

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan  
GNSO: RrSG Meeting Part 1  
Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 09:00 AST**

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

Man: GNSO RrSG Meeting at ICANN 61 San Juan on the 13th of March 2018 in Room 104 GNSO.

Graeme Bunton: That was a very soothing voice, someone. Can we start the recording? Okay. Oh I just got my tent card. All right, everybody ready to go? Good. All right, good morning everybody and welcome to the RrSG Stakeholder Group Day. As per usual, we've got a full agenda and lots and lots to talk about.

A couple house rules. This is Graeme Bunton. I'm chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Say your name before you talk to make everybody's life easier. Please and thank you. Right let's maybe do a little bit of an introduction because I actually - I see some new faces. If you're a registrar and you're sitting in the chairs, feel free to join us at the table. I can see a few chairs left open. Don't be shy. Come on up. But let's start down there and let's hear who you are and where you're from.

Tim April: Tim April, Akamai Technologies.

Susan Jang: Susan Jang, Google.

Zuan Zhang: I'm Zuan Zhang from Beijing, China.

Elisa Cooper: Elisa Cooper, Brandsight.

Matt Serlin: Matt Serlin, Brandsight

Marta Baylina: Marta Baylina, Corehub

Peter Larsen: Peter Larsen, Larsen Data, Copenhagen.

Kristian Ørmen: Kristian Ørmen, Larsen Data, also the RrSG Secretary.

Frédéric Guillemaut: Frédéric Guillemaut, Safebrands, France.

Neal McPherson: Neal McPherson, 1&1.

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

Tom Keller: Tom Keller, 1&1.

Graeme Bunton: Ben Anderson was sitting over there but he's gone to get me and himself a coffee. He is also our treasurer. He's from (Net Names). I'm Graeme Bunton. I'm chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and I have worked for Tucows. Yes, Zoe, do you have something to say?

Zoe Bonython: There should be coffee coming to the room soon-ish.

Graeme Bunton: I'm sure everyone is super pleased to hear this.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Blacknight. I am one of your GNSO representatives.

Darcy Southwell: So also missing is Tobias Sattler over here. He's our vice chair, right, with United-Domains. I'm Darcy Southwell with Endurance International, and I'm also a GNSO Council representative for the registrars.

Sara Bockey: Sara Bockey, GoDaddy.

Greg DiBiase: Greg DiBiase, Amazon Registrar.

Pam Little: Pam Little. I'm with Alibaba. I'm also one of our GNSO councilors.

Sherry Hildebrand: Sherry Hildebrand, MarkMonitor.

Vlad Dinculescu: Vlad Dinculescu, DNS Africa.

Eric Rokobauer: Eric Rokobauer, (Endurance International).

Rob Villeneuve: Rob Villeneuve, Rebel.com.

Zoe Bonython: Zoe Bonython, RrSG Secretariat.

Janelle McAlister: Janelle McAlister, Uniregistrar

Graeme Bunton: All right welcome everybody. It's good to see all these friendly faces. So anybody else sitting in the room that wants to jump up to the mic and say who they are? I see some ICANN staff. I see James Bladel happily being a civilian again. All right. If they don't want to introduce themselves, they don't have to. They can remain anonymous. I see Jen from (unintelligible).

Right. No need to delay, let's get right into it. We're going to start off with what's going on at the GNSO, council, issues, motions, and we've put Darcy on the hook for that one. Darcy, you want to tell us what's going on there?

Darcy Southwell: Sure. Thanks, Graeme. Darcy Southwell. So Sunday, Saturday -- Sunday I think it was, we had our council working session. If any of you were there, you'll notice we spent a lot of time talking about PDP improvements, what are the challenges, what can we do to make those better? Some of that - the plan for that stems from a strategic planning session we had in January, and one of the key things we identified is that there's, you know, we all have experienced a lot of challenges with the PDP process.

So we talked a little bit about that, different - all the PDP chairs were there and we went through some of the challenges that they felt they saw, either as a leader or from or from their members. I think you're familiar with many of them if you've been on a PDP, the fact that charter scope is often huge, which means the PDP takes forever. It's a challenge to participate on something that takes four years to complete. So working through a number of those - discussing I should say, a number of those challenges and how we can make them better. We don't have a solution yet, unfortunately.

