

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad
GNSO RySG – Brand Registry Group (BRG) Open Session
Tuesday, 08 November 2016 at 15:15 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>

Cecilia Smith: All right we're going to go ahead and get started. I am Cecilia Smith, Brand Registry Group President. I also represent dotFox. This is the Brand Registry Group open session, so welcome and thank you for coming. We're going to quickly go around the room to introduce ourselves just so we can know who's here since there's quite a few new people, or people I don't recognize. So, Martin, you want to go next?

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Cecilia. My name is Martin Sutton, the Executive Director of the Brand Registry Group. Thank you.

Cole Quinn: My name is Cole Quinn. I'm from Microsoft and I'm on the Board of Directors of the Brand Registry Group.

Luca Barbero: Luca Barbero, from Studio Barbero, member of the Board of Directors of the Brand Registry Group. Sorry. And I'm representing Ferrero Trading Lux, applicant for dotFerrero, dotKinder and dotRussia.

Jim Prendergast: My name is Jim Prendergast with the Galway Strategy Group, just sitting at the table as instructed.

Woman: (Afni) Registry for dotFR in France, but also back in for French brand TLDs.

Dirk Krischenowski: Dirk Krischenowski from dotBerlin and dotHamburg but also for dotZone, which wrote applications for a number of German brands like Volkswagen and Audi and Lamborghini and others.

Sue Schuler: Sue Schuler, the Data Management Assistant for the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Hector Ariel Manoff: Hector Ariel Manoff from Argentina, Vitale, Manoff & Feilbogen, a law firm of Argentina.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Excuse me, would you like to introduce yourselves?

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): Hi. I'm (Michael), the company (Knipp) we are running some registry backend systems.

(Sylvia): (Sylvia) (unintelligible) from (Core) Registry.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. (Unintelligible).

(Jore Sippens): (Jore Sippens) from Deloitte Belgium.

(Claudia Martin): (Claudia Martin) from Louis Vuitton.

(Andres): (Andres) from (Thompson) (Unintelligible).

Mert Saka: Mert Saka, ICANN organization.

Jennifer Scott: Jennifer Scott, ICANN Contractual Compliance.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Don Hollander: Don Hollander from the Universal Acceptance Steering Group.

Owen Smigelski: Owen Smigelski, ICANN Contractual Compliance.

Man: (Unintelligible) ICANN (unintelligible).

Andrew Barrett: Andrew Barrett, Encirca.

Man: (Unintelligible) I represent Geo (unintelligible) industries.

Janelle McAlister: Janelle McAlister from Mark Monitor.

(Alan Jane): (Alan Jane) representing dotStar.

Jeff Neuman: Jeff Neuman with Valideus, also here to give an update as one of the cochairs of the Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group.

Frieda Tallon: Frieda Tallon from dotSky and on the BRG Board.

Susan Payne: Susan Payne from Valideus. I'm one of the BRG's honorary legal advisors.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon.

Marc Trachtenberg: Marc Trachtenberg, Greenberg Traurig, honorary legal advisor to the BRG.

Cecilia Smith: Thank you and welcome again. One thing I want to say to all the folks here who are in the Brand Registry Group I just wanted to make a point here that the Brand Registry's main difference between some of the other registries that you guys may be familiar with is that we don't sell domains. So I just want you to keep that in mind that being part of the ICANN world may or may not be part of our main business space.

That being said, we are still very much involved in ICANN and so today's session we're going to have some speakers come talk to us about the areas that impact us with a brand eye. So I just wanted to make sure that you guys were aware of that difference between the brands and the open TLDs.

Martin Sutton: And I'd just add one more point. We have people joining us in remote session as well so if there is any questions as we go long we'll monitor for those and call those out. Thank you.

Cecilia Smith: All right, well on that note, we have the agenda up here. And I'm not going to read through it. I'm sure you can see it. So we're going to Jeff Neuman here, who is the cochair of the Subsequent Procedures working group give us a quick summary update on what that group is and how that impacts the brands.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Cecilia. And thanks for inviting me here to give an update. So the Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group, we abbreviate sometimes we say SubPro so if you hear me say that that's just the abbreviation.

That working group was formed at the – well towards the beginning of this year. And has been really working ever since really around the Helsinki meeting, which was towards the summer. We are tasked with reviewing the procedures for the introduction of new generic top level domains from 2012 and then suggesting improvements or modifications to the policy and

implementation for the subsequent introduction of new gTLDs on a going-forward basis.

The – one of the important tenets of our group is that there is existing policy today on new generic top level domains. In fact in 2007, the GNSO, the Generic Name Supporting Organization, approved a policy which states that there shall be new gTLDs that are introduced in a predictable – in a predictable manner. And so it envisioned not just the one round we had in 2012, which is where all of you had applied, but also an ongoing process to keep the introduction of new generic top level domains.

So the group is comprised of about 130 active participants and another 40-50 observers. And we divided our work essentially into a set of overarching issues as well as four work tracks which deal – each deal with some individual areas, I'll be touching on, in a minute or so.

So the overarching questions all dealt with, well, should the policy that calls for additional new generic top level domains should that be revisited? Also, should new TLDs be introduced in what are known as rounds, like the 2012, or, you know, even on an ongoing first come first serve basis as opposed to announcing an application window and then closing that application window and then waiting a few years and opening an application window and closing again.

So those are some overarching issues that we sent out for community comment a few months ago. And we received a bunch of comments back from the Registry Stakeholder Group, from the Intellectual Property Constituency, the Government Advisory Committee, and some others. And are working through those comments now.

In January we hope to release a set of more specific detailed questions in our Consultation Number 2, which deal with really, like I said, kind of more specifics on the procedures to get some good feedback. Ultimately, our hope

is to be able to publish a preliminary report in the third quarter of 2017 and finish up our work by early – or I should say mid-2018.

Some of the issues that are being considered that I think are of relevance, in Work Track 1 we are considering some issues such as whether to accredit backend registry service providers. That is – well I use the term “accredit” there’s still a bunch of discussions on whether it’s called accreditation or certification or even just preapproval.

The concept is that during this round in 2012, there were several providers that many of you are using, whether it’s Neustar, VeriSign, Afiliis, CentalNic or others, that went through the same evaluation process, in some cases, a couple hundred times. And so it just seemed to be kind of a waste of resources to require the same operator to go through the same set of evaluations that many times.

So the group is thinking about whether to have a preapproval process whereby registry operator or backend operator, I should say, registry service provider, is approved prior to the beginning of the round or application window, so that such that brands in the future can have a list of all the registry service providers that have passed ICANN’s evaluation and choose from that list instead of not knowing whether the registry service provider would prevail in an evaluation or not.

Work Track 1 is also dealing with issues such as applicant support, and outreach to the underserved or the – what’s called the Global South. And there are a number of brands in that area so the hope is to not only get additional new generic top level domains from those areas but also some brand TLDs as well. And that’ll be certainly part of reaching out and a program that’s ultimately developed by this group – or recommended by this group and then adopted and implemented by ICANN.

