

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO – CPH / NCSG Membership Meeting
Wednesday 24 October 2018 at 830 CEST**

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

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Hi everyone. Let's start the meeting. Is Maryam here, Maryam? Okay great thank you. Hi everybody. Thank you very much for giving us this early morning to meet with you. Just my name is Farzaneh Badii and this is a meeting of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group but Contracted Party House.

I specifically asked for this meeting because I thought that we might want to discuss our goals, our common goals and what overlaps for this year because we have always been a little bit reactive in the - in our common goals and reacting to things instead of being proactive and also it is we might be actually more effective making changes where we agree on if we have a plan.

Now I am not going to be the chair of NCSG by the end of this week. Stephanie Perrin will replace me and so you will be working with Stephanie. Maryam, can we go to the agenda? Yes thank you. So first I wanted to know what the Contracted Party House priorities are for this year. So I mean not - I'm not asking for a question. Now I want to know what are your priorities that

you think that we might actually care about so and it might be like something that we have in common and I want to pursue it like goals that we might want to pursue together. Go ahead.

James Bladel: Thank you Farzaneh. And think - is that actually on or have my ears stopped working? Last night was later than I remember. Thank you for having us. So, you know, the priority for us is still going to be going forward getting our EPDP done. That is a very big deal for us. The uncertainty that it introduces into our industry is when and if that fails is a super big problem for us. So, you know, if that is most of the focus. And, you know, in a wonderful world where we get that done is going to be a lot of implementation of the work that comes out of that because there is for us going to be a lot of technical work that needs to like we need to build a whole bunch of RDAP stuff and it's going to need to be really quick and so we've got a lot of focus their think.

You know, behind all of that there's still like it feels like ICANN hasn't done like a regular sort of - there hasn't been a regular sort of PDP in the community for some time and there's a lot of issues that are getting increasingly problematic things like transfers are, you know, the thing that affects all of our businesses on a day to day and we haven't touched how they work in far too long. But I suspect still within this space we're going to be still GDPR, the PDP and privacy for the next year. Thoughts from the (unintelligible). Hey Donna is this your first meeting as chair?

Donna Austin: Yes I believe it is. Thanks Graham, Donna Austin. So I think from Registry Stakeholder Group perspective, you know, very much in line with what Graham has said. But I also, you know, like to highlight that I think the strategic plan is something that we need to look at given its going to be a five-year project and I think ICANN is looking at wrapping that up sometime between March and May next year. So that's personally that's something I want to look at and make sure stakeholder group understands, you know, where we can add that where we have concerns. So that's probably the only

immediate thing that I can think of right now. I don't know Sam do you have others?

Jeff Neuman: Hi. I'm Jeff Neuman. I'm not on the ExCom but active speaker always. I would say that for registries and registrars making sure the new gTLD process moves forward is also high on our agenda. I know it's not as always product to the forefront as GDPR is now and there are always lots of events that become the issue of the day. And but we are - there is a GNSO policy dating back to 2008 which says that there will be a predictable process for the introduction of new gTLDs.

So there is a bunch of us focusing on making sure that process moves and while it hasn't been in the front would strongly encourage the NCSG to make sure that it's paying attention to what's going on there because it is moving forward and it is on a track. And as a community we need to make sure that the issue of the day doesn't derail everything else that's going on within ICANN. So that's really important to us to - lots of things like this will come up. GDPR is this year and there could easily be something else next year but we want to make sure their way ICANN was formed to do and the regular business does keeps going. Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much, Farzaneh Badii speaking. So I - as to NCSG priorities we have not had a discussion with the group as a whole but we had a discussion yesterday and we looked at board priorities for the FY '19 actually. And they have the domain abuse project as one of their, domain abuse reporting as one of their projects. And that project has always worried us because we are worried that it might lead to ICANN taking action against registries, registrars and also like might lead into content regulation as well. So this is what I think that I have put it forward for NCSG to think about to think about how they want to monitor the progress of this project so that it does not lead into adverse effect. So I wanted to know if you - that's one of your concerns, if you're concerned about if you are just like being paranoid or...

Donna Austin: Thanks Farzi, Donna Austin. So I think in the context of the audit that is happening for registries I think it's taking place soon after this meeting. In that context we had some conversations with GDD staff yesterday or compliance staff around that yesterday so I think it is an issue for us and a concern but, you know, it's something we have to kind of I don't know, take back to the stakeholder group and understand what our issues are and maybe get a little bit more what's the word I'm looking for ,focused on it and understand where our issues are and what's the path forward for us in dealing with it or raising concerns.

Jonathan Robinson: Well then I'm not sure how and others - I'm not sure - it's Jonathan Robinson for the record. I'm not sure how much has been made clear to you guys how aware in the NCSG you are about this audit? I mean I don't - it's probably inaccurate to say it's unprecedented but it's a very significant scope. ICANN is proposing to audit the entire registry with a very specific focus but it has to link to that whole thinking.