Also talking a lot about the Sub Pro PDP, the Subsequent Procedures PDP, and then the Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP and what those - if they intersect and what the timelines for them are, because there's some dependencies in launching a new round of gTLDs on both of those, obviously. Those are a couple of the key issues going on right now.

The council meeting is on Wednesday, tomorrow afternoon at 1. We actually don't have any motions pending this time, right? Yes. But there's going to be some interesting discussion. We're going to be talking about the inter-registrar transfer policy, which I know we all love that policy as registrars. Also discussing the GNSO Review Working Group. The new cross-community engagement group on Internet governance, which used to be a cross-community working group, which is different, they're refocusing their efforts. And then also looking to discuss the fellowship program, along with the FY '19 budget. I think that's about it. Michele or Pam?

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Yes there's a couple of things there that we're probably interested in in terms of how that impacts us. The IRTP, the transfer policy one is one that you're all aware of. There is a bigger discussion at council that we're having around reviewing policies in general and what - how that should be done, how that should be handled.

Either myself or Darcy circulated the stuff to you on the members list awhile back and we didn't get much feedback. It would be nice if you could give us a bit of feedback. The question there is when should you review a policy, who should be able to start - trigger that process, what kind of perimeters are around it.

And personally I think, you know, we should review policies but obviously we don't want a situation where we are constantly reviewing policies and that every man and his dog can start a policy review, because that would be completely dysfunctional. But we really could do with some input from you. You don't need to give it this minute but if you could please have a look at what we circulated or, if you can't find it, we can send it to you again. Beg your pardon? We can resend it. Sorry. Thank you, Darcy.

Pam Little: Pam Little. Just to follow up on that, I believe we did circulate a letter from ICANN staff, the Registrar Services Director, Jennifer Gore. So I would be interested to hear whether our members have any comment on that. Basically the staff is proposing they will prepare a status report of the IRTP post-implementation status report so - and then submit it to Council and allow Council then to see what their findings are and decide next steps.

I believe the IRTP actually said after one year implementation there needs to be a panel seated or constituted and then you get together and decide how to review the effectiveness of the policy. So do our members have any strong feeling about whether we should support the approach to have the status report? I guess it's harmless. We asked them to do this.

My only concern is about what sort of data they're going to gather at that stage for this status report. Presumably it will be mainly from the compliance tickets they - or the tickets they receive through their compliance functions, is that dialogue going to be representative or reliable to give us some good indication whether the policy is being effective or not. So do we have any strong feeling about - so for councilors so we actually have that on the discussion agenda this - or tomorrow, so do we need to say anything, make any particular comment or suggestion? Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Pam. And if you want to put yourself in the queue everybody, just sort of raise your hand or you can put your hand up in the Adobe Connect. I'll try and follow both. Sorry, this is Graeme again for the transcript. I'm going to forget all day. IRTP is - so is this - they want to look at IRTP bits, A, B, C, D? So I think that's an interesting segue into a brief chat that we can have about transfers in general.

I think so - registrars just, and registries, sent a joint letter to ICANN around how transfers may work post-GDPR. It's not a perfect solution but it's an okay solution. I think it's good it's not perfect because it still provides the impetus for us to fix transfers. I think we uniformly regard that transfers suck. They're slow, they're complicated, they're fraught, they drive I'm sure lots of our compliance stuff, as well as own internal tickets and support issues. So I think we need to have this report on transfers so that we can use that to kick off IRTP EE I think would be the next one or just - to rebuild transfers.

But what I think we need to do ahead of that is build a straw man inside of tech ops for what a robust next generation, if I may, transfers process looks like so that we can bring that to the PDP and have something to work off of. And that is probably going to flow out of this report. I see a hand from James Bladel. Please, James.

James Bladel: Hi thanks. James Bladel. I didn't know if there was a queue. Okay. So I agree. I think it's time to start talking about transfers. They're not sexy but, as

Graeme pointed out, they are the cornerstone of the competitive marketplace and they drive most of the negative customer experience and registrant experience out there.

As a veteran or victim of IRTPs A through D, you know, I think that we need to make a choice. I think you're right, we need to tear it down and restart it from the ground up, modernize it, get rid of authorizations from fax maybe and put in things like SMS, two-factor, you know, mobile apps, push notifications, just make it - bring it into this century.

