

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting
Tuesday, 14 March 2017 at 9:30 CET**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Man: It is Tuesday, March 14, 2017 in Hall C1 for the GNSO for the GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting, 9:30 to 13:45.

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: Good morning, everybody. Are we ready to go at the back? We are ready to go, let's get this party started, please and thank you. All right, good morning, everybody. My name is Graeme. I'm the Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group; I'm from a company called Tucows. Thank you all for coming today. It's good to see so many friendly faces. Some of them look a little tired and weary. Don't worry, there's still a couple more days of this meeting to go.

We have a lot to cover today, it's a pretty busy agenda, and we don't have a lot of time to do it, which is also another thing that we'll talk about later on today. A couple general reminders for this whole session, which is say your name before speaking for the transcript, try and speak into the microphone so

that the translators can hear you and everyone can hear you, and then speak slowly, which I'm not doing and I apologize, because we are having this meeting translated into Chinese, and it gives the translators a break.

So with that I think let's do a quick round of introductions so that everyone knows who each other is. Yes, right, Graeme, Tucows, Chair. Let's go left.

Ben Anderson: Ben Anderson, Net Names, CSC, Treasurer.

Theo Geurts: Theo Geurts, Secretary, Realtime Register.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Blacknight, GNSO councilor.

James Bladel: James Bladel, Go Daddy and GNSO councilor for North America.

Bob Wygant: Bob Wygant, Web.com.

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

Pina Erdogan: Pina Erdogan, 1API.

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

Neil McPherson: Neil McPherson, 1&1.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller, 1&1.

Sofia Feng: Sofia Feng, ZDNS.

Christian Muller: Christian Muller, Cronon. S

Zoe Bonython: Zoe Bonython, Registrar Secretariat.

Greg DiBiase: Greg DiBiase, Amazon Registrar.

Man: (Unintelligible), registrar.

Eric Rokobauer: Eric Rokobauer Endurance International.

(Lima Due): (Lima Due), (SDC) (unintelligible).

Sarah Wyld: Sarah Wyld, Deluxe.com.

Wendy Scott: Wendy Scott, Wordpress.com.

Kellie Peterson: Kellie Peterson, Wordpress.com.

Sara Bockey: Sara Bockey, Go Daddy.

Vlad Dinculescu: Vlad Dinculescu, DNS Africa.

Pam Little: Pam Little, Alibaba.

Tom Barrett: Tom Barrett, EnCirca.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chris Pelling: Chris Pelling, NetEarth.

Frédéric Guillemaut: Frédéric Guillemaut, SafeBrands.

Janelle McAlister: Janelle McAlister from Mark Monitor.

Rieke Poppe: Rieke Poppe from One.com.

Tom Summer: Tom Summer (unintelligible) euro.

Kristian Ørmen: Kristian Ørmen, Larson Data.

Peter Larsen: Peter Larsen, Larson Data.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

Graeme Bunton: We do have a microphone in the sort of back of the room if anybody sitting in the back wants to introduce themselves and you're a registrar. Jeff Eckhaus, you don't want to? All right, thanks, everybody.

Process notes and things to do today, we've got a break at 10:30, we'll have a working lunch at 12:40. One of the things that I'd promised our – one of our members apparently at some point, and I'm now regretting this a little bit, was that we would try and keep the acronyms to a minimum today so I'm going to try and not use those. If I had a buzzer I would do that. But let's all try and be conscious that especially for people who where English is not your primary language, your first language, acronyms cause pain and misery, so we're going to try and be nice and long-winded I guess by not using them so much.

All right, I think that's – let's get started with some of the GNSO update from ICANN staff, Marika, if you would please?

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Graeme, and thank you for inviting me over. I'm actually little bit confused what you want me to talk about because I was under the impression that I was giving a GNSO update, but I see that you actually under agenda have as a Council – issues for the Council, so the slide that's up are some of the issues that the GNSO is considering and discussing during this meeting. But then there are also of course, a number of specific items that are on the Council agenda for Wednesday. So what would you prefer me to talk about?

Graeme Bunton: My impression was that, sorry this is Graeme for the transcript, was that we are going to get a Generic Names Supporting Organization update.

Marika Konings: And I'm happy to talk about both so maybe I will first talk about the first one and then if there's time left, but I know there are several Council members around the table as well so I'm sure they can speak about that as well.

So on the screen you basically see some of the topics that are under discussion during this meeting, and they've basically been divided up into three different buckets. So first and foremost, the activities in relation to policy development processes that are underway. I think probably with most of them you are probably quite familiar so there are for PDPs that are currently in the working group phase.