So it's worth you being aware at least as Donna says we're formulating our thinking on that and how we deal with it and we have yet to see the questions in that audit. So it's been presented as a targeted and limited scope audit but nonetheless it's very wide in scope. It's not simply picking out a select bunch of registries to look at for compliance. Is taking the whole range and looking into a specific area and asking yourself specific questions which have yet to be disclosed.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman again. And I just - this is a- as I said this hasn't really been discussed too much within the stakeholder group so what I'm saying is more kind of a personal thought. We have an issue and we need to figure out how to deal with it as a community. We - there is domain name abuse going on right, that is a fact. And we need - we're trying to balance the need to have a self-regulation in order to make sure that we as a community can lower or can mitigate some of the abuse that we all know is going on in the industry

because if we don't do it ourselves we're going to have people forcing it upon us right? And so I think as a community and as a group we haven't done an effective job or as effective a job at self-regulation as I think we can probably because, you know, it's hard as a group to while a lot of us are and most of the ones at the table right, or all the ones at the table sorry are doing what we can to mitigate abuse.

But we do recognize there are players in the industry that probably aren't living up to the standards that they should. So we all recognize that there are some bad actors. So we need to figure out and balance how we can regulate ourselves to not have others kind of jumping in and trying to regulate us. And DAAR does scare us because it basically publishes the statistics that make the entire industry or the entire group look worse than it actually is because of a few bad players. And when they publish these statistics it doesn't do - it doesn't give the industry a good name and a lot of the players here that are really doing, going out of their way to make sure that abuse is mitigated it doesn't make us look good. So it's just - it's something we all kind of struggle with and but we can't really - we need to figure out - this is a question for the NCSG is how do we figure out ways to make sure that we are doing a good job by regulating ourselves as a community rather than having governments or ICANN or others jump in and try to over regulate us and paint too broad a brush?

Man: I think Maxim had his hand up first so I'll go after him. Go ahead Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, yes one of the new counselors for the GNSO from Registry Constituency Group. In about the thing about DAAR is that these two we as registries and registrars we cannot use it. It's kind of black box to which some sources dump and unfortunately it doesn't have any evidence attached. For example in some yes systems like fish tank when you see that there is abuse at least is a screenshot saying the yes they are trying to pull something there, that are trying to steal your (gray card) identify. It's a screenshot of the process.

And with DAAR there is no way you can act upon the information coming out of it because for example registries and registrars by registrars it's a chain of contracts with the registrant who effectively uses the system. It doesn't all around the world and blind trust to what is done through DAAR will lead to breach of the contract with the registrant. And effectively you shouldn't blindly trust the sub parties to breach contract with the persons because they have rights, they paid for the service and effectively and in some jurisdictions you have to deliver the service when it's paid for. It's your obligation under the law. So it's not very (transparenting) because the situation promote in blind trust with third parties effectively monetizing their services while this system it's something murky I'd say. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Maxim and thanks Jeff. Got a lot of thoughts here and not enough caffeine to kind of put them in any order that makes sense. But let me just say that I agree with you that there is - I think there is a trend where everyone kind of says my yard, my house is in order, everyone else is the problem. And I think that collectively that looks like an industry that is maybe has its head in the sand a little bit to what is going on. I think too - I agree with Maxim that DAAR is and tools like it and those third-party services that are just one dimension of the problem reporting. But maybe we should look at it differently and just look at it is maybe a report of a problem and then look a little deeper at the problem.

I think that - well first of all let me - I do reject your premise that more self-regulation will be the - will inoculate us against regulation. I think the regulation is coming. I think it's just - that's just the nature of the beast. The Internet is out there and governments think they understand and want to do stuff with it. So that's just that's we're going to have to deal with that regardless.

But I do think we can do a better job of being a little bit more visible and okay we know how to keep our house in order now. What are we going to do in

terms of putting together a neighborhood watch and going around the neighborhood and making sure that, you know, there isn't, you know, a bad actor somewhere in our neighborhood? One of the things we could do is use sources like DAAR to help contracting parties who may be either don't understand or don't have the capabilities, the anti-abuse systems that are at all of our contracts that we can help them kind of develop those capabilities to the level that you see more the more mature players have.

And if they don't want to, if it's a question where they don't understand versus they're just unwilling to do so then I think we need to call them all publicly. And you're the lawyer you tell me if there are any anticompetitive issues here but I think having an industry say this particular player has a problem, we've made them aware of it, we've reached out we've tried to help them as an industry and so we're now saying that, you know, we disavow their practices and their approach this problem. It even just visibly saying that I think will put the rest of the industry on the right side of some perspectives.

But I would say this would be a really great topic perhaps for I know we're just now starting to hammer out the GDD summit and sometimes we're kind of hurting for topics and I think this would be a good one because we need registries that are sorry, contracted parties, you know, kind of to go off into a room and start brainstorming about what we can do about this because I agree with you there's a couple of negligent players out there that are bringing the whole industry down.

