet you again, Cyrus. I actually had an idea when you talk about reaching out, and Sophia said to collaborate with the current reach out activities. Actually I'm not sure how other regions work but in APAC region, the APAC hub organizes online APAC webinars, and I think the attendance is really good, considering the time is very inconvenient for the region.

So if the survey - I think it's of high interest of other registrars in APAC's region so maybe they could have such a APAC webinar to collaborate with the APAC hub. Also there's the social media of now in our case in China they have a social media outlet that's (unintelligible) so maybe that could translate into Chinese and actually publish on that APAC China social media. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: This is actually a great time to mention that we're doing an APAC lunch tomorrow at some time. (Zoe), do you...

Zoe Bonython: It's at 12:15.

Graeme Bunton: Great.

Zoe Bonython: So - if you want to come, if you're from the APAC region and you'd like to come, then send me an e-mail. You should - most people hopefully would have gotten an invitation already but, yes, just in case.

Graeme Bunton: Great. So if you are a registrar in the APAC region, you should - and you're not - you don't know about this, absolutely get in touch with (Zoe) and we can have lunch and address some of these issues there. (Sean)?

Zuan Zhang: Thanks, Graeme. And Zoe has sent me to the e-mail and we sent the e-mail to invite Chinese registrars to attend APAC lunch at noon tomorrow. And just to add, (Sophia) and (Wen), my question for the GDD summit location, my question is for Cyrus -- sorry, I didn't say hello to you. My question is it seems there is a conflict. The conflict between the principle of ICANN meeting location and the results of the survey. So my question is when there is a conflict then how you decide between this? Thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you and hello to you. This is Cyrus. I tried to explain to you the process that we followed by which we settled on Europe as the location, choice of location for May 2017 summit. When we decided to do the GDD summit, this was I think almost two years ago, maybe a little more, one of the principles of it was that we were going to design and essentially hold the summit in very close collaboration with our contracted parties. And that collaboration takes place through the leadership of the two stakeholder groups that we work with, the registries and registrars.

It was really through that mode of communication that the strong desire for having it in a place that they call central that was easy to get to from different regions sort of overtook the desire to move it from one location to another similar to what the ICANN meetings team does.

Now we never said that we would actually follow that format. I had just assumed that we would do that. But since this is a collaborative sort of summit in terms of the design and the planning for it, we'll listened to it and by virtue of conducting the survey, it sort of overwhelmingly proved that participation in the summit would be increased greatly if it was held in a location in Europe. So I don't see it really as a conflict per se, it's just something that collectively, based on the data that was provided and the input that came from the leadership of the stakeholder groups, ended up being decided.

And I'm fine, quite fine frankly, for the following GDD summit to move it to Asia or to move it to North America or any location that makes sense. For us, it's the same amount of work so we really don't have any preference. If we held it in Los Angeles, it would be less work for us, but anything beyond that is the same amount of work. So I would strongly suggest that among yourselves and together with the registries, you decide what you want to do, and we want to listen to you because the GDD summit is for you. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Cyrus. This is Graeme. I think we can move some of this discussion into the APAC lunch we're going to have tomorrow and address some of these other diversity issues as we cope with the growing geographic diversity of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and ICANN and the GDD and wrap our brains around the best way to do things. Jen?

Jennifer Gore: Thanks, Graeme. I'd just like to reiterate -- thank you, Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff, Chris is over here yelling at me. I'd just like to reiterate that luncheon is for registrars but also potential registrars because I know there's quite a few new attendees to ICANN 57 and I've been approached by many that I'd like to extend the invite to them as well that are seeking a better current - currently seeking completion of their application as well as interested inviting them to join the Registrar Stakeholder Group as well.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jen. And I know myself and (Tobias) will be there and a couple other registrars, Jen will be there. So feel free to join us.