First one on generic top-level domains, subsequent procedures; the second one on the review of all rights protection mechanisms in all generic top-level domains; next-generation registration directory services to replace Whois; and then the international or the IGO INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms.

All - the first three of these groups are still in their deliberation phases basically leading up to an initial report at some point in time. They all actually had lengthy face-to-face meetings this Saturday, and I think several of them are having a follow-up meeting tomorrow. So if you are interested in those topics please attend those sessions.

I also want to point out, as we have relatively limited time during the session, and I'm happy to take any questions, I do want to direct you to the GNSO policy briefings that were distributed in advance of this meeting where we provide a bit more detail on all of these initiatives, where they currently stand, which questions are they expected to address, what are some of the opportunities to provide input.

So I would encourage you to review that and of course if you have any questions following that review do always feel free to reach out to me or any of my colleagues supporting these efforts.

And then in relation to the curative rights working group, they actually have an initial report out for public comment. They are having a session I believe tomorrow morning if I'm not mistaken, where they will be presenting their recommendations. So if you are interested to hear what they are recommending or if you want to provide some input, you know, please attend that session or provide your input as part of the public comment forum.

So then in addition to the working group activities, there are also a number of implementation review teams that will be meeting throughout this week. And I'm actually assuming that my GDD colleagues will be briefing you were updating you on the status of those later today. But again if you have any questions about that also happy to talk about that.

There are also a number of non-policy issues that are under consideration. As you may recall, the Board adopted a little while ago in number of recommendations in relation to the GNSO review. Based on that, there was a working group that developed an implementation plan. The Board approved the implementation plan and now the working group is moving ahead with implementing those recommendations.

As it relates to the number of recommendations that will affect daily operations and the working of the GNSO, you are strongly encouraged to participate in that effort. I believe there are a number of Registrar reps that are in that group, but it's important to keep an eye on that as it directly affects how things work.

Bylaws updates that basically relates to the work that was undertaken to make sure that the GNSO has the processes and procedures in place to be

able to work in the new environment, the post-transition environment of the empowered community.

So a drafting team was formed to look at, you know, what changes if any would need to be made to the Operating Procedures or the ICANN Bylaws to make sure that the GNSO has the ability to make use or take advantage of some of the new powers that exist.

So that drafting team came up with a number of recommendations which were approved by the GNSO Council and then directed staff or at least directed staff to develop language reflecting those recommendations.

The staff went through the exercise and it's actually a pretty lengthy document, I think over 60 pages if I'm not mistaken, where we've gone through all the bylaws provisions and the related recommendations from the Bylaws Drafting Team and how we believe these can or should be translated into potential changes or in many cases as well, no changes are deemed necessary apart from any clarifying how decisions are taken.

So we've now passed that back to the drafting team because there were a number of questions that we did identify and going through it, and as well a number of assumptions that staff made in that exercise. So we hope to get some confirmation and feedback from the Bylaws Drafting Team on those open items. And any subsequent step once that has been - have happened, those proposed changes will go out for public comment. And I believe I think Darcy is on that, is there anyone else from the Registrars in that group or is it just you?

So I think each stakeholder group and constituency have a representative in that group and they will be meeting tomorrow. It's an open meeting so if anyone is interested you can also join that effort.

Slightly linked to that, and that goes slightly already into the agenda for the GNSO Council are the discussions in relation to the creation of a Standing Selection Committee. I think as you may have heard, there are a number of requests in relation to nominations or endorsements or selections from the GNSO for review teams but also some of the post-transition structures that have been created.

So in order to have a more streamlined process for that, the Council is currently discussing the creation of such a Standing Selection Committee, which would basically be tasked to provide recommendations to the GNSO Council on who should be nominated or selected, and then the GNSO Council is expected to review those recommendations and act on those.

There is a draft charter for this effort. One of the main remaining items, and I'm assuming looking at James, but that probably is one of the things that you probably still will discuss as well at some point today, is in relation to the question of who should be members of this Standing Selection Committee? Are members selected per stakeholder group? Is it done for constituency? So I think that's one of the main outstanding items.

And there is also I believe one question in relation to rotation of selections per stakeholder group so that there is, as nominations are made that there is a rotation or at least a guarantee that it's not always the same group that has their representatives selected, so that's also another item that's under discussion.

There are also a number of cross community working groups that are meeting and continuing their discussions. The new Generic Top Level Domain Auction Proceeds is having a meeting tomorrow. They recently started their deliberations. That group is tasked to develop mechanisms for how auction proceeds should be distributed or allocated. It's not talking about who or how to actually - who to give the funds to or projects should be funded, that they separate or subsequent conversation. This is really focused

on looking at the mechanism that should be developed or put in place to be able to allocate those funds.