Farzaneh Badii: Farzaneh speaking yes James we are here to figure out how we can work together. So maybe that includes us too. Okay so Jeff you wanted to respond and then...

Jeff Neuman: Yes real quick. And I know...

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: So real quick response and yes James I probably am guilty of doing what I just said this problem which is I looked around the table and didn't want to insult anyone and just said we're all good right, we're all good players. We may not all be good players. My question is we're here from contracted party so I really want to hear from the NCSG. We certainly see the papers you all file and what, you know, your - a lot of groups come out against and we certainly know that we certainly see that takedowns and other stuff are not looked upon very favorably.

So once all the contracted players kind of have a, you know, I see us wanting to speak but I'm looking at you guys directly. What is it that you all would accept because we know what you're against and I'm asking this very directly. You're very clear on what you're against. What I find difficult as a contracted party is to see what you're for. What types of measures to mitigate abuse would you actually support? Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Think you, Farzi speaking. Technical, within ICANN we believe that purely it should be technical. It should not be the content but when you want to domain name abuse should be defined as like a technical matter and it should not be content. Well I know that but there are some - we are not saying that the contract not - we are not saying that the registrar registrars could not have their own practices but outside of ICANN but to take down content or abide by the law or but what you are saying is that as ICANN it should be for I think that we should be technical and should not go to content takedown. Does he want to say something?

Man: No.

Woman: I just wanted to go to your initial comment which was your concern that it's kind of a slippery slope to content regulation and that sort of thing. And then we went deep into the whole of talking about what registries and registrars do and can do. But I think what maybe it would be helpful for our coordination that with NCSG group would be to take what it - what we do and what we've

all just kind of talked to you about an work to share how that is kind of enough and how that is appropriate, you know, with regards to being technically focused and maybe that can help mitigate the knee-jerk reaction for folks to sometimes request or move straight to that content regulation takedown request sort of thing. So I think that's maybe how we can bridge the gap between what we do as businesses and technical folks and that the more content Internet (governancy) sort of focus that you guys have that concern. So I think it's maybe somehow we can bridge that gap.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. So I think we're moving to agreement but to what James said, you know, neighborhood watches are normally looking at the outside of the neighborhood whether they're break-ins, whether there's graffiti, whether you don't like pink flamingos on the lawn. You're normally not auditing for the art in my living room. And so again where is the line?

So to Jonathan Robinson the idea that there's an undefined unbounded audit going on when you find a what the definitions are we'd love to know because there does seem to be this kind of movement of ICANN some people in ICANN org from farming and phishing into trademark and copyright. And sometimes it's all of a sudden the same voice.

So, you know, to what (Beth) said separating, you know, trying to draw some clear lines trying to work together for clear lines between the technical and the content I think is going to be really important. It's not always that easy. There are windows we look in to people's houses but how far you go into those houses into what they're doing inside their private homes and their private domain names that's really what we're talking about here. And there's lines and we're happy to help you draw those. They're hard but we're happy to help you draw them and we really think they do need to be drawn.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jeff Neuman and Kathy that's helpful. And I think when - so oftentimes when we see the papers come out it's very definitive on the things that you're not in favor - or the registry is not in favor of. What would be great

is to see, you know, what - like what you just said so support for registries and registrars that internally take actions that they believe are taking care of their, you didn't say walls got - whatever the term I saw -- I missed the term that you used -- but basically the neighborhood. So there are lots of times.

And when you come out with these positions put yourself -- because I've been there and I am there -- when you do see content or you do see things that are on your domains that you see clearly - I'm not talking about the gray cases. I'm talking about cases where child pornography or if the sale of illegal pharmaceuticals and other things you do see that. And it's easy from the outside to say don't get into content regulation. And I completely agree that, you know, once you start getting into ordinary copyright infringement, all that stuff that we can't be the judge and jury.

But when any reasonable person can look at something, know that that is harmful to not only a third party, but to your own reputation to your own business then you do need to take action. So one thing I'd like to see from the NCSG in addition to, you know, we shouldn't see people regulate you and we shouldn't see, you know, you get too far into content regulation it would be great to see what you all would support as opposed to just what you're not in favor of which I think does align a lot with us as well so thanks.

Woman: Can I respond to Jeff?

Maxim Alzoba: It's one of the questions about - around this audit a double audit of TLDs. Do we know if it's going to like cause a spike in spendings, because usually if you have average audit of 20 companies and 1000 companies it costs a bit more maybe ten-fold, maybe more but...

Jeff Neuman: So I just - this is Jeff. I've had some conversations with ICANN and they did come into the registry stakeholder group. Let's hold off on fears about this audit until after we see the questions. What they've told us is it's more kind of a request for information right there is a very broad provision in the contract

that talks about registries and registrars keeping certain types of reports and taking certain types of actions. If it is as - if it's as they've kind of talk to us in the last couple of days it may not be as concerning. It may truly be a request for information to see what registries and registrars do. If after we get the questions it seems to be more concern then we'll - you'll certainly hear about that from us but let's I don't want to speculate too much on how bad this - what they're calling about it is because I have a feeling that there - it may not I'm hoping it may not be as bad as it could be. So yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. Well if you want to share with this I'm not sure how public - this is Kathy Kleiman, how public that the audit results will be. So if you are concerned when you get them, you know, feel free to share. That would be great.