In Work Track 2, I think is probably the most relevant. It deals with legal and regulatory issues and contractual issues. So some of the issues that are being discussed are the base registry agreement; one issue is should there be just one base agreement as was in the 2012 round, albeit with some specifications including Specification 13. Or whether there should be potentially different agreements for different types of TLDs.

So in theory, there could be a different agreement for brand top level domains, geo top level domains and others. So that's all up for discussion. And I know that that's something the Brand Registry Group is looking into as to how to move forward on that.

There's some other issues that talk in Track 2, one important one is reserve names. That's a really large topic. It deals with not just reserve names at the second level that we all think about for existing TLDs, which is Specification 5. And, you know, the names that are reserved like the Red Cross names, the Olympic names, the two-characters, which we just had a resolution on today, and country names and others, but also reserve names at the top level.

And this – the work of this group is going to rely on the work that was already done by the CCWG, which stands for Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names at the top level, that's a mouthful.

They finished up their work and – or are finishing up their work. They were able to come to an agreement on blocking two character letters at the top level from the future rounds. So that does affect brands that have two characters as their name, and there are a few of those.

But there's also – there was no agreement on whether to protect three character country codes. And I say three character country codes because there is a list of ISO country codes that are three characters, things like USA or GBR for Great Britain, etcetera, there's obviously one for each country.

The group was unable to come to consensus on that and we think that that group is going to refer the matter over to our working group so there are some issues especially if you are a brand that's three characters, that may potentially match a name that's on the ISO list. So that's another issue that Work Track 2 is considering.

Some other ones in the – that may be of importance are issues like vertical integration, meaning can a registry be the same entity as the registrar? It also includes things like the code of conduct which brand registries are exempt from, but also the requirement to have to use ICANN accredited registrars and the requirement of – which is 2.9 in the agreement of not discriminating in favor of one registrar or against other registrars.

Work Track 3 is a work track that is dealing with the issues around string similarity, string confusion, objections, public comments and the use of accountability measures after the fact. So this includes things, if you recall, there was a tool that was supposed to measure whether two strings were similar either to – whether a string was similar to one that was already in the root, which at the time was only 26 but now will be, you know, over 1300, 1400, whatever it ends up being but also processed to deal with similarity to other applications.

If it was similar to something that's already existing in the root then it wouldn't go forward. If it was similar to another application it'd be put in the same contention set. So we're discussing – we'll review the auction processes. In theory if we just went to a straight first come first serve there may not even be a string contention process, because the first one in that qualifies would be selected.

We're talking about the objection processes, which include the legal rights objections. That was where a trademark owner would file an objection against a applied-for string based on confusingly similar standard. But also the other

objection types like the community-based objections, the objections for – it's called limited interest, I think, limited public interest objections, which essentially was, you know, whether the string violated some morality and public order, which there were a few of those objections.

And also important we'll talk about how the – whether there should be an appeals process from some of these decisions. Right now or into the 2012 round the only appeals really were through the accountability measures, so if you didn't like a decision by the community panel or by the string similarity panel, or geo names panel, you had to go through either, you know, the ICANN reconsideration process, the ombudsman, or ultimately the independent review. We're talking about whether there should be a formal appeals mechanism even outside of those accountability measures.

And finally, Work Track 4 is dealing with really the technical, operational and finance issues involved in the evaluation. It's looking at, you know, were the questions that were asked during the 2012 round the right questions from each of those aspects? Did the questions really help the evaluators judge the finance capabilities or technical capabilities of the applicants or should there be improvements?

It's also talking about name collision issues and universal acceptance and also about internationalized domain names. So there's a lot really grouped into that Work Track 4.

So that's kind of the summary of what we're working on, the timeline again, hopefully will be to do a preliminary report sometime in the mid to late 2017, getting in public comments early 2018 and then hopefully finalizing a final report in July or so of 2018.

Although the group has started its work, it's always open for additional participants if any of these areas are of interest for you. And, you know, the

only requirement is that you catch up on your own but other than that, you know, you're more than welcome to come and participate.

Like I said, there's 130 participants, but I would say of that 130 there's really only a core group of maybe 20-30 that are really actively involved and so we could certainly use the help with all the subjects we have. And I think I'll close on the final point of the way that we're operating is that, you know, absent a consensus in the community to revise or change anything that happened in the 2012 process, the default rule is that we will go back to that – the way – the way the policy existed and was implemented in that last round.

So if you really feel strong about an issue it's highly encouraged that you work with the other members of the working group to try to get that issue or those revisions in place so that we can make sure that we have some improvements from the last round.

Cecilia Smith: Thank you so much, Jeff. This is a really big topic and a really big job. And I know you're working around the clock on that. I do have a question for you regarding the participants. Of the 130 so, do you know how many are brands or represent brands? Estimate?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I've not broken it down to brands. I would say that there are probably – the last time I think I counted somewhere around 20-30 registry participants. But a lot of those were more of the generics. I know that just looking around in this room I know that Amazon is participating, Kristina is participating; Cecilia, you're participating as is I believe Beth from Fox. Freida in participating. Paul is participating. Mark Monitor is participating.

So I think a lot of people around this room are participating which is probably not a surprise, but it would be great to have more brands. And in fact, one brand, Karen Day, who is with SAS, a BRG member, is actually one of the cochairs for the track that's dealing with objections and community

processes. So there are some brands involved but we welcome – the more the merrier I guess.

Cecilia Smith: All right, thank you. Go ahead, Martin.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Jeff. I think that great to be able to summarize that for a lot more of the brands that have been able to join us today. But one of the things I'm conscious of is that there's now, I don't know, 490 nearly Specification 13 registries delegated and another 60 odd exempt from the code of conduct, which again, probably includes a good batch of brand related registries which is a significant proportion of the near 1200 that have been delegated overall from the new gTLD last round.

With that it introduces a brand new model. There's no distribution needed for selling domains in a vast network of registrars to accommodate that. In fact, much less is the fact that we want just a very controlled and structured environment that we've got with the Specification 13 element so one or two registrars to adopt our business needs.

But within the PDP working group, is there any kind of reflection, do you feel, for those new models that introduce different risks or lower risks? Because I think there's some elements here that could be – if viewed in a specific way might be helpful to ease the path for future brand applicants.

The reason I say that is that there's risks and advantages on both – on this, but there's lower risks involved with dotBrands and a lot of advantages. In terms of consumer protection, great big tick. In terms of no issues in terms of RPM elements involved. In terms of if it fails, it's not going to calm any registrants because you're not passing those out and distributing those to third parties.

So in that I'm hoping that we will be able to reflect that there is a different risk model as we go through this process and try and make sure that that is

understood. And I don't know whether there is vehicles to try and do that or it's just a matter of continually trying to raise the awareness of these as we start to see more activations of dotBrands.