Anything else for GDD team? Any other topics we wish to raise with them at the moment? Great. Thank you guys for joining us today, appreciate it. We look forward to seeing the portal and getting more frequent status updates on that and holding your feet to the fire. A departing word from Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Departing words from me. This is Cyrus. I just wanted to thank you again, Graeme, Darcy, and the team, for having us here. Really just to repeat and reiterate the fact that we're here to serve you so if there are times in which something that should be done by us is not being done or if it should be done differently, you should certainly feel free to reach out obviously to Jen and her team or myself to be able to resolve it for you. The objective here, the overarching objective here, is for us to provide the right service for you. Thank you again for the opportunity to be here.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Cyrus. All right. It feels like we've been sitting for a little while but we're going to power on through. We're going to get a - what we typically do is we go through the current PDPs that people are working on to get some feedback and discussion going on about how those are proceeding, and we have some more of that coming up this afternoon. My name is on far too many things. And we're running about still 15 minutes ahead of time so we'll get an update from Sara Bockey on the RDS PDP and then we'll have a break.

Before we get that far, is there anything particular to our break? We don't have our own coffee or tea or anything? Okay. So it doesn't matter when we take that. It's the normal break time. Okay so we might end up being a little bit ahead of that.

So if I may, Sara, are you ready? Great.

Sara Bockey: My name is Sara Bockey and I'm a member of the RDS working group, which is the Registry Directory Services Working Group. And this is a GNSO policy development process to define the purpose of collecting and maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data and considering safeguards for protecting data.

The working group began its work beginning of the year 2016 and the work itself is going to be divided into three phases. We're currently in phase one, which is defining requirements. Phase two will be more technical designing function, and phase three will be implementation.

During the first phase of this work, the working group has been tasked with providing the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions, the first being what the seminal requirements for gTLD registration data, and two, is a new policy framework and next generation RDS needed to address these requirements. So we're looking to see if we can work with the Whois system we have or do we need to just scrap it and start over.

So when this working group began we divided into three small groups and reviewed a very large amount of documentation that had been identified as relevant in answering the chart questions regarding the purpose data and privacy. To give you a little overview, the purpose in users we're looking at who should have access to gTLD registration data and why, for the data elements, what data should be collected, stored, and disclosed, and then for privacy, what steps are needed to protect data and privacy.

So after reviewing all of these documents, we have a list of possible requirements that currently is exceeding over 1,000 items. Staff has been gracious enough to go through and code all of these to help identify which requirements each item can be sort of put in that bucket, dividing them up to help us better process the information.

At our last meeting in Helsinki, some expressed concern that this enormous list of requirements didn't really define the problem and that we needed to first define the problem and then create requirements to solve that problem. There was also concern that the current course of work was just too big to digest. And so from this evolved the idea of a problem statement or a statement of purpose.

And this is intended to help the working group have an effective deliberation on possible requirements that we are going to be reviewing. The working group has basically been working on the statement of purpose since Helsinki. We also have done some reviewing of use cases, but for the most part we've been working on the statement of purpose since Helsinki. The week before we came here, Chuck just sort of -- Chuck Gomes is the chair -- and he kind of just drew a line in the sand and we just stopped talking about I think for a bit. It's still not, I think, 100% complete.

So we had a face-to-face meeting on Thursday and actually began to have some preliminary deliberations. We're basically systematically going to be going through and considering this enormous list of possible requirements that we've identified and determining if that possible requirement does indeed relate to the charter questions and if it should be kept as something that we're going to review later on and deliberate further on or if it should be just kicked out and not considered.

So that is where we are currently. As you can see, it's not been moving very quickly. If anyone is interested in joining, you haven't really missed a whole lot and it's probably going to be going on for a really long time. I'll probably retire before it's done. But we are always looking for new blood and new ideas. So please if you're interested, join us. Does anyone have any questions?

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Sara. I appreciate that. I've got a question from Michele in a sec. But my impression is this thing will generally go for forever but is there

anything that you've come across so far that requires more attention from the Registrar Stakeholder Group?