The other thing is I think we have different definitions of neighborhood watch. Your neighborhood watch is a very content oriented one. Mine is very much for the potholes in the street and, you know, making sure there, you know, the streetlights are working and the stop signs are up in the crosswalks are clear. So it's much more of a technical and infrastructure one so I think that's where our clear agreement is. And that's what we do here at ICANN is the technical is Farzi said.

And we help put DAAR into a box, not a very clear box as we pointed out but, you know, trying to keep it under balance and keep it, you know, there was movement to push DAAR much farther out. And we helped I think together we help kind of push it into a box. And it's a, you know, four clearer corners that were more technical. So I think that was something we all did together so congratulations to us for that. But that's I think where our common ground is on the technical.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you Kathy. Farzaneh speaking. So I think the distinction here is where we are talking about where ICANN is trying to do DAAR or is trying to implement a project that might lead to tell you how to regulate content or

might lead to content and regulation because you are asked by ICANN to do it. That is what we want to stop. And we are for having like good practices for technical - fighting with technical GNSO abuse and all that but when the content regulation should not happen at ICANN.

Now outside of ICANN would you like to invite us to DNA when you discuss the best practices of how to protect intellectual property rights, how to enforce - for example in my opinion and this is my personal opinion this is not really not related to ICANN but if you I believe that registries should be a neutral, not of course for like child pornography. That's like an extreme case and it's very obvious case.

But when it comes to intellectual property, trademark, copyright the boundaries are a little bit blurry. And we are not I'm not comfortable with registries deciding what is copyright infringement or even referring the - other than referring the parties to a platform even if it's neutral. And I worked on private justice and align private justice systems for a long time. And I think there is hope because they can - where there's no court, there's no rule of law and we are like in a vacuum of lawlessness, we actually can use them. I'm not against that. But I think as much as registries and registrars can do this just stay neutral. So anyhow...

Jeff Neuman: So this is Jeff Neuman. I think you need to put yourself in the place of the registry or registrar that actually sees the bad stuff happening. It's so - I'll clam down a second, very easy from the outside to say it should be neutral and, you know, you shouldn't do anything, it should all be technical. It's very easy. But when you yourself are reviewing something as a registry or registrar that you know, you know is causing harm or is very likely to cause harm to a third person then that puts you in a very different position.

So while I fully understand and we totally agree that where there is an issue and there's, you know, were not the judge and jury. But when I was let's say responsible at NeuStar a little while ago for .biz and I saw that o- n and was

directed to a site that was - and calling for the incitement of violence, immediate violence including a car bombing attack that you know what stuff, I'm taking it down period, I don't care because at the end of the day taking that content taking that site down if that's going to save a person's life or it's going to stop a bomb or it's going to stop some harmful activity who cares -- all out the window.

So you can say easily from the outside the registries and registrars should do this stuff and I completely agree that they're - we shouldn't be judge and jury and that there's not as many cases and that's just an extreme one. But be very careful with coming out with these very broad positions that the registries and registrars should be absolutely neutral for their own business and their own content because I think when you put yourself in that position you need to have the flexibility to make the decision that's right for you, your business, your organization and the community. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. I don't think they're talking about something that's ICANN related. We can totally have this discussion outside of ICANN but at ICANN, ICANN should not tell you...

Jeff Neuman: I agree.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, so agree on that great. But about that discussion of course is Internet governance project I came up and talked to you about this and but that is like your - if you have best practices and all that you can implement them. You can (unintelligible). That is now I cannot stop that. I might fight it but not at ICANN. And at ICANN we have the common ground that ICANN should only look at the DNS abuse, and the DNS abuse definition should be technical I hope right? So it does not...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Farzaneh Badii: ...lead to content. Jeff?

James Bladel: Yes I just I'm trying to maybe be mindful of - I mean lots of hands went up on that last intervention Jeff so well done. Let's see if we can kind of put a button on this one here okay? Everyone agrees this is not the role for ICANN. I think what we're saying is as an industry we may be able to develop some more self-policing which is where I think we started from. And Kathy I completely disagree with the neighborhood watch idea. It's also about - it's maybe a blend of neighborhood watch and neighborhood homeowners association or something like that.

But I think let's draw a couple of lines. Registries have a role. It is much more technical and much more of a nuanced technical utility provider. Registrars have a role. It's a little closer to the end user, a little closer to the nature of the market, the nature of the use of the domain name. Most registrars are also either Web hosts or affiliated with Web hosts. They have an even closer role to content. None of these I think, ICANN stops at step one, registries probably stop at step two, registrars stop at step three and then hosts are the ones that probably take it all the way to the end user.