But it just kind of a feel for, you know, does anybody perceive it – does it have to be a one-size fits all or are we beginning to see a need for different approaches for different models?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Those are all very good points. I think there's – I would say that most of the participants do understand and agree with the fact that there is a classification of TLDs known as brand TLDs, and that they are different in a number of respects. I'm not sure that most of the participants appreciate all the differences that you've laid out here. And I think continuing to educate the members of the working group by participating in the working group is a very good idea.

I think, you know, the stats you mentioned about the 490 plus Specifications 13s and even more – an additional number of code of conduct exempt registries, is certainly great to point out because that really does amount to close to half or at least 40% of the TLDs that are delegated at this point.

And so educating them on all of the differences is a good idea. And then ensuring, you know, most of the colorful issues or the sexy issues I call, are mostly related to the generic top level domains and, you know, the distribution and premium name pricing and all sorts – reserve names, all sorts of things that brand registries have different interests on.

And I think it would be great for the brands to stay actively involved in the PDP working group to make sure that any policy we recommend isn't overly broad so as to accidentally sweep in the Brand Registries when the same reasons for that policy don't necessarily exist.

And, you know, issues dealing with reserve names is a great example. And starting to be recognized by ICANN even in the two character proposal, or that was just adopted, there's a recognition that brand TLDs or Spec 13 TLDs and code of conduct exempt TLDs don't have the same recommendations from ICANN that with respect to two characters that the more generic of the names have.

So I think there are a number of items where I agree with you, I think the Registry Agreement is another area which I think a lot of it deals with issues that may not apply to brands. And so it may be advisable for the brands to try come up with some sort of separate scaled down agreement that's more easily understood for brands as we go in the future. So I think all those are really good points.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Jeff. And I think the appreciation is that, you know, it's not their core business so this is very difficult place to navigate and understand in terms of the contract itself but also the relevance to a lot of the existing and historic policies that are in place. But there is one thing that you called out there which I think was fantastic news today in terms of the developments with the two character codes.

And I would just like, whilst we've got the opportunity to say thank you immensely to Susan Payne that's been involved with the A-Team in the Registry Stakeholder Group and Kristina and others that were involved to get the very, very good result that we saw today and highly appreciate that and all those that have supported that effort. Thank you.

Jeff, did you want something else to say there?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, there's one other point I should have mentioned and that's – and I don't know to the extent that your group has been discussing this, but there's – there was a notion before we really started ramping up our work that there may be potential interest in a brand-only round or whether brands could move

through this process more quickly than other TLDs in the sense that, well, since brands don't have to deal with premium names and some other issues, could brands be introduced prior to the other TLDs or is there some priority that can be given to brands.

I will say that right now the working group hasn't really heard that very strongly at all. And so at this point if that is something you are all still interested in, I will say that that message is not coming through in the sense of most of the participants when we discussed this, you know, just kind of didn't really fight for that. And so if this is something of interest I would say that the BRG would be, you know, well served to discuss that issue first and come to some position and submit that, you know, fairly soon because work is – I think if you don't put that position forth pretty soon I think it's just going to get swept up with all the other issues.

So and again I don't know if that is a position. It's just something that we've heard from the outside. And I don't know about whether that will be accepted by the working group but anyway I thought I'd relay that.

Cecilia Smith: Okay. Thank you. Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady. I don't want to address what Jeff was talking about, sorry Jeff, but what I found – I do want to talk about a subject that has to do with future dotBrand applicants. And I learned over the years that if you say things out loud at an ICANN meeting sometimes they stick better on working group calls. So I'm going to do that.

One of the major flaws of the Applicant Guidebook was the nonsense legal rights objection, it was complete nonsense. Very few people used it when they read it. And those who did use it were not, for the most part, very happy with the outcomes. Because the legal rights objection was based upon an infringement analysis. And of course infringement requires use. And it's not at all clear to me how you can use a registry that you've only applied for. Right?

So essentially that part of the Applicant Guidebook was written by somebody who just flat out didn't understand anything about legal rights. And for whatever reason, I think maybe in our haste to finish up the prep work for Round 1, I know it always seems like we're always in a haste to finish up something around here, that just got left out. And so I think it's important for us in terms of protecting future brand applicants against competing bad applications that we fix that. And I commit to helping with that process. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I mean, and thanks, Paul, that's great feedback. I, you know, that subject – the subject of the legal rights objections was initially discussed. Those comments were not brought in so I think that if you could not only, you know, obviously we have our discussion here but it would be great if you could submit an email on that. And then, you know, maybe provide some ideas of things that we can do to improve it that would be fantastic. I know Karen would be very happy to get that.

Martin Sutton: And final for me probably, I hope, before we wrap this up, is just referring to the open session on Thursday I think it was that we had for the PDP working group, so I'm just wondering what will happen with the input from that session because it was flagged within the discussions of next windows and whether it's rounds, distinct rounds or a continuum. It was raised at that particular meeting this option that for a lower risk type model and a significant number that we've already seen.

So there, you know, if it's a dotBrand they could be entertained within a smaller distinct rounds as anything else is lined up for the broader market. So not only would that help to keep momentum of the new gTLDs going, it would also mean that you could try out some of the new processes that are adopted on a smaller distinct group particularly any streamlining processes that are adopted in the application process.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Yes, it seems like that was forever ago even though it was – what's today, Tuesday? That was Thursday. So we're still digesting all of the comments that we got back. The role of that Thursday meeting was really to – there was a set of questions as you said, one of them was on should we do rounds or first come first serve. I think there was some great feedback.

The feedback you just gave was not – it's not something I've heard. It's a good – it's good feedback and, again, I would say that would be great to feed into the overall questions because that's one of the overall questions. It's not something that's been argued before but I think it's a good point and I think it would be great for the BRG to make that kind of statement.

Cecilia Smith: Thank you, Jeff. Note taken. Thank you. And I'm going to go ahead and move on to the next item, but you're very welcome to stay. It's a nice space. The next item on the agenda, we don't have it up but it will be up shortly, is the Registry Agreement. And, Susan, if you wouldn't mind giving us an update on that? Thank you.

Susan Payne: Hi there, everyone. It's Susan Payne again. Yes, the Registry Agreement renegotiation, which is an exercise that's been going on for a very long time, it feels as so many things in ICANN do. And hopefully most people are familiar with the renegotiation process, which was kicked off a little more than two years ago. And a group of Registries participated as a kind of working group with ICANN staff to negotiate under the terms of the contract.

There is a process by which the agreement can – you can exercise a request annually to reconsider the provisions in the Registry Agreement. And so just although the BRG now is an associate member of the Registry Stakeholder Group, when the process started, the BRG was not actually a member of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

However, although in theory the working group is formed by RySG members, they did invite us to participate and we did have very good representation sort

of on that working group so we were given a seat at the – more than one seat at the table, which was – which was really helpful. It meant we could be, you know, we could advocate for amendments that brands wanted during that process.