Sara Bockey: I don't - I personally don't think so, no, because there hasn't been much really substantive deliberation. It's all been sort of just gathering information and sorting, and nothing I don't think really substantial has taken place anyone should be concerned about.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thank you. This is Graeme. So first before we get to Michele, sorry I'm making you wait, A, I think we all appreciate you and whoever else is in the RDS PDP because I think that's going to be a really long haul staying in there and fighting the good fight because in theory the output of this could be extremely impactful to our businesses. It's just going to take a very long time to get there. So hang in there. Please and thank you. Let us know if there are things that - or information that is useful for the Registrar Stakeholder Group or if you are looking for information back from us that would be useful. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks, Graeme. Michele for the record. I'm one of the vice chairs of that PDP and in terms of number of registrars involved, I think we're okay for now but I think we will probably need to look at kind of almost rotating people through that group because it's going to be there for a very, very, very, very, very long time.

The other problem we have is that there is the Whois review that's kicking off now, and at the moment, the - pretty much every registrar representative who has expertise in Whois is already in the RDS PDP and the Whois review, unlike previous reviews, has been given a narrower scope and they're also trying to narrow the timelines down so that it would be, I think it's six months, somebody can correct me, Marika or somebody if I get it wrong. But we will need to have people who know what's going on with Whois kind of peel off RDS for a period of time or, I don't know, swap out or something because the two are hugely impactful for us.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. The Whois review, and maybe I think Marika is still in the room, she can answer this for me, is it a nomination process and so does it end up falling on the RSD ExCom to put someone forward for that or is it anyone can apply? Do you know offhand?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So it actually falls under the new process, as outlined in the bylaws. And I think it's currently under discussions as well for the SSR review team. So as far as I know, I think the call for applications is open. People I think are expected to identify by which SO or AC they want to be nominated. Then that SO/AC has to decide how many people they nominate. I think there's - if you nominate three, you get a guaranteed seat. If you nominate seven, you just to have to wait and see. And then it's up to the SO/AC chairs to make a decision on who gets on the review team.

I think it's up to 21 maximum. So basically everyone would get three, they're guaranteed seats, but if some people appoint less, there's room to appoint others. And my assumption is that that same process will be followed for the Whois review team but there are some discussions going on at the moment between the SO/AC chairs on how their process would actually work in relation to deciding who would get on the review team.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Marika. If only we had an SO/AC chair available. James?

James Bladel: Hi. James speaking. And yes I think Marika just covered what I was about to say. We had a meeting to discuss the process of this selection. I think we're getting close to a process. It is a new formula since the AOC doesn't exist anymore and we're not operating under the bylaws. But generally I think the short answer is the GNSO puts forward three names therein. Anything beyond three is not a guarantee.

So one approach might be that each SO and AC identified three primary candidates and four alternate candidates, and then the alternate - the pool of

alternates would be used to balance any missing skill sets or background required for that particular review team or also hit the desired diversity for region, language, gender diversity issues that we'd be looking for.

So that's generally the goal. We're going to try it out first on this SSR review team and then it will also apply to the Whois review team, and I believe we've got ATRT3 coming up in the future as well. Where'd Marika go? Sometime early next year. So there will be more review teams. We want to get a predictable process in place this first time so that we can use that for future teams.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, James, for the update. This is Graeme. So there's no guarantee that we get a registrar into this Whois review. That would seem like a bad outcome for us, so we should think about who wants to volunteer for that and then we should make sure that we're putting them forward, that, A, they're a good representative, they have the skills that this review team is looking for, and we can put them forward to the GNSO, and, B, as assured as we can possibly be that the GNSO is going to select them. So if you are interested in that review, we should talk.

Yes go ahead, James.

James Bladel: Just that I was the registrar member of the previous Whois review team, which has a broader scope and was a fairly significant undertaking, I think it would be great if we could have not only a non-North America registrar representing us this time around but specifically an EU registrar that has to deal with some of the privacy conflicts that we're seeing in the Whois conflicts with local law and taking a look at that process. I think that would bring a specific and localized expertise to this review team.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thank you, James. This is Graeme. I see a hand from (Tom). Briefly though to a point Michele raised about how the heck to deal with like a four-year PDP and not destroying humans, I'm not sure - and I think about this

problem a little bit. It's a resource management problem. We have finite numbers of people participating in PDPs, and burning them up inside of an ethic one is not a great idea.