So everybody has to wear different hats. We have terms of service that say there is a distinction between things that are clearly illegal like child abuse materials. Let's not draw that line because that's just an easy red herring. There are network abuse issues like spam and DDOS and things of that nature that need to be addressed. And then we get into economic disputes like intellectual property. That's not our role. That's between two private parties. But there's this other issue okay, this other issue of abusive type materials. And that I think is where we can develop best practices. We can help each other out but I don't think we want ICANN wading into those waters. So...

Farzaneh Badii: Great.

James Bladel: I think that everybody is saying the same...

Farzaneh Badii: Yes exactly yes.

James Bladel: Okay.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes let's move on...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: (Unintelligible) we're not monolithic, we're not ICANN, we're not an industry. We're looking at all the different roles.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes okay. Farzaneh speaking. Thank you. So we can - shall move - I wanted to talk about the board priority of reopening the global public interest issue but I don't know what - I don't know if you're aware that the board wants to start a consultation again in the public global public interest. And I think that again is something that concerns us. I don't know what the position of the contracted party is on that but this is something that we need to follow closely. If you don't have...

Sam Demetriou: I don't - this is Sam. I don't know that we collectively come up with a position but I'm sure something that we're going to want to take a look at. We as Donna mentioned earlier, just all the board's new strategic priorities have that plays into strategic planning and all that kind of stuff is something that we're going to be diving into. We just haven't gotten there yet.

James Bladel: Sorry and I agree with all that. Can you just explain to help us understand why it's a concern, just a little bit more background so that we can understand it?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes because it's not clear what it is. And if they want to define it and then based on that definition come up with a, they call it like a community comes up with a definition of the public interest and a consensus based. So we're

going to go back to Fadi's time where we were having the discussion after discussion about what is public interest. And we are going to spend a lot of time. And I say and it, I think and we might come up with a definition. I don't think there will be consensus on that at all. So I don't know why the board is reopening it but...

Jeff Neuman: So well if there is no other hands - could it help us in a way - and the reason I'm kind of thinking of now my role as one of the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures that the GAC believes that it's involved in all decisions that involve the public interest. And because we haven't been able to really come up with a definition it's pretty much been interpreted as everything. So I - while I share the reluctance and I completely agree that we're never going to get to an agreed-upon decision if we turned it around a little bit to kind of help us to maybe think of how that kind of could help us in our work to figure out when we do see for example on the next, you know, one of the next bullets there is on government's encroachment into generic name domain name space, policymaking could we take the optimistic benevolent side think that they're doing this may be to just kind of put - try to put people in sort of boxes so that if we do have a new if and when we do have a new gTLD roll out but if there are comments or advice related to things that we don't think necessarily it fits in that definition could it help us, you question?

(Beth): (Beth) speaking. So I think that you don't really want - this we're talking about speculation here because we don't know what the board has proposed other than they said the words public interest in consultation so I don't know if we want to go down the road of speculation. However just to Jeff's point into the next bullet I think the GAC encouragement into generic names policymaking is more a product of letting the GAC run amok at -on what their scope is which is to be policy advisers, not on the public interest but on public policy. So I think it's more of a maybe focusing on what that is. And just to you point I don't know if that's something we want to take up but I don't - I just think that it's something we should flag for future note and see if there's - once it comes out if there's places where we can coordinate.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks (Beth). I think that does help and I do agree. I think we need to define the difference between global or public policy and public interest. I will note for the just everyone as someone that's reviewing the comments that were submitted to the subsequent procedures the board submitted a comment to the SubPro Working Group that asked us Subsequent Procedures Working Group to define the global public interest which was really strange to read because they want to know how that fits in with the whole new gTLD program. So that was a question that the board had asked the SubPro Working Group so that's it thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you Jeff, Farzaneh speaking. So yes this is very important and we should closely monitor it and see what and see later on NCSG and CPH perhaps they can discuss this document that the board is going to come up with. Kathy do you have a comment? Okay so that takes us to - well I also wanted to talk about - we can't talk about the government encroachment to generate names policymaking. And this is what worries me and I can see that in SubPro they are very actively want to work on a policy that gives them all the geo name even if when they respond to generic names and are like other examples like the intergovernmental organizations that just come up for example the Red Cross that happened for the (unintelligible) of the names. And also there are other aspects that I see that as worrying. I wanted to know if this is something that concerns CPH and if so do you want to work on it and what should we do about it?

James Bladel: So just and I'm not a participant in SubPro. Jeff has the expertise on this. I think the geo names issue is concerning, the geo names issue is concerning, the legal bases for not only blocking these from the registration but also, you know, even disputing the ones that are already registered particularly when they are clearly generic names. I think that's very, very thin.

And I also think that we're starting to take a machete to the dictionary in all language and start to carve out what's mine, what's yours and there's really

very little left for, you know, for development, for innovation, for naming and I'm concerned about that trend. And I think it's limiting to our customers who maybe, you know, want to incorporate those identifiers into their business name or name their business after something like that. And I think we should challenge it. I don't know if Jeff probably can't speak on this because he's a co-chair of that working group.