We've – the process – I think people who do have registries I'm sure will be aware that after this extremely long drawn out negotiation, the proposed revisions to the agreement were circulated a little earlier this year for public comments. Public comments then closed. There were a fair number of comments from some registries, from other parts of the community who weren't involved in the negotiation, from some governments and so on.

And the next stage in the process that the contract envisage is a sort of review by ICANN staff of the comments that have been received and a further discussion with the working group. And that's kind of underway at the moment.

But I think what I wanted to talk more about was just to kind of flag up for people and kind of bring to the front of their minds that in due course there will be a vote on the proposed amendments. And how it will work will be that ICANN staff will publish a kind of what's called an analysis report, which summarizes basically the changes and in particular addresses the comments and identifies if any changes to the proposed amendments are needed as a result of addressing those comments from the public.

And then there will be, as I understand the current process is envisaged, anyway, there'll be at least a kind of 14 day notice period and an FAQ that will tell people, you know, hey, we're going to open up the vote soon. And then there will be a notice direct to each registry by their legal notification contacts telling them that it's time to vote.

And who they'll be receiving a link from and you'll then receive a link for each of the registries that you have which is for you to vote yes or no on the suite

of amendments. It's not possible to vote for just some, you know, you either vote yes or you vote no. And the voting period will be open for 60 days so there should be plenty of time hopefully for the necessary votes to go through.

And in order for this amendment to be approved it needs the following – both of the following. So it needs the approval of 2/3 of registry operators by reference to fees paid to ICANN, which very roughly you could view that as being by reference to the size of their registry because fees, you know, as your registry gets bigger and the number of domain names you issue goes up you start paying higher fees to ICANN. So 2/3 by kind of size of registry.

And then also a majority of just all registry operators on a one TLD, one count. So it needs approval of both of those, which hopefully would be received during that 60 day period, and if that's the case then the amendments will go forward and will be attached to everyone's registry agreement.

So that's going to happen – I don't know precisely when, but, you know, relatively soon hopefully you'll be getting these notifications to let you know if you've got a brand registry that it's kind of time to vote.

And certainly the BRG's position would be that we would be encouraging people to approve. That's definitely our position. You know, there were things that we certainly were asking for in the negotiation that we did not get. But nevertheless we do believe that what has been achieved has been beneficial.

And two benefits in particular that I'll just quickly call out. One is we've agreed a slight amendment to the provision that deals with internal company assignment of your registry, which we felt was very beneficial. There's a clause at the moment about signing to group companies but it's quite narrowly drawn and quite often doesn't apply in circumstances where you

might imagine that it would apply when you're wanting to do some kind of internal restructure.

And that has been broadened out or will be broadened out if this is approved to make it easier to do an internal reorganization in your company and move your registry to a different group company without having to go through an approval process with ICANN staff. So that's one thing that is actually beneficial for all registries but certainly is, you know, it's very beneficial for the brand registry operators.

And then the other one is around some improvement to the process for the future about this negotiation process. And that's just that because of the way that the agreement was drafted in that it envisaged one size fits all, there was a – the voting process envisages – there's a theoretical possibility that registries who don't have Specification 13 in their registry agreement could actually, in some circumstances, if they got enough weighted voting, could actually amend Specification 13 even though it's not in their contract.

And so we've managed to agree with ICANN staff that a slight change to the voting process, which ensures that amendments of Specification 13 couldn't be pushed through by other registries unless there's also approval by the brands that have Spec 13 in their contract.

And whilst it's not, you know, what we managed to negotiate and agree is not perfect in relation to that clause, it is definitely an improvement and I think it's a very important improvement that warrants voting "yes" for.

So I think that's kind of all I was going to say but happy to take any questions.

Jim Prendergast: This is Jim Prendergast so maybe I am sitting – doing more than sitting at the table. A question on the effective date of your registry agreement and eligibility to vote, is it – is everybody who has an enforce registry agreement eligible to vote or is there a cutoff date or a date certain on that?

Susan Payne: Speaking without the contract in front of me, I'm pretty sure, nevertheless that it's anyone who is currently signed up to the registry agreement would be eligible to vote. Is that correct?

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: Hi, everybody. It's Krista Papac from staff. So that's the correct. The one thing I would just add is it's anybody who has this language in their contract. So there's a couple of legacy gTLDs that have adopted the new G-based form Jobs, Cat, Travel, Pro, so as long as the contract is effective and they have the language. Thanks.

Cecilia Smith: Susan, one quick question. I thought I heard you say that this would be sent out to the legal contact, is that correct? You should just sit at the table.

Krista Papac: Thanks. Thanks for the question, Cecilia. It's Krista again. Before I answer that, I am going to tell you guys she really beat us up over that Spec 13 language so you guys owe her a huge thank you because we really pushed back hard. Susan did an awesome job so – for you guys, not so much for us. But we love her.

So to answer the question, oh yes, I'm almost positive the note to the – in the contract there's language that says there will be an official notice, which is a legal notice, so that will go to the legal notice's contact. But will also be copied to the registry primary contact, so both will get it. And my subject matter expert on this is actually back in LA right now but the FAQs will address this information. And I believe this part – I could look it up for you in her notes but I believe we're looking for the registry primary to actually do the voting. Okay, but again it will all be covered in the FAQs that come out before the process is kicked off.

- Man: Excuse me, some folks on the line are having a hard time hearing all of the speakers so if we could be conscientious about speaking more directly into the microphone that would be helpful. Thanks.
- Martin Sutton: Thank you. Thanks, Susan. That's – I was going to echo the comments there from Krista. And as well as that the experience that's been gained from this whole process has been very valuable in terms of the brands being able to engage and, you know, start to work within the processes that exist within ICANN. So, you know, we've gone wholeheartedly into that process with the intention to work with it with the Registry Stakeholder Group and progress it so it's good to see that it's coming to – close to an end for this time. Thank you.
- Cecilia Smith: Are there any other questions for Susan? Okay. Susan, thank you again. We'll be throwing you a big surprise party or not surprise party. All right, let's move on. So next up is some fun stuff upcoming events. Martin, you want to take this one?
- Martin Sutton: Absolutely. Thank you. The event coming up in December, brands and dotDomains is the brainchild of Dietmar Fitz who run domain events in Europe so other organizations with the – in the ICANN arena will probably be familiar with Dietmar and his efforts in this respect. But he's noticed a demand coming up for brands that have either applied for registries or intend to apply the next round or window, sorry, Jeff, whatever it is.
- So we've been working with Dietmar to try and create an event that is focused on brands and that is focused on trying to attract different functions within a brand, so that digital marketing, DNS teams, legal, to come and join us in Valencia where it will still be relatively warm at this time of year, to have a time and a chance to share experiences, ask questions.
- And it's a pretty neutral event so I know that we've had valuable times and workshops created in the past via interested parties, I would say, so it's either

backend providers or consultants that have helped a bunch of brands get to this stage. So this is trying to introduce an area where it's fairly neutral for those service providers to be there. But the focus is really on the brands and future applicants.