And then there is also the Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as Top Level Domains, they actually published I think an interim paper in advance of this meeting that's open for public comment where I think they've outlined a couple of options for taking this work further. I believe they haven't really come to agreement on some of the questions so I think they are now looking for guidance as to what should happen next.

I think that's in a snapshot what's happening in the GNSO throughout this week. And happy to take any questions.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme for the transcript. Thank you, Marika. That is a lot going on. I saw a hand from James and then I'll put myself in the queue after that.

James Bladel: Thanks, Graeme. Thanks, Marika. James speaking. I just wanted to highlight a couple, just one or two issues that I think would be particularly interesting to registrars. The first is the PDP, the next generation RDS, which is a PDP that's looking at top to bottom rethinking of Whois. We had a really great session yesterday with data protection officials and experts from across Europe.

And one of the things they kept emphasizing with us is that Whois needs to have a purpose and that purpose needs to be defined. So for those of you - do we have folks in the room who are participating on that PDP? I think Michele is one of the cochairs. Yes, so a few folks. I would encourage Registrars to please follow this at a minimum and get involved if you can and particularly in the subgroup that's defining the purpose of registration data and the uses for registration data because I think, you know, it's not necessarily specific to European registrars, if any registrar with a customer in Europe or hopes to have a customer in Europe someday.

The next item that I just wanted to point out, as Marika said, the Standing Selection Committee, right now very discussion of whether that should be allocated per stakeholder group, which would mean Registrars would get one number on that committee or if it's per constituency, in which case we would probably get more than one like two or three.

I know we have a challenge sometimes finding volunteers for this but this will be a very important group because it's going to determine how the GNSO review teams and panels and empowered community and all these new things that we have to fill, it's going to determine what our slate of delegates look like to all those important functions. So I would just encourage folks to follow that.

And then the other thing would be, you know, I think the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds could probably use a little bit more help. So if anyone is interested in that topic and wants to get involved, it's not too late I think to join that effort. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, James, for that input. I've got a question for Marika that's maybe a little bit nuts and boltsy but maybe to respond to James, I have some concern that the RDS is a black hole where policy people go to disappear for forever. And so for those who are participating may be, so not just you, James, how can we make that experience a little better? Is that actually true? Do we think this PDP is going to finish in the next three years? Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Graeme. Michele for the record. I'd love to say something really optimistic but I'm not drunk so I won't. I think yesterday's session with the data protection and privacy people should be taken as providing us with a lot of very serious guidance.

The reality is if this isn't addressed in a timely fashion, we are all going to end up being fined huge amounts of money which means none of us are going to

put anything into Whois and ICANN is not going to be able to enforce anything on us because we will be in breach of local law, and by the way it impacts all of you. If you have any registrants in Europe you are all impacted. This is not a hypothetical, you are all impacted.

So the problem we are having in the RDS PDP is that there are some people who want to have free and open access to everything and there are a lot of people who don't. And the two sides just don't seem to be able to get along, which is terribly sad.

And at the moment we are working our way through a very long detailed work plan. We have made some progress but even the progress that we've made is being questioned by many people. So in some respects, yes, I can see it as being a bottomless pit that could go on forever. And there is other Whois related activities that are still going on such as the review, there is the RDAP thing, there is the thick to thin, sorry, thin to – oh God, you know what I mean, the thick and thin Whois thing going on.

I don't know, I think keeping -- there are enough Registrars involved in it now, I don't think we need more Registrars. What I think you need to be doing is interacting with those of us who are involved. We are not going to bore you to tears with detailed updates because if you'd just probably want to kill us all. We will have some kind of document ready, Marika, what did we agree on? We said we'd try for something after Johannesburg I think? And we are going to have problems as well because that group is going to need a new chair at some point in the next few months.

Marika Konings: Yes, and if I can, so this is Marika. I just may want to add so when Michele was referring to would be an initial report on Phase 1. So this is a three phased PDP which after each phase has a kind of decision point built into it so that the GNSO Council can decide, you know, has sufficient progress been made to move to the next phase. And the first phase is really focused on developing and agreeing on the requirements for an RDS and then

basically determining do those requirements, can they be met by the existing system or does the new system need to be developed?

So that's really the question and the answer that's expected to be provided at the end of Phase 1 and then Phase 2 provided that the answer is yes we agree on the requirements and, no, the current Whois model cannot be adapted to accommodate those requirements, what are then the policies that need to be developed for any new RDS followed by implementation phase.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Marika.