And I'm not involved so I don't know how far this has gone but I just I feel like we should be at a hard stop that this is, you know, this is - there's no such thing as cultural property of a word or a mountain or river or an ocean or a forest. It just it belongs to everyone and no one. So...

Michele Neylon: Good morning. I agree with most of what James said. Michele for records and all that. I mean the - one of the issues I find with some of the conversations from the GAC side on this particular subject is their complete either it's - I don't know whether it's lack of knowledge, ignorance, stupidity or something else because they make statements about what happens in the ccTLDs that are actually not true while some ccTLDs have restrictions around certain strings a lot of them don't.

I've personally registered a ton of country names in some in ccTLDs because and of course when you look at the gTLDs like .com you have UK.com, GB.com, DE.com. There's a company (unintelligible) in the room who made a pretty good business from selling subdomains off that. And now, you know, years later trying to kind of enforce all these weird restrictions on this is just bizarre. And it is also something I think where I don't know I think it's also - even within the GAC it's not consistent.

I mean some countries have taken a very kind of look why do we care? Others are super excited about it and is just quite frustrating so I agree with them. Sorry but him being James.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay thank you Michele, Farzi speaking. Yes that's exactly the problem because on the issue if they don't have consensus sometimes but the board before the new bylaws can and to effect, the board actually took action on somebody that they did not have consensus. And that's like a two letter second level domain name and new gTLDs that corresponds to ccTLDs and they were pronouns like it .sucks and .love. It belongs to India that one. Yes Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. I can't really comment, you know, as the co-chair on the substance of what you're all saying, kind of in that neutral role. But what I will try to get is hopefully that we can all that as a community work together to find some happy media or some sort of solution going forward, that recognizes concerns expressed by governments and figures out ways to deal with those concerns rather than just kind of pushing them all aside.

So right now one of the issues that we're trying to grapple with is that we have it's kind of like two sides of the pendulum right? We have dot, the view that some of you are mentioning of, you know, all geographic terms need to be protected no matter what they are. And by protected we mean reserved and nobody can get it unless you have consent by the government. And that includes cities, towns, mountains, rivers, statues -- you name it.

And then we have the other side which says right, that everything it's all a matter of - it's all - it's words, its letters, its strings and you can't regulate any of that and there should be no kind of regulation. So we need to get somewhere to some solution, maybe it's dependent on intended use of a string. And if the intended use of a string is geographic in nature related to something that maybe a government has jurisdiction over, that there's some sort of dispute process or some sort of consent if it's specifically intended to be used for that. But if it's being intended to be used in the most generic sense then maybe it's only an after the fact dispute.

I'm not trying to say what the solution should be but we need to kind of sit down and think of potential solutions because if we just like a lot of what happens in Worktrack 5 you have one side arguing this, another side arguing that on opposite sides of the extremes and then we're kind of just left with everybody in the corners. Try to figure out ways to accept the concerns of the other side. And I'm saying this to the GAC too, to accept the concerns of the other side and try to figure out how we can deal with those rather than just keep putting ourselves in the corner in the one position. Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you Jeff, Farzaneh speaking the like...

James Bladel: And I don't mean to sound rude but can we hear from some other folks on the NCSG...

Farzaneh Badii: I wanted to actually - that was my point. You're not rude, I talk too much. Anyone (unintelligible) opinions I will just say what you think?

Woman: (Unintelligible) speaking...

Man: Microphone.

(Elsa Sadi): Hi (Elsa). We did talk about it yesterday in our meeting as NCSG. So basically Farzi speaking for all of us because we already had discussed this yesterday all together if that's fair enough to say. So try not to get bored with Farzi's voice. She is basically representing all of us at this moment.

Michele Neylon: A bit of variety would be nice.

James Bladel: Thank you. I just - I was not bored with Farzi and I enjoy her voice. It's music. But I was hoping to just kind of - it felt like it was her against the entire Contracted Party House that I didn't want her to feel like she was the target of all of our debate so...

Farzaneh Badii: I want you to be a target too if that's the case, no problem.

(Beth): Actually there's not that many people here and I don't think we all know everyone's faces and names and we have a bunch of new people in ExCom so maybe we want to do a little round the table?

Farzaneh Badii: So (Beth) I think...

(Beth): I mean we know Farzi.

Farzaneh Badii: We also need to know like your ExCom and who is on your ExCom. And you should know who is on our ExCom. So I think that would be good. So I think yes and a round of introductions. My name is Farzaneh Badii from Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

Jeff Neuman: I'm Jeff Neuman. I'm with Cum Laude Valdez for members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group but we also represent - we do consulting services for the registry - for registries so we're a participant in the Registry Stakeholder Group. I'm not on the ExCom but I'm co-chair of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan Robinson with Afiliis and on the registries ExCom and in role of treasurer.