So I just wanted to flag that and take that as an opportunity here to let you know. If you want any more details there is a Website to go to and to register. If you need anything else, any further information, come and please see me and I'll let you know more or take any questions now if you've got any.

I can move on. So Krista, thanks for joining us. And the reason we wanted to put this on the agenda, CZDS keeps cropping up quite often in terms of questions especially as brands suddenly switch on. So there's lots been delegated this year. And suddenly – well after they registered their NIC page and nothing else perhaps, they've got a lot of interest all of a sudden from Mickey Mouse and various other people wanting to access CZDS.

So they kind of go well what's this about and why? And so we wanted to open up just for the benefit of these new models that, again, not their core business so they're not close to everything here is to understand a bit of history, the origins of CZDS and give us a chance just to sort of absorb the elements of what it's there for, what its purpose and intent so that we can actually inform our members accordingly.

Krista Papac: Thanks, Martin. And hello, again, everybody. Krista Papac, not interfering in the agenda but actually here to provide this information. So after speaking with Martin about what you guys were interested in hearing about I kind of broke it out into a couple buckets, the purpose which is really the overall question. But I thought it might be interesting just to cover a little bit of history of how we kind of got to the current form of the centralized zone data access system, or centralized zone data system, I think we call it now.

And then before I go on I also just wanted to quickly introduce (Mert Saka) who is a member of the Registry team. (Mert) is based in Istanbul and is the – what we would call a service owner for the CZDS. And then we've got Francisco Arias here too from Technical Services in case you guys start having more technical questions because he's much smarter about that stuff than I am.

So that being said, so the purpose of CZDS or of providing the zone file access is really to provide a tool for registries and legitimate zone file access users to interact with each other and provide and obtain these zone files or copies of the zone files. It's typically used by these type of people, so researchers, just general researchers, security researchers, intellectual property types, law enforcement and security – not just security researchers but security folks as well. The – and again the purpose is for them to be able to provide this data for legitimate purposes or legal purposes.

From a historical perspective gTLDs have always had to provide or allow zone file access. The zone files have always been public information since ICANN was established. And in the past, pre-new gTLDs, and Jeff Neuman will remember this, it was a really manual process. And just to give an example, and just so you guys know I wasn't at ICANN for all of this history so I'm – I did some research and talked to people that were around.

But the – the way it used to work is those people who were interested in getting zone file access would go to the registry agreement page, download the zone file access agreement for that particular registry, which was fairly – not so difficult to do because there was as many as 18 at the time. They would, you know, sign up the agreement, send it to the registry. The registry would provide them credentials and then they would exchange the files.

So as the new gTLD program was being built out, people recognized the fact that this might not be scalable for the future and although we didn't know then that we would have, you know, somewhere around 1400 TLDs by 2016, we

didn't know if there'd a few more, hundreds more, thousands, tens of thousands. So the community did some work together to come up with something that was more scalable and that's basically where the CZDS came into play.

There was a community basically proposed this current system that we have or something – proposed the notion of the current system that we have and proposed it as a way to mitigate malicious conduct so it gets used, it's meant to be used for that as well. The centralization it's obviously there, what they came up with was centralization to, again, make it more scalable and easier for both registries to use as well as legitimate requesters.

The group of folks that were involved in developing this proposal was the anti-phishing working group, law enforcement agencies, security researcher, again, were a part of it, and then there was quite a bit of registry involvement.

And again the thinking was just to kind of put it in the context that you guys care about is by creating the centralized system you would not be dealing with thousands of manual requests. I get that the centralized system is not that easy. And that's obviously, you know, that's something we're working on. It's not much better but I think it would be better than if you were getting faxes and email – and snail mail requests for access to your zone file.

Anyway, all of that aside, just a couple points I wanted to maybe make is that the data in the zone files is accessible elsewhere. It's not accessible in this centralized fashion but it's not data that's not publicly available.

And that – everybody knows this but just kind of wanted to try and build some credibility around this or try and – not credibility but maybe I know there's – we talk to brands individually who express, you know, concern or are trying to understand this so I'm familiar with some of the concerns there. But just a reminder that Whois and DNS are public services and that's my update. I'm happy to take questions if there are any.

Martin Sutton: Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Hi. Krista, if you can, could you speak a little bit to the update to CZDS that are coming in terms of what and when? I think some of the folks in this room might not have heard that presentation. Thanks.

Krista Papac: Thanks, Kristina. It's Krista again. It's funny to say. Are you talking about where we had this discussion in the compliance session the other day, is that what you're talking about? Yes, sure. There was I think week before last now like everybody else at this meeting I've lost complete track of time. But we did send out a notice to all of the users of CZDS including registries, letting them know that we would, on November 20 – 20, we are going to be pushing some upgrades to the system. And so we sent out an outage notification and let people know what the changes are that we're going to be pushing.

The changes are we're adding filtering...

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: Okay, sorry, the filtering is already there but what we're adding is the ability to use that filtering to – sorry, let me back it up. We're adding the ability to download or export to Excel the data that you're viewing. There's pros and cons to that. Just one sec. Give me just one second, Kristina, I'm going to actually grab the email that we sent to you because my brain is not working like it was a couple days ago, just one second.

Okay, now I have the date the notice went out too, October 27. So, yes, so the download list, which I was just talking about, so people get excited about that because people do want the ability – it's kind of difficult to navigate the system and users want the ability to export the details so that they can manipulate it themselves instead of trying to navigate through the interface. So the good news is you will be able to do that.

The not as good news is it's limited to – the export will only allow you to export what's on the current page that you're viewing. However, we've expanded the view I think is currently 50...

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: It's currently 50...

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: It was 25. It's being increased to 50. So not ideal because I know lots of people have thousands – there are some that have thousands and thousands of requests. However, if you combine that download with filtering it should help you to narrow down hopefully the scope a little bit so you don't have to go through 20 pages of 250 and instead can maybe go through a handful of pages.

So that's the first change that you'll see after the 20th or probably that evening of the 20th depending on where in the world you reside. There's also enhancements to the zone file request function to make it more efficient. And there's going to be changes to – there's a couple bug fixes related to security enhancements as trying to help with making requests a little bit more secure when they're coming in and prevent you guys from getting so many Mickey Mouse requests.

So it's – they really aren't access changes but they're little changes that should hopefully make the experience a little bit easier for you guys. I'm trying – did I forget anything, Kristina, that we talked about the other day? Okay. Perfect, thank you. Sorry I was a little bumpy there.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady here. Can you build code that will automatically kick out a request for the reason is heart?