Man: (Unintelligible) after that inspirational recruiting speech from Michele, I'm almost afraid to ask this but what would be involved in getting involved in this process? As you mentioned, clearly it does have a significant impact on our business. We have about half of our registrants in Europe, although I suppose I could change that if I had to send our registrants are us. But it's not going to be pretty, as you outlined. So what kind of a time commitment would be involved? What kind of frequency of meetings, etcetera, would be entailed in paying attention to this?

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. The RDS PDP at the moment, we have one 90 minute per week -- 90 minute meeting per week. For three of those meetings per month are held at 1700 UTC and then the fourth one is like oh 500 or go 600 UTC. Depending on where we are with things, there have been a number of side groups and subgroups working on specific items, who've met or, you know, done stuff via email in between.

Just in terms of disclosure, the four chairs and the ICANN staff also have a one-hour meeting every week in advance of the actual weekly meeting. The volume of email on that list, I'm not sure, I think -- it ebbs and flows. A quiet week it could be three or four emails mostly from Marika and other ICANN staffers. On a crazy week you can have 600 emails mostly involving things

that you may not care about what if you'd actually delve into it there sometimes are bits and pieces in there.

I mean in terms of time commitment, 90 minutes for the meetings, I don't know how fast you read email so I can't really answer that part of it. But if you want to sign up just email me or Theo or anybody and we will hook you up.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Michele. We've got about four minutes left with Marika. This is probably going to be a longer question but I think there's a number of members -- sorry, this is Graeme for the transcript -- that are probably curious about this, which is in the Privacy and Proxy Implementation Review Team, we are expecting something back from the Board, I believe, as well as something from Public Safety.

I don't understand what the mechanism is going to be to integrate that advice or whatever it is we get from Public Safety, and I'm curious if ICANN staff has any insight on to how that's going to work.

Marika Konings: Well as I said, I think my colleague Amy is probably better qualified to talk about what's happening there but I can just maybe talk at a general level. There are of course a number of processes and guidelines in place in relation to how implementation review teams are expected to operate and work.

And also if there are issues that come up in the implementation phase that are deemed policy, how those can be channeled back to the GNSO Council. So if there is a concern or an indication that whatever is being provided either by the Board or by the PSWG, that goes beyond implementation or beyond or in conflict or contradiction with the original policy recommendations, there are mechanisms in place for that to be channeled back and be dealt with.

And I see Amy is standing up so she may have more specifics on the question that you provided.

Amy Bivens: And I think Marika actually covered most of it. From the Public Safety Working Group we've requested a proposal that we are going to be working on within the IRT, so that's really all it is is a proposal and we will be working on it with the IRT.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thank you Amy. James.

James Bladel: Yes, so I think for Amy, Marika and anyone participating on the IRT, the thing to be aware of is that that proposal coming back starts to have something in there that we can't support that's reopening policy discussions and then is accompanied by a GAC -- a mention in the GAC communiqué that says, you know, we advise you to do this and it's at odds with the, you know, and then we are right back into the Red Cross IGO quicksand. So just if you can keep us all informed on what's coming out of that and share it with the list as soon as you have it that would be great.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, James. This is Graeme. There is a good number of us involved in that implementation review team and it will certainly be a topic on our monthly policy calls. I should also add in there, there's been people using the acronym GPDR, I think, GDPR, General Data Protection Regulation, which is European legislation I believe, and it sounds like we are going to need to bring back up on one of our policy calls too because I think not enough people have been thinking about that and we probably should.

Do you have anything else for us, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, just as I said before, you know, please review the materials we've provided in advance of the meeting. If any questions always feel free to reach out to us. I think we realize that, you know, participation can require quite some time, obviously there are also other ways in which you can provide input or stay up to date.

I do want to note that although there was I think James mentioned or Michele, there is quite a significant participation in the RDS PDP, my colleague Mary just pointed out that there actually are relatively few registrars participating in the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP so if there is any interest there it would be good to get a few more reps from this community to participate in that effort.

And I think that's all I had.

Graeme Bunton: Great, thank you for joining us. Moving back to our agenda, we are going to get -- we are going to meet with GDD staff now, so I think we are going to see Jen Gore join us up at the table. While we are waiting on Jen to come in and set up, could I get a show of hands from all of our local Danish registrars? Is that it? Hey, guys. So there our hosts, they've been -- oh yes, Ben beside me and have been very welcoming, and we all appreciate being in your fine country. It's nice here. Thank you.