David Cake: David Cake, NCUC and NPOC ExCom and (unintelligible) Australia.

Martin Silva: Hello. This is Martin Silva from Argentina. I'm a lawyer. I have my law firm and I run a NGO and I am a GNSO Councilor for the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

(Bruna): Hello. My name is (Bruna). I am with (Coding Rights) and I'm also NCC Chair and NCSG member.

- (Elsa Sadi): Hi all. (Elsa Sadi). I'm from Lebanon. I'm incoming GNSO Councilor representing NCSG ex NCUC ExCom.
- Amr Elsadr: I'm Amr Elsadr. I'm a member of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. I'm in any executive team or anything. I worked in hospital information system design.
- (Amenis Frey): Good morning. (Amenis Frey). I'm from Tunisia and I'm from the NCSG Africa representative in the executive committee.
- Keith Drazek: Good morning, Keith Drazek, one of the Registry Stakeholder Group GNSO Councilors.
- Joan Kerr: ((Foreign Language Spoken 0:50:23)), good morning, Joan Kerr, NPOC Chair.
- (Zoe Vanata): I'm (Zoe Vanata) and I'm the Registrar Secretariat.
- (Christian Herman): My name is (Christian Herman). I'm from Latin Data, small registrar in Denmark and I'm the RST secretary.
- Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. I'm the co-founder of the Noncommercial Users Constituency and of course a member of NCSG and co-chair of the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group.
- Pam Little: Pam Little. I'm with Alibaba Registrar and a Registrar GNSO Councilor.
- Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba .Moscow and a GNSO Registry Councilor.
- Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Blacknight Ireland, GNSO Councilor for the registrars.
- James Bladel: James Bladel, Registrar not currently on any committees.

Man: Yes you are, EPDP.

James Bladel: Oh EPDP sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Rafik Dammak, I'm a NCSG GNSO Councilor.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell, Endurance International and GNSO Councilor for the registrars.

Sarah Bacci: Sarah Bacci with Go Daddy. And I'm also the Vice Chair of Policy Coordination with the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Graham Buntin: Graham Buntin from Tucows in Canada Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Sam Demetriou: Sam Demetriou with VeriSign. I'm the Vice Chair for Policy for the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Beth Bacon: Beth Bacon. I'm with PIR and I'm the Vice Chair for admin for the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Farzaneh Badii: Great. So okay going back to our topic so I think we've covered almost everything. I wanted to talk about our - it's not me. Of course NCSG wants to talk to you about (unintelligible) for implementation. I wanted - my question is that I'm pleased NCSG members if you have any opinion tell me. I will tell - I will relay them to the CPH. I'm joking.

I wanted to talk about the RDAP implementation. I want to know whether it is really feasible to implement RDAP now before we come up with a policy because I know that the temporary spec is asking you - is asking you to implement RDAP. But is it really feasible to implement RDAP before a policy

is in place that is GDPR compliant, just a feasible question. I'm not questioning implementation of RDAP.

Graham Buntin: Thank you Farzi. I mean I think the short answer is yes but you're just building it out however you choose to do so. So like Tucows has a tiered access thing that's based on RDAP. So it's already out there and live. But it's not like the implementation and sent to the SLAs and all of that. That's just us freewheeling. I'm sure Jeff has some opinions about this. He's looking at me like I'm a crazy person.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff. Yes RDAP itself is just a protocol that enables different types of policies to be implemented whether it's the policies chosen right now by Tucows or policies chosen by others or eventually policies determine with the EPDP. It's just kind of the infrastructure. I'm trying to think of a good analogy. It's just basically, like, an empty train and the train can move through the tracks and what you fill it with is - no I shouldn't say relevant. What you fill it with is not really necessarily - it doesn't necessarily impact the technology. Obviously to the extent that the policy could become cumbersome yes, but at this point just implementing RDAP is really just kind of putting the tracks down, having an empty train but that's it. Maybe that's a bad analogy. It's the first one that came to me.

James Bladel: Yes Jeff I agree with your analogy and I don't think it's a bad one. I think that the bottom line however is that they are separate and it is appropriate to pursue both in parallel. They don't - they will intersect at some point but it is good to have this. I think there is something that we've raised is registrars that I think the NCSG should be concerned about is a RDAP function because RDAP has a lot more functions.

There is a feature or function of reversed search in RDAP. And we have felt I think fairly consistently that that was never a part of the I want to say Whois, RDS whatever we had prior to May of last year. And so we should let the technology drive the data. And so because we've built this feature now you

must collect data in a certain way or populate the data set with a certain thing. So we've opposed the idea that RDAP, the RDAP profile should include a reverse search. And I think we would - would love to discuss with you why we have concerns about that and encourage you to do the same.

Farzaneh Badii: Farzaneh speaking. Yes actually we commented on that and the search function on the RDAP public comment. We actually commented on that but then when you look at the registry agreement in 2012 I think you do have clauses there that okay (unintelligible). You do have clauses there that actually I cannot quite remember it - doesn't it require all the registries do that or for the search function?