Krista Papac: I know, I'm joking. I mean, I know you're joking. We can do it for two hearts but not just a single heart. It has to be two or more hearts. One of the other enhancements that falls into the security bucket I was talking about is displaying the IP address of the requestor which has I think been something people have been looking for so.

Martin Sutton: I've just got – it's probably sort of more or less a comment I suppose in respect of this is that still trying to understand in terms of the intent, I know you've mentioned that it's sort of public information so there's Whois, it's relevant to Whois, which is already available there. The – and was the intent at that time more or less when it was distributing domains, selling domains, those were the registries in play? Whereas now what we've got is a very different market of brand registries where it's – their own second level domains.

So I'm probably missing the link as to the intent when there's already Whois. So that's available. So that's not going to cause an issue. Why do we need to entertain this added layer of process which is a burden of a few, but it's just to try and make sure we understand it's beyond the researchers, law enforcement, you know, what are they expecting to find from that CZDS file which they can't find via Whois?

Francisco Arias: Hi. This is Francisco Arias from (unintelligible) Technical Services at ICANN. So the main difference in zone file you have the data in bulk so what the CZDS is making is making it easier as opposed to having to query the domain name or discover it through other means. Does that make sense?

Krista Papac: Okay let me – thank you. Thanks, Francisco. It's Krista. So I'm going to say – I'm going to say it a little bit differently. So when you look at the Whois you're looking at it maybe domain name, you're going to look at it domain name by domain name and that's to my earlier point where I said the same data and – in the CZDS is available in Whois, it's just not available in the bulk format.

So if you wanted to – let's say you are a security researcher or you're law enforcement and you're looking for some trend in a TLD, you'd have to do through the entire Whois and pull that data and, you know, manipulate it whereas the zone file when you download that you get the whole bulk of the information that you need and then you can more easily manipulate it to find those trends and identify, you know, bad guys or whatever the cops call them.

Cecilia Smith: Thank you, Krista. Actually to that point on the flip side, I think that's one of the biggest concerns for brands. So for brands, we own that TLD and we plan to use it internally for marketing and for products. That's basically giving us – or giving away our black book of what we're planning to do, right, I mean, from the flip side if you're talking about phone books versus black books. Go ahead.

Krista Papac: I have to check with the expert to make sure I'm not messing it up. But so, yes, and this has come up also in one to one conversations with brands. And this is an age old problem for brands. I remember the olden days before new gTLDs when they were looking, you know, in the existing space – I use to work on the supporting brand registries or branded – big brands. Anyway, I know one of the practices was to go register a bunch of different product names to kind of throw people off or whatever.

Anyway, the way that you can resolve that is to just reserve the names and – or, you know, not – have them be available. And depending on the way you reserve it it wouldn't necessarily show up in the zone file. There's different ways to perform a name reservation, technical ways, and some of them would show up and some of them would not so you would just use the other way.

Cecilia Smith: I appreciate that. There's still just with businesses usually we don't have the DNS folks, the domain people who sit there and reserve it. Usually we go

ahead and register ahead of time so it's available for testing and different reasons. So it's a business process from what you're suggesting.

Martin Sutton: Okay, we've got a couple more minutes on this topic. I've got Susan, sorry. Please go ahead.

(Alan Jane): Hi, this is (Alan Jane). Sorry if I sound kindergarten because I'm new here. So yes Martin actually asked 80% of what I was actually looking to ask. So I just have one more part to ask along with the Brand Registry Group. When we sign a Specification 13, then it becomes imperative that the (unintelligible) or the registrant is going to be the company only. So basically there's no pointing in getting a (unintelligible) because there's going to be a single registrant all across one or within the company.

And as part of Spec 13 negotiation, did we really approach CZDS as (unintelligible). That if we can be exempted as brands because same concern are shared, that if we are signing Spec 13 we should be exempt from this because competition and I mean, other things as you mentioned.

Marc Trachtenberg: This is Marc Trachtenberg for the record. Just to clarify, I mean, I agree with you and Martin certainly, but just to clarify, factually, for Specification 13 it's not only the registry operator, it can also be the registry operator's trademark licensee so there could be third parties involved just for clarification. But I still agree with the comments made here.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Susan, Kristina, Paul.

Susan Payne: Oh okay. Sorry, Susan Payne. I was just going to make a quick comment which is obviously I recognize the sensitivities around this for brand owners and our clients. And I think it maybe something where sort of some kind of a gated solution might be something that we would want to pursue. But it is quite, you know, we should also kind of recognize and bear in mind that it's useful for brands themselves sometimes to be able to see what other people

are doing either because you might want to see what your competitors are doing and how they're using their brand TLD.

But also, you know, we've been talking during the course of this week, for example, about some of the brand trends, brand TLD trends analysis and the work that's been done by (Giam Pahut) for example. And he relies on the zone file data in order to be able to do that and to be able to do these assessments of which brands using and what kind of names maybe a – coming to the floor as particular terms that people are registering frequently and, you know, what's in use and what isn't.

So, you know, yes, there are sensitivities, I totally understand that. But actually like we in the BRG are using the zone file data as well.

Martin Sutton: So have we got Kristina and Paul, quickly?

Kristina Rosette: I'm going to pass.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Kristina. Paul.

Paul McGrady: I want to talk sideways to what Susan said, but there is sensitivity in this space, right? And one of the – and suspend, you know, doing a reserve name doesn't really help if you're doing a beta site and test sites and all this other stuff and the tech folks are used to, you know, calling it what it is and having three or four other sites that are beta before they go live. And so if there could be a domain name that was halfway between showing in the Whois and halfway between reserve that'd be terrific. I don't know if that's possible.

But in the overarching is is the whole point of Whois is captured in its name, which is Whois it, and everybody knows in the registry it's either the – either the registry operator or trademark licensee. So there's no public policy reason why any of this really needs to be available because to answer the question

Whois it, you just go to the registry site and see who it is, right? I mean, there's no question of who dotMcdonalds is, right?

So the whole philosophical underpinning of Whois just doesn't really apply here. And so we have to really say this is just a creature of contract without a public policy underpinning. Thanks.

Cecilia Smith: All right, we're going to have to close this session. But Krista, that was fantastic. I really...

((Crosstalk))

Cecilia Smith: One minute. Less than one minute.

(Jonathan McCowski): Thanks. (Jonathan McCowski) for the record. I'm speaking personally. Came in late. I might have missed a few comments. And I apologize for that. But I heard someone say that the – what you get from the zone files is the same as you'd get just in bulk from the Whois and that's mistaken because you cannot get the domains from the Whois unless you have them to query.

So the zone file is a critical way for compliance and cyber security specialists as well as brand protection companies to be able to know what's going on. And the last point is that when it comes to dotBrands, there could be breaches of the contract which is a matter of public interest. So other non-brand holders need to know what's being registered in order to know if there's compliance with that contract. Thank you.