Ready when you are, Jen.

Jennifer Gore: Good morning, everyone. Graeme and Registrars, thank you for letting us come update you with some GDD current activities. I am Jennifer Gore, the Director of the Registrar Services Engagement from ICANN staff. I'd like to introduce Jamie Hedlund who is Vice President of Compliance and Safeguards? Safeguards. And he's going to give a brief update this morning, and I will follow him with a couple updates on key items.

Jamie Hedlund: Thanks, Jen. Yes, I am Jamie Hedlund. I have the sexy title of SVP Contractual Compliance and Consumer Safeguards. And I'm the new Allan Grogan, and I'm very happy to be here. Thank you for allowing me to come.

Just had a few slides that I was going to go over, but by way of background, I've been at ICANN for seven years. I'm a lawyer by training, worked in

government, worked in the private sector mostly doing public policy work in Washington DC.

I am still new to the job. And meetings like this are a great opportunity for me to get feedback from you and hear what your concerns may be about contractual compliance and consumer safeguards. My door is always open and happy, grateful to hear from any and all of you on what you're concerned about.

So next slide please. Is this me? All right, okay. So early on one of the things that Göran asked for all the executives is to develop a short narrative on the purpose of their organization and why they exist. This little blurb here basically says that ICANN Contractual Compliance plays an important role not only within ICANN but for the greater Internet ecosystem where I think we are under even greater scrutiny now than we were when we were under the auspices of the US government.

There are three sort of initiatives that I'm focused on right now. One is to increase transparency in Contractual Compliance. As I'm sure you've seen in the CCT Review Team, the draft report, there are a number of recommendations going toward increased transparency both in terms of the way we handle complaints and in the rationale that we provide for them.

And what we are hopeful to get in response, you know, community comments is more granularity about exactly what kind of data people want to see, what kind of granularity. It's one thing to say ICANN is not transparent, which doesn't give us a whole lot to work on; it's another thing to say, you know, we want to see this kind of data on this, you know, this frequency. That's much more actionable.

Another area is collaborating closely with David Conrad, the office of the CTO, and looking at ways that we might be able to help mitigate infrastructure abuse. This is like malware, phishing, botnets. It is not spam. It

is not content. It is really, you know, related to what's within ICANN's mission and preserving and enhancing the security and stability of the DNS.

And so, and working not only with his group but also with third parties potentially, ensuring data particularly with respect to areas that are outside of our remit. And then finally, soliciting feedback on the possibility of creating a communitywide ad hoc working group on contractual compliance and consumer safeguards matters.

The main purpose of this is to serve as a vehicle for transparency, for allowing for a forum where a lot of the current discussions on contractual compliance and some of the mythology are happening within silos, but instead have been happening in silos, you have them every once in a while communitywide so that there is hopefully a greater understanding of what compliance means.

Let's see, why is this not, okay. Oh it's not a, got it. So last thing I'll touch on quickly is the consumer safeguards role. This is a role that's very different from contractual compliance. This is first and foremost an engagement role. This person will – the idea is for this person to go out into the community and outside the community, to explain and raise awareness about existing consumer safeguards, facilitate discussions on their effectiveness and whether additional safeguards would be something that is worthwhile exploring.

In other fora this person would not be responsible for developing new safeguards that would enter into contractual discussions but would be again, primarily serve education and awareness engagement role.

And that's it. Thank you and happy to take any questions.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme for the transcript. Thank you, Jamie. Thank you for joining us. It's – for those of you who haven't met you, it's nice for you to be here and

introduce yourself. I think quite obviously registrars have a deep and broad interest in compliance and how it functions. And so we are happy to engage with you and your team. And, you know, continue developing that relationship.

You mentioned increased transparency in there, and one of the things that was coming out of our closed session with Compliance on Sunday morning was, and, you know, Compliance will hopefully see this relatively shortly, is a request for data on abuse complaints that are submitted. And so we're going to get in the line for getting some data out of Compliance on that too.

Does anyone have questions for Jamie? We've got another about 21 minutes or so with GDD, and I think we've got you for another 15 or so. So I think we have time for a couple. I saw Joyce. There's a microphone there.

Jamie Hedlund: Graeme, if I could quickly just say, I'm sorry I was not able to join that session, unfortunately it was above my pay grade decision. But I do look forward to working with you all on how to make things more transparent.

Joyce Lin: Okay, I heard the consumer safeguards...

Graeme Bunton: Can you say your name?