I'm not sure it makes sense to swap people in and out of the PDP but maybe what we can do is figure out what resources participating registrars need to be able to swap meetings so that, you know, you can skip meetings, you don't have to get up at whatever or time or something, you can give that to someone else. You set up an alternating schedule. If that's the case for this RDS one, maybe we can look at the people involved and figure out how to do that. Do you want to come back on that?

Michele Neylon: Just very, very quickly. Sorry, (Tom). That I think makes perfect sense. I think we informally did it on another PDP at one stage a couple of years back. But I mean we're still dealing with a finite number of people and, you know, there's - for people in Asia Pacific for example they are usually put at a distinct disadvantage from most of the calls because most of them fall during kind of morning for West Coast U.S., early late morning East and afternoon or something for Europe. Asia Pacific usually suffers except in those PDPs where they're rotating.

But I mean if we could come up with some kind of way of managing that kind of cover type thing, it would help a lot. Because the - I think Jeff Neuman brought it up in another thing. He said a lot of time you feel that you need to keep track of what's going on and I think also maybe that's the other side of it as well is that we get better updates on the PDPs from people who are actually tracking them so that we don't have to always feel that we have to be involved in every single one of them.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Michele. Tom?

Tom Keller: Thank you. Tom speaking. What is being reviewed? I don't really get it. I mean we went through it numerous times. I think I've been on one of these

years back in time basically. What is the proposed outcome of the Whois review, the next one?

James Bladel: Actually there's only been one other -- sorry, this is James speaking again -- actually there's only been one other review team that reviews all of the Whois policy. This one - the proposal is for this one to be scaled down and to have specifically a review of the previous Whois review team and how that work has been implemented and how it's been adopted. So it's supposed to be lightweight, streamlined and a little bit faster in recognition that the RDS is already ongoing and hasn't completed.

Michele Neylon: Also as well, (Tom), it's one of these stupid things where they're actually obliged to it because it was up to the AOC that they have to do these reviews. So there's - that's why there's the - there's a Whois review and there's two or three other ones that are on a schedule of every X number of years. This one in particular should have kicked off, somebody can correct me, but I think it was like nine months to a year ago but we managed to push back and get it delayed a little because of the RDS one. It has narrowed in scope but it still needs to happen.

Graeme Bunton: Did you have a question for me there? Sorry, I was distracted by James. He's a terrible person. Tom?

Tom Keller: Tom speaking. So what is the planned outcome of the whole exercise? It's just going to - I understand that review team is to be reviewed and whether everything has been implemented or was said to be implemented. If there is finding that there was a flaw in the process, what's going to happen then? Is that going to change policy? Is it going to open up new parts of (unintelligible)? I don't really know, you know, what we have to expect from that.

James Bladel: Yes so the review teams make recommendations to the board. The last review team made recommendations that resulted in the expert working

group and the RDS. So could this result in new policy? Potentially yes, but I'm hoping that, and I think it's the hope of the entire community that with RDS already underway, that this review team would instead make recommendations towards that group or towards the implementation of things that have already been adopted and not start from whole cloth and make, you know, broad, sweeping reviews, so - or recommendations. So that's the goal of the narrowed scope. Because I think nobody wants to reopen all of these discussions with - especially with the PDP already underway.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Anybody else have thoughts on RDS or that Whois review? I'll just put out there again that, as James pointed out, perhaps if you're an EU registrar and you want to participate in that Whois review, you should reach out to someone on the ExCom and we'll talk about that.

Man: But anybody should apply.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. Right. Anybody can apply; it is open to anyone that privacy implication is interesting. So, yes, reach out. We are at 2:52. Next up is afternoon break till 5 - 15:15, I'm going to mix the way I tell time. So why don't we get an extra eight minutes into our break because I - my hunch is that a couple of those things in the afternoon agenda are going to be a little quick. So behold an extra eight minutes. We'll see you back here and we'll get going again at 3:15 sharp. Thank you.

END