Cecilia Smith: Thank you for that. Krista, and team, thank you so much. This was obviously really helpful to all of us and we'll talk through about future webinars for the brands as well.

(Jonathan McCowski): That as the shortest lived argument of my life. That lasted about 45 seconds, so thank you.

Cecilia Smith: Okay so moving on next on the agenda we have, let's see, Don Hollander here to speak to us about universal acceptance. Just like all different – all the other registry operators, the brands also are affected by email and browsers and stuff. So Don, if you could give us sort of background on what your area does we can kind of feed into see how the brands perhaps can help there. Thank you.

Don Hollander: So thank you very much. Don Hollander here. Just produced a couple of slides just to make sure that everybody – we're all on the same page and then I have a request for you when we're done. So next slide please.

So this is my plan just to introduce you to universal acceptance and the Universal Acceptance Steering Group to show some of the work that's being done and ask you to get your IT people to make sure that your IT systems are indeed UA ready.

So next slide please. So UA in a nutshell is that all domains names and all email addresses work. That's pretty simple and straightforward. And the reality today is that they don't. So if you have a very long email address, you might have a dotPhotography or dotBlackFriday or something – and you try to use it to register for a service or to sign up for a bank or to sign up voting or to sign up for whatever, where it's used as a personal identifier, you may very well get that rejected because it's not really a real email address.

And then if you – if you want to get even more complicated then you start talking about IDNs and that makes it even harder. And I'll just give you an example. I have a bookshop in New Zealand. In New Zealand one of our official languages is Māori. Māori uses the English alphabet plus macrons so I have a domain name called (nipukapuka.nz). I cannot use that to engage with the New Zealand government. I can't use it to pay my taxes. I can't use it

to register for services even though it's in the official language. So and that's at the second level, same issues of the next level.

So is there another slide there?

Martin Sutton: Will be any second now. Thank you. We do have connectivity issues here I'm afraid so I'll put it back up shortly so if you can carry on talking then we'll just fill it in.

Don Hollander: I have the slides here.

Martin Sutton: Thank you.

Don Hollander: So key points that I want to share, UA is a software issue and that's why I would like you to go to your IT teams to say are our systems able to accept all email addresses and all domain names?

UASG is the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. It's a community initiative that is supported by ICANN so it's not an ICANN initiative. It was formed by – from the community many people outside of ICANN but ICANN is providing financial support, logistic support, moral support and a number of the people within the ICANN organization are helping us do some stuff, so we're very appreciative of that.

We are an encouraging agent. So we're not going to actually go into Amazon.com and change your system so that I can use my (nipukapuka.nz) email address to buy books from Amazon.com. You're going to do that for me and hopefully you'll do that very soon. Does that make sense?

So we're – when we talked to CIOs and system architects, a year ago, and we explained what the universal acceptance issue was, they said, I got it. Where do I go for more information? And the answer was, nowhere. So that's what we've been doing for the past little while. And our domain name is

UASG.tech. And you can go there so that's very short but it's a new TLD. And you can go there and see the documentation.

So we are an agent encouraging change. We're facilitating it, giving documentation, but we need you to go and make your own systems UA-ready. Next slide please. Thank you.

So there are five verbs to UA readiness. This is aimed at your CIO, system architects. But we want your applications to be able to accept, validate, store, process, and display domain names and email addresses properly.

And the big issue, the biggest issue is in validate and display though the other issues do need to be taken in. So a lot of applications do their validations, they'll accept – ask for your email address and you put it in and it does a validation to make sure that it's the top level name is only two or three characters because that's what all domains are, aren't they? So this is – those rules were really set about 15 years ago and some of that validation code is still there.

And the other big issue is displaying and this is particularly around IDNs that IDNs should be displayed in their native script. Next slide please.

So our target audience are the doers, the people who direct them to do so doers, the developers, system architects, the director so that's CIOs and senior IT managers. And the influencers, so these are people in the C-Suites, thought leaders, government ministers and officials.

Our target audience is not Joe Public. We're looking to just let the people who can address the issue know about the issue and how to go about addressing it. Next slide please.

So why bother? It's all about supporting – all about culture empowerment, societal empowerment and making money. So we're in the process of

preparing a white paper and one of the goals of the white paper is to look at the economic, social and cultural benefits of being an early adopter for UA. And this is – will probably be around the portion at the bottom of the pyramid sort of stuff in terms of the economic advantage of being UA ready. So Amazon.com is losing my shop's business because it doesn't allow me to use my email address.

We think businesses have a responsibility to keep up with standards. And we believe that better UA, so people are UA-ready, it will lead to a better user experience so users won't get a that's not an – that's an invalid email address or are you really sure that's an email address that you want to use or whatever. Next slide please.

So these are the things that we have done or are about to do. If you go to UASG.tech/documentation or documents or something along those lines you'll see that we've got about 13 sets of documentation. We have it in a bunch – much of it in a bunch of language – different languages. So we have a quick guide to universal acceptance. You would – people are passing by the GDD booth might have seen a big bright orange brochure, that gives you a good idea. I have some here if people would like.

We have a 40-page detailed documentation that's in for uber-geeks. We have language that you can include in your tendering and contracting documents that on – on asking your suppliers to be UA-ready. And we've also included IPv6 and DNS SEC just because they're all sort of broccoli issues.

We have FAQs, we have a knowledge base. We have the quick guide. We have a model on how to engage in local initiatives. So I was in Seattle a couple of weeks ago, there are a lot of people in Seattle interested in universal acceptance. And there are a lot of people in Seattle who can address the issue because there's a big software environment. Hyderabad would be similar.

Coming up we're working on EAI. Anybody know what EAI means? Email, address – see, this is a quiz. You'll do better tonight at the pub quiz. Email, address, internationalization so these are – these two bits to it. First is the domain name is in IDNs, but the second bit is your mailbox might be in Unicode. So even if you have an ASCII domain name, even a dotCom domain name, you may very well want to have a mailbox name that has Unicode characters.

So Fadi Chehadé, who had accents in his name, could not use his name as his mailbox name because ICANN's email system did not support EAI, was not EAI ready. So EAI is a bit part of what we're doing and we're – have plans over the next couple of months to produce a quick guide similar to what we've done for universal acceptance, with detailed technical document and some good practice guides.

So the exciting news on – for people how know what EAI means, so that's like nobody here, but the exciting news is I now have an Arabic@arabic.arabic email address and it works. So that is very cool. And apart from a test bed that the Saudis ran a few years ago, this, as best I can tell, is the first time it's happened. So that's courtesy of some folks in India who are supporting EIA in multiple languages.

And they are looking to be the Gmail of IDNs. So they're offering a free service. And if you want a domain name in Hindi, the NIXI are providing I think they said that they'd offer 100,000 names to get people started so free for the first year. So EAI is happening. And it's very exciting. And particularly for people outside of the native English-speakers.