Joyce Lin: Joyce Lin from 007 Names. The consumer safeguards that's been all over the place, I'd just like to know a bit how you categorize what areas of the safeguards that you're trying to educate the public, and how it's going to be related into the contractual compliance and everything? It seems to me that since ICANN opened the floodgate for all the new gTLDs, the safeguards, the public is suffering more than anything else with all the phishing and all the DNS abuses. So I'd really like to know what safeguards – the items that you will be covering. Thanks.

Jamie Hedlund: Sure. So the most obvious area of consumer safeguards are the ones that are included in the new gTLD Registry Agreement. There are other – in the RAA as well. There are other provisions that are supposed to extend to consumers and I should point out that we decided not to narrowly define what “consumer” is because there are all different types of consumers and there didn’t seem to be much value in narrowing that.

So again, we will talk about the safeguards that exist in current agreements. We will talk about safeguards that may exist elsewhere under other statutes or facilitate discussions about those if consumers can’t get redress within ICANN, helping them find other areas where they might. But it is not – again, it is not the function of this is not to extend or expand any existing contractual obligations.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. Before we get to - you have got Michele, Stephanie and then Darcy in the queue.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. One of the things, Jamie, that you mentioned both in a blog post about a month or so back, and then in various other places is this community across something other group, blah blah blah, to talk about compliance. And it sent a chill down my spine. Maybe you can assuage our views a little bit and explain to us exactly what you mean by that because last time I checked, my contract was with ICANN, not with the rest of the ICANN community. Thanks.

Jamie Hedlund: Thanks Michele. As I tried to describe earlier, the main purpose for the ad hoc working group, communitywide working group, would be for a forum for discussion on contractual compliance and consumer safeguards measures. There’s a lot of interest across the community beyond contracted parties in what, you know, what these things mean. There is a concern that if ICANN does not have a credible contractual compliance function that we will - our credibility as a multistakeholder organization will weaken and national governments will step in to the breach.

So the purpose of this is to facilitate discussions, debunk the myths, explain, you know, across the community rather than within silos where folks maybe just talking to themselves about what contractual compliance and consumer safeguards actually means. It is not an enforcement mechanism or a compliance mechanism, it is a venue -- it would be a venue for raising awareness and hopefully understanding.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jamie. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Stephanie Duchesneau with Google. So I appreciate the focus on transparency. I think that's something that we think can be done better. I think that something that folks on the other side of the community can be done better, and we have to kind of reach across the aisle and find those shared wins.

But one thing that I just want to put on the record is out for me, transparency about ICANN's compliance function and consumer safeguards function, it's not just about how you package and parse the compliance data. Like I don't like the slide either with all of the different notice categories and when it's closed. It's like also about the narrative that we are telling about our compliance function.

One thing that I've had a hard time with is that looking at that slide and looking at the Compliance presentations it tells me nothing about what Compliance is doing to make ICANN a better place; it doesn't actually tell me about - there is such a ticket counting paradigm that I actually know very little about the kinds of problems that Compliances fixing.

So if as we look to increase transparency we are also looking to kind of changing how we talk about compliance so it's not just like numbers and we are debating the definition of what a first closure versus a second closure, ICANN coding, ICANN's fault coding means, and we are actually telling a

story around what we are doing to make the industry better, I think it's important to not lose sight of that.

Jamie Hedlund: Thanks, Stephanie. Putting that kind of data in context, I agree, could be helpful.

Man: (Unintelligible). I don't know if this is exactly a compliance thing or not, that the Internet by its very nature is a very fast moving, fast evolving thing. Policy, by its very nature, is a very slow moving thing. We have an additional lag in that once the community puts policy forward we don't really have a mechanism to implement the policy until contractual renewal. And some of these contracts are rather long-lived, especially with the registries. And I'm wondering if we could look at perhaps modifying the next generation of contracts so that they include an ability for policy to be updated more rapidly without requiring a contractual renewal cycle for the policy to get implemented?

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme for the transcript. I actually think you're incorrect on that. I believe there is a mechanism inside our current contract that doesn't mean you have to implement policy as it comes through the community, so it's in there already. If you're waiting for a new contract, you should not do that anymore. Tom.

Tom Barrett: Yes, this kind of got me confused with the cross whatever working group. Is that a working group early for our reach of policymaking? And if for policymaking, that must be in the remit of the GNSO and cannot stand freely. And as far as in our consumer safeguards haven't been in our contracts and aren't in our contracts and aren't even in the remit of a – a remit of ICANN at all. So I kind of wonder how all that fits into it.

Jamie Hedlund: So, again, this cross community - ad hoc cross community, or not even - communitywide working group, it is not a policymaking vehicle, it's not a

contractual requirement imposition vehicle. It is a vehicle for transparency, for awareness and education.

And I would, it doesn't really matter what I think, but I do think there are obligations in the RAA, and particularly when thinking about requirements that flow to the agreement with the registrants, that would be viewed as sort of consumer safeguards in terms of, you know, what they're supposed to know about and what their obligations may be as registrants. But this is - I can't emphasize enough - this is a forum for discussion, it's not a forum for imposing new contractual obligations.

Greg DiBiase: So Greg DiBiase, Amazon Registrar. Did someone in the community request this forum? I'm just trying to understand the basis. Is this a response to a request from someone or is this just something ICANN is thinking is a good idea?

Jamie Hedlund: So this was an idea I floated in a blog. And it was an idea that I continue to try to get feedback on, whether or not it makes sense to do it. So far I have gotten a fair amount of positive feedback from other stakeholder groups but it is very much in the idea formation stage looking for feedback.

Pam Little: Pam Little from Alibaba. Hi, Jamie. When Maguy came on board five years ago she inherited a staff of five and a budget of \$2 million a year. Now you came to this job, you have a staff of 25, maybe even more, and a budget of I don't know how many times, three or four times, I don't know, maybe. So I guess my question is have you been thinking about what success would look like for you? And considering this really quite significant increase of budget or resources you have at its function comparing with five years ago. Thank you.

Jamie Hedlund: So thanks, Pam. I guess if we were trying to keep up with the amount of growth in registries and registrars in domain names over the past five years we would have grown much more than we have. But, I mean, we have a mission, we have specified functions that we are supposed to do, success is

doing those while and that is defined by internal leave the ICANN staff, but as received by the contracted parties and the larger community.

Pam Little: Can I have a follow up please, very quickly, Graeme?

Graeme Bunton: So we've got about nine minutes left in this chunk. We need to give five of that to Jen as well.

Pam Little: Sure.

Graeme Bunton: So I've got four minutes with – you can have a quick follow-on. I've got James in the queue and if we have time we'll get to you, (Joyce), but we might not.

Pam Little: Okay, I agree with Jamie, it's not about numbers. But I think previously elsewhere when other stakeholder group was commenting about the compliance function in light of the budget, the financial year, the Compliance response to our query about efficiency and effectiveness to me wasn't really satisfactory.

So I think yes, it should be matter whether you're inefficient, whether you're effective. It shouldn't be just because oh we have now so many new gTLDs, more registry or more registrar, and we should grow so many more times. It shouldn't be in that sort of ratio. So I guess we can all think together how to make Compliance a success story, I guess that's my point.

Jamie Hedlund: Absolutely. And if this goes for you and for everybody, if there are areas where you think we're falling down on efficiency and effectiveness, please bring those forward and let's fix those together.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. James.

James Bladel: Hi, thanks. James speaking. Two questions quickly for Jamie. One is that you've – I keep missing the name that you're referring to this group, is it cross

community working group, community working group, does that mean we're going to see a charter come through the SOs and ACs at some point? Or is this just an informal...

Jamie Hedlund: No, no...

((Crosstalk))

Jamie Hedlund: No, this is informal working group.

James Bladel: Okay, I would then encourage you to brainstorm some different names so that we don't have collision or confusion with some of those animals.

Jamie Hedlund: Yes, just quickly, it was a sort of loosely based on Xavier's group on the budget.

James Bladel: Okay. And the second one and perhaps you covered it in an earlier slide and I just, it went over my head. But can you take maybe 60 seconds to talk to what you envision Krista's role being for this Complaints Officer? I mean, it's something that's been hanging out there for a while. I don't think the position was ever filled under your predecessor. What do you see that role doing?

Jamie Hedlund: So Krista is obviously much better place to answer that, but I can, you know, her role is not contractual based; she's not going to be taking complaints based, my understanding anyway, based on any of the agreements that we have with the contracted parties. She is going to be taking complaints from community members, from, you know, stakeholder groups regarding ICANN and ICANN staff and what we are doing. I hope that's helpful.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jamie. Sorry, (Joyce), I think we need to move on. Very briefly, and this is maybe a little nuts and boltsy for this session, is Compliance uses a ticketing system that we all loathe. It's not going away until the Registrar Portal is done, my understanding is that about two years out before we end

up with the Compliance function inside that portal. Maybe we should talk about that a little bit more.

But also it's clear we have quite an interest in dialogue with Compliance, and so perhaps we can figure out a mechanism to have some more of this in the future, maybe jump on one of our policy calls...