But here's the question that registrars collectively are going to have to answer, and I don't think it's an easy one, is do you want to see a fast transfer process that's lean and mean but has some undo mechanism for fraud or abuse or some sort of window to recover or do you want to have one that's cumbersome and has lots of approvals and steps and checkboxes but once it's done, it's done? Because it seems like those are the two extremes that kind of come to those types of groups and you can't have both, you know?

I think some folks want to have something super-fast but insecure and some folks want to have something super cumbersome that has all kinds of undos. I think it's one or the other and, you know, that's the spectrum I think that transfers need to exist on. But I would be happy to volunteer to contribute to that. I know Michele and some others were involved going back to IRTP A, but we would have to call it something else, IRTP next gen.

And there should also be some more facilities in there for bulk transfers. I think there're some operations that are occurring that are really hard to squeeze under the current policies. So. And the country codes have maybe innovated in this area that ICANN can learn from. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, James. I've got Darcy.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks. Darcy Southwell. To follow up on Pam's point, I think the process of staff providing up with a report is typical and it provides us with useful information. It's not an indicator that staff is then going to ignore the review process, we're going to have a review. So I'm not concerned that we're doing that. But I just want to point that out. I know you're concerned. I think the information they give us will be useful from their perspective because it's information we don't have and we have no other way to get it. So. And then, yes, I agree with James, we need to tear it down and start over.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thanks, Darcy. I've got Greg and then Vlad in the queue.

Greg DiBiase: So when we talk about, you know, doing a review, what is the data that we'd be looking at? Like is it transfer - the amount of transfer complaints and compliance, is it, you know, comments from registrars? I guess I'd like more clarity on that.

Graeme Bunton: I see staff in the room. Did you guys catch that question? Like what are the bits and pieces that are being used to build this report I think is the short answer. Sorry to put you on the spot, guys.

(Caitlyn Tubergan): Thanks, Graeme. This is (Caitlyn Tubergan), ICANN Org for the transcript. As Greg mentioned, we do have some basic compliance metrics, like types of complaints, reasons the complaints were closed that we can use. We actually also have in a complaint that was filed with our official compliance officer about - specifically about inter-registrant transfers or change of registrant. But if you have any ideas of other types of metrics you'd like to see, we can see if we are able to provide those or if there's any sort of anecdotal evidence that registrars would like to provide to add to the report, that could also be helpful.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, (Caitlyn). So that's interesting that we have the opportunity there to engage with staff to help build up that report and so that I think we can build this compelling case then. We have the opportunity here to build this

compelling case to rebuild transfers from the ground up if we want to spend a bit of time and effort to collect the friction that we see inside of all transfers and out businesses and get that in. We should do that. Vlad and then Rob.

Vlad Dinculescu: Vlad for the transcript. So I've got a quick question here with regards to changing this and the review. So based on what James said, we do want it one day, nice, slick and very fast, you know, to be workable but if we got this review and then we're looking to amend the policy does that go back to the GNSO though and then the entire community gets involved, which might end up with IRTP C again, which is a cumbersome process, based on what the community wanted, and then are we going to achieve what we want, which is option A, a smoother, faster, better transfer process that's modernized?

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Vlad. Absolutely the whole thing needs to involve the community. We can't do this alone but this is also why I think we want to start with the tech ops straw man so that we can - we get our smart technical people in a room and we come up with what we think is going to be an appropriate technical solution and then we can bring that forward to the policy development process. James, is that a response to Vlad?

James Bladel: Yes, just a brief response. I just want to be clear, I was outlining the choices that we would have to make, not advocating for one or the other. I think that that is certainly a controversial discussion within these groups. But, yes, everything you said, it would have to go through the GNSO. I think you will find that outside of registries and registrars there is an aftermarket interest, there's not a whole of interest in this process. So we will have to take the lead on it, but it will be mostly a registrar-driven process.

Graeme Bunton: Rob then Tom.

Rob Villeneuve: Just speaking on the data that might be used to analyze this policy, I'm just curious maybe if in the last IRTP process or through some other work we've done we have a sense of the number of successful transfers, even a rough

idea of the volume of transfers that go through over a period of time. My concern about starting with some of the compliance data that it always points out the problems but then it's not balanced with, you know, what is a quantity of problems in relation or in ratio to the number of successes.

Graeme Bunton: Yes, that's an issue. Tom?