We're developing some course notes that can be used by a university and the white paper that I talked about before. Next slide please. And I'm almost done, promise.

So this is the current and pending stuff. We've got a Website that got launched earlier this year. We're developing a call logging resource so somewhere on the Website, a little bit hidden but not terribly hidden, is a place where you can go and record – log your instances of bad UA experiences and that will be followed up. So ICANN Global Support team have agreed to offer that service and we'll announce that.

Our plan is that that is – we're going to start small. We're going to promote it within the universal acceptance community first. We'll look to gather about 100 entries. We'll look at the nature of the entries and then we'll review and revise the form and the process and then we'll spiral out the awareness.

IDNA, anybody? No, this does not look like an IDNA audience, but this is a technical issue where IDNA 2003/2008 is not able to keep up with the changes in the Unicode character set so we – and this is a – sort of a big deal. And we're working to get that addressed and we think a couple of guys have come up with a pretty reasonable solution to that.

The white paper I talked about. Industry – Internet industry blueprint, so the folks at ECO and i2Coalition are building a blueprint for CIOs in the Internet industry to get their own systems UA-ready so it's not the brands, generally, though you could use it internally if you wanted, but this is to make sure registries, registrars, hosting companies and ISPs can look at their own systems and see where they need to get themselves UA-ready.

IGF – we'll participate in the IGF. And linkification is another area that we're looking – we have some guidelines and we're going to do some evaluation of linkification. And linkification is where you go into a messaging or social media application or word processing application and you know where you put Amazon.com in and it – right now and it'll say oh that's – I'm going to create that link so they can – you just press it and go to Amazon.com so if you have Amazon.(shabacom) it's not going to think that's a real domain

name. So we're just going to evaluate that and then encourage the people who run those software to come up to the modern times.

Next slide please. Sorry, I'm going very fast. And that's – so the rest of the slides you can keep and share but that's not really what I'm here to talk about.

The last thing I would like to talk about is getting your systems, your own internal systems UA-ready and how can I help you reach out to your IT teams to raise awareness to make sure that, A, your own systems are able to accept – deal with your own brand names, but also able to support other people's names. Thanks.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Don. That's been really helpful in terms of the content and just the overwhelming amount of work that's gone on in – already within universal acceptance but all of the tolls now and information that's now been made available. Certainly for the Brand Registry Group members I'll be happy to circulate the deck of slides and encourage them, obviously, to look at their own IT and systems to accommodate any changes for UA.

Cecilia.

Cecilia Smith: Don, I'm not going to answer your questions before I ask you a question. For us to – meaning our corporation – if we need to reach out to just say another provider such as somebody who runs a browser or email, do we – how do we channel that through your group? Do you reach out to companies to let them know that there may be an issue with the new gTLD space?

Don Hollander: So give me – let me see if – I'll give an example, you tell me if I'm right. So I have a dotFerrero – so my email, I guess is taster@chocolate.ferrero, something like that. And I don't know why there are no samples, but maybe I'm late. And he's trying to use that email address to order from Amazon.com, he wants a book on chocolate cookery.

And he tries to do it and Amazon.com says, no, that's not a real email address. Actually Amazon – that – it will work, it just doesn't like my email address. So what does he do? So we are setting up, as I said, a call logging resource where he can log that in and we will follow it up on his behalf.

But also in our documents there is UASG 002, which is a short pleasant two-paragraph statement that he can copy and paste into the reach-out to contact the webmaster at whatever thing. And that's available in 16 or 17 or 18 different languages. And if people would like it in more languages that's not a worry. So does that answer your question? We would like you to reach out directly but we have a logging facility that will help us get some sense as to how big the problem is.

When we talk to registries and registrars, everybody says, oh yes, this is a big problem. And when I ask, and how many complaints do you get? The answer is, one a month maybe. So I answered your question.

Cecilia Smith: Yes, I already have someone in your team – in your group within Fox. Okay so Jeff and then Marc.

Jeff Neuman: Hi, this is Jeff Neuman. Hi, Don. I guess my question is more on a follow from Cecilia. I think it's one thing if us as individuals contact these companies. I'll use the Wall Street Journal as an example because I have a email address that's longer than whatever limit they set on their TLD. And I tried to change my email address to that new one and didn't work.

So, yes, I can – and I did actually send the two paragraphs off to that contact and of course no response. I think one of the benefits of having a UASG but also ICANN involved is that ICANN, as an established organization that's at least recognized by some major players, and at least has some clout associated with its name, you know, someone at ICANN, some high

executive at ICANN or someone with a nice little title, could also reach out to these organizations.

And, you know, that's what they should be spending time. I mean, it's amazing to me, ICANN's a technical – they're a coordinating body, and they would have a lot more, in theory, clout reaching out to some of these companies than, you know, an individual who responds and says, hey, you're Wall Street Journal, you can't accept my email address. They don't care, they don't respond. I used the two paragraphs. It was good. But silence.

Don Hollander: Yes, so to be fair to the ICANN executive team, they are aware of it, they are supportive and they – one of the things that we'll do after this meeting is give them a briefing pack that they can use. So currently the GSC Team, which reach out to people all over the world, they have UA slides in their deck. And the executive team and the Board are aware of it. We have some very strong champions on the Board. And they're happy to go out and evangelize as well.

So the logging facility will give us that extra next step. But it is hard because if you're the – if you're the somebody at New York Times and you get one guy who says I can't do this, he's going to say, yes, use a different name. Go to gmail.com or. So this is a demand issue. My goal is to provide resources for the developers to be able to fix the systems. But right now they're seeing nobody complaining. Apart from yours.

Cecilia Smith: I have one last question from Marc and then we're really going to have to close because we have another group coming in.

Marc Trachtenberg: Marc Trachtenberg for the record. I'm very supportive of your efforts and I think universal acceptance is a huge issue. But going back to your example with the email address of, you know, taster@chocolate.ferrero, assuming that the user of that email address is not Luca who understands this, that's someone other, you know, normal person, not that you're not normal, you know, how would that person know to come to your Website to find that

paragraph considering most people don't know what new gTLDs are much less domain names; have no idea of what universal acceptance is? Is it realistic to expect that anybody is going to utilize that resource.

Don Hollander: Yes, so the short answer is we don't expect mere mortals to be involved in this in the near term. We're focusing on the registries and registrars in the near term. Let us get some measure of the nature of the complaints that we're hearing from the people who are in the know, and then we'll look to expand it. But as I said at the very beginning, our goal – our communication focus is not mom and pop; it's the guys who can actually make this fixed.

Cecilia Smith: Don, thank you so much for coming to speak with us. And to answer your question on how you can help us, we are going to take the documents that you've given us and pass that amongst our group. And as you know, we already have some folks or members who are participating in your group as well so I think that's the best way to start.

So with that I'm going to go ahead and close the meeting. Thank you all so much. And we can close the recording. Thank you.

END