((Crosstalk))

Jamie Hedlund: Absolutely with whatever regularity you all think is appropriate.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thank you very much for joining us, Jamie.

Jamie Hedlund: Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: This is still Graeme for the transcript. And I am terrible at saying my name. Back to Jen Gore. We've – I've left you five whole minutes.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks, Graeme. Jen Gore, ICANN staff. So thanks to Jamie for coming out today. I just have three quick bullets that I want to cover and if there is any questions at the end I will be happy to take them.

I want to make an announcement that in the coming 9 to 12 months we will be putting out a data escrow proposal for a provider in the European Union. We will draft, publish and collect responses and we will be working with the Registrars on that proposal.

Another thing I wanted to mention was the naming service portal. We had a user policy group meeting earlier this week. We had a great turnout. I would like to solicit volunteers for that to make sure that we have global representation. The first phase of the portal, the timeline on that is Q4 of this calendar year, 2017, in which we will be soliciting feedback from the user

portal group on the demo. It will not be in production, just a staging environment demo. And that will include content management functionality.

So similar to the function and roles that you're handling today within (Radar), that will be Phase 1 of the portal, and from there, there are three more phases of which I do not have timelines associated to them. So I ask if anyone is interested, especially beyond those people in this room with the newer registrar that uses the (Radar) portal today, IT folks, compliance folks within your organization that will be using the naming service portal on a more regular basis, we ask them to join as well.

And then just the last point to note, we have a Whois Validation Working Group meeting tomorrow on the crossfield address validation. I thought that it was on your agenda, Graeme, so just wanted to mention that, it's going to be held tomorrow. That's it. So any questions?

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme for the transcript. Thank you, Jen. And sorry for leaving you so little time. The European Union data escrow provider proposal, I am sure many of our members are super interested in that. Cheers from the audience for those who are online.

I'm sure we would love to see if we can move data faster than 9 to 12 months, and presumably it would not just be limited to European registrars, it would be available to all of us.

Jennifer Gore: Oh, I'm sorry. They would be available to all ICANN registrars. We were looking for a DEA in the European Union.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thank you. And we circulated the information for the portal users group to the membership list yesterday I think, or the day before, so that should be available to everybody on the Registrar Stakeholder Group mailing list.

Do we have anybody with questions for Jen? We've got about two minutes left. Wow. Oh, Christian.

Christian Muller: Christian Muller. If you say escrow service, are you talking about (unintelligible) currently Iron Mountain?

Jennifer Gore: Yes, sir.

Christian Muller: Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme for the transcript. If you can't see it, Christian is beaming like he just had a child. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record. Good, about bloody time.

Jen Gore: Thank you, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: All right...

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: It's 10:30 now. We've got a break until – oh, Joyce, Joyce, real quick.

Joyce Lin: Just a quick question, I understand that your European escrow provider because the privacy issue that related to European members, but like a registrar in the United States that we have some European customers, how are we going to handle that?

Jennifer Gore: How are you going to handle your data deposits if you're a North American based customer and a registrar? And you've got European registrars? Registrants?

((Crosstalk))

Joyce Lin: European customers, European data customers data. So and then right now we are using the Iron Mountain and which is probably not complying to the privacy issues that European Union have.

Jennifer Gore: Actually, Iron Mountain is in compliance with the US/EU privacy shield. My intent is to be able to offer another option beyond just the single provider that ICANN is contracted with today. As far as how – what your strategy is on your data deposits, as far as what provider you'd like to use, that's up to you. And ICANN will not require you to use one versus another or just one.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you for joining us, Jen. We appreciate you coming in. We'll try and give you some more time at our next meeting. But we really appreciated having Jamie come and talk to us so thank you for helping with that.

Okay, 10:30, I believe we have a break until 11:00, which is quite a long break.

James Bladel: Hey, Graeme, just a quick question or comment for Jen...

Graeme Bunton: Oh sorry, James.

James Bladel: Sorry. If we wanted to divide up our portfolio and use multiple data escrow providers and since some of our domains have – that would be compliant with the data escrow program?

Jennifer Gore: Well that will be part of the discussion as we draft the proposal, as far as what the strategy would be or data escrow.

James Bladel: Okay.

Jennifer Gore: But that – my thought is, is that would be – if the community is accepted to that that would be the intent to be able to use more than one.

Graeme Bunton: Cool. Again, thank you. Right, break now until 11:00. I think there's coffee in the lobby as there normally is. And then we're going to dig into some PDP working group updates. I mentioned earlier we've got a – not a lot of time together today, and a lot to cover so your promptness in returning would be deeply appreciated. Thank you. Get some coffee.

END