Tom Keller: Thanks. Tom Keller for the script. Just want to point out that there will be a session dedicated to transfers at the GDD Summit in Vancouver in May, so this is the exercise we're trying to come up with a new process, description and then we need to see and we want to debate in that meeting whether we put it through a PDP or whether there are other means to get it working. So I happily invite all of you to participate. Please come.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Anybody else have thoughts on transfers? Pam, go ahead.

Pam Little: Thank you, Graeme. Pam Little speaking. Based on what I heard, I just want to get some clarity. Do we - we are willing to engage with staff during the report preparation stage to provide input in terms of metrics and data perhaps, so that's something we are willing to do, right?

Graeme Bunton: That was my impression, yes.

Pam Little: Okay. I just have a suggestion for our members to consider. On the council project list there's also another item up for review, which is specifically only for TAC, that transfer emergency contact or something.

Michele Neylon: Emergency action contact.

Pam Little: Emergency action contact. Thank you, Michele. So my suggestion is to maybe fold that one in, included in this IRTP review, because that particular piece of IRTP really is quite troublesome, especially for registrars who are in sort of opposite time zones and so if we could - I would like to ask for your

permission to propose that to do in a council discussion to have the TAC folded into the IRTP review report.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Pam. I don't know enough about it to say definitely but I think we can probably start reasonably wide and narrow as we go. Darcy?

Darcy Southwell: So. Darcy Southwell. So the one thought I have there though is the IRTP review is going to take a long time and I know you're really concerned about TAC. It might slow it down by folding them together because it's also set for review, it's just a much smaller thing. So just a thought.

Graeme Bunton: We don't - we can sort of chat through that one. I have Tom and then I'll get to Marika.

Tom Keller: So you brought up that we wrote that letter about fixing the transfer process in the short term (unintelligible) the GDPR kind of thing. Do we know what the next steps would be? Because currently this process is completely non-compliant and we don't even know how to follow up on that. That was really a more technical letter outlining what we should be doing. I think we're all in agreement that's the only thing that's reasonable at time being, but what the heck is the next step? I don't know.

Graeme Bunton: That's a good question, Tom. I'll try and answer that after Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Graeme. This is Marika from staff. On the IRTP review, I think the idea or staff thinking currently is that that would cover all - any issue related to IRTP, so it would also include the TAC, as that also was singled out as a potential separate review. But our understanding is that was the IRTP D recommended was looking, you know, overall at the IRTP and see what issues are there.

But to Darcy's point, and that's also of course something that happened in the previous review, as part of that, you know, after that initial step of data

gathering and identifying what the issues are, of course there's the ability then to say, "Well, you know, these are some priority issues that we want to deal first with" or "Here are some issues that can maybe wait until later." Or maybe that is not possible, as, you know, James noted, and maybe an overall review that needs to be taken place that captures everything at the same time.

But again, I'm guessing that conversation can only happen once we have the information and data that comes in through the staff report but also potentially public comment because the idea is also, you know, that whatever staff finds goes out for public comment so that all of you and also but also anyone else that's affected or impacted by the transfer policy has the ability to provide input and data or information that they have that will help inform the council then to decide on what the next steps should be with regards to the review.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Marika. That's helpful. Back to Tom's question about transfers and what the process is, we don't know is the short answer. We wrote this letter. It outlines this potential avenue forward on post-GDPR transfers. I don't even think ICANN has posted it yet, as far I know, and they've had it for about a week now. So we'll have to follow up on that.

My expectation is that we'll flag that for compliance when we talk with compliance, saying this is what we think we're going to do. You guys should go look at this letter and give us some sort of response. But we need to keep the industry moving. And so if they - if we all more or less follow that guidance in the letter and they want to try and breach all of the registrars in the room, then they can maybe try but I don't think anyone would find that particularly helpful.

Right. That was a fulsome discussion on transfers. Do we have anything else there or anything else on that GNSO agenda? Michele?

Michele Neylon: Sorry. I'm losing my voice. Michele for the record. The other one which I think is just kind of mixed feelings around this one is the discussion group around Internet governance. Some people feel very passionately that that group is super important. Other people feel - would love to see that group die. In terms of budget and resources, yesterday - well at this meeting, they have two meetings on this agenda. The one they had yesterday I think three people turned up for, so that's a bit of a waste of resources.

If you look at the ICANN budget discussion which is a bit broader beyond that, the meetings' budget is one of the biggest chunks