Michele Neylon: Farzaneh, it's Michele. I mean not - I don't want to go down a rabbit hole of this language is in there but essentially there was a push from certain quarters to include that language that's in there. Some of us never wanted that language to be there because we thought it was highly inappropriate but unfortunately there be some language in there.

And just to what both James and Jeff were saying RDAP is like it's just a technology. The policy is, the policy that the sides which widgets and gizmos you turn on and enable. So that's the bit that's important. So for an initial implementation of RDAP essentially a mirror of, it's just a Whois just I'll start with a slightly different background. So I mean this - but there are features and potential things that one could put into RDAP that some of us are very, very uncomfortable with.

Farzaneh Badii: I just to respond to Michele, yes to - RDAP is a technology but when the policy is not ready and you can have features and you don't want to turn those features on I think that I am skeptical about implementing it when policy is not ready. But I should not be the only one talking here, you know, rescue me (unintelligible) members but...

Michele Neylon: So when she says she should be the only one talking she didn't say Jeff should be talking.

Farzaneh Badii: No, but Maxim has his hand up. Maxim has his hand up but yes, Maxim first and then is that Stephanie?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually it's one thing more, registries and in particular registers spent many years educating like police, and judges on how to read Whois. And we yes be - yes nations be lack of policeman kept the machine code reading because RDAP is not human range it seems. So it's going to be interesting direction in the future.

(Stephanie Duchenne): Yes and just to go back quickly to the question that's in the registry agreement, this is (Stephanie Duchenne). I'm with Google. That language is pretty high level. It requires registries to implement the protocol but doesn't go into specifics about what features that has to entail or what the response profile has to look like. Registries and registrars have been pretty vigilant here about working with ICANN to make sure that's clawed back to a point where we're only mirroring what the existing policy requirements that exist for the production of registration data as part of the RDAP profile and that this isn't becoming a proxy exercise for creating new requirements.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I want to create another analogy that maybe turns this around a little bit. I wouldn't spend time protesting or arguing against the implementation of RDAP in general but maybe more focus on what (Stephanie) and others have been saying about the features that could be implemented. It's almost like to turn it around to 15 years ago when people were protesting the file sharing technology because of what it could be used for right? That was - and many of you all and some of us were on the exact opposite side right. We wanted the file sharing technology because it enabled a lot of potentially good things.

RDAP is a more efficient protocol for implementing RDDS and - or this particular system. So let's make sure that it's not RDAP itself that you're going up against but it's the features and it's the policies but not the technology. Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you Jeff, Farzaneh Badii speaking. Okay well I think if there are no other comments I - we can discuss to - I'm the only one talking here. And did you have a comment or you don't? Okay. I have the tendency of not seeing people putting their hand up. So if we don't have any - I'm the only one talking here and a bunch of other people from (unintelligible) but I think that we have covered quite a lot.

What the purpose of this meeting as I said was for us to be more proactive on issues. So what I hope Stephanie will do after the - after she takes over is we can write down the issues that we discussed today and then we can see if like three month or in six months there are like developments about this and just monitor it and see how we can work together. And I think we are good with GNSO and the council on GDPR issues. If anyone is any comment on that then you can but if not we can - we have ten minutes to (clear) this conversation. We can just go and take a break.

Sam Demetriou: This is Sam for the record. Farzaneh thanks for putting the meeting together. Thanks for driving the agenda. You know, we've been meeting at the last couple ICANN meetings and I think it's a great opportunity to exchange ideas and get a line on, you know, the things we're working on where we can be helpful to each other so, you know, definitely looking forward to continuing the dialogue.

I think it's also been successful in the context of the EPDP having, you know, members get to know each other, reach out to each other. And I would also just invite you guys as things come up in-between ICANN meetings if you ever of questions about where we're at on something please feel free to reach out to the ExCom. We'll you know, we can get the temperature of the

stakeholder group and see how we can work together on a more dynamic basis in between meetings.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay perfect, thank you very much. Okay Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: So on since we have a minute just as - sorry Jeff Neuman as just talking as a subsequent procedures working group co-chair. I did read your comments and so thank you for submitting those. One thing that SubPro has asked for was to see if you would appoint liaison so that we the group could come to them and just ask them many questions about the comments. I'm not sure, hopefully you all did that.

But at the end of the day the comments were really good comprehensive. But one of the things I would like you all to think about is for areas that you said that you were against certain implementations and certain things one thing we're going to come back and ask is okay so how do we - there are - you may not like the way that we chose to implement something that addresses certain concerns. The question is how do we address those concerns if not in the way that was proposed? So thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Rafik you have a comment on that?

Rafik Dammak: Okay just to respond to Jeff about who is the liaison from NCSG should be, (Robin). So I saw that it was done already but...

Farzaneh Badii: Okay great. Thank you very much for attending this meeting. And goodbye.

Woman: I think you can stop the recording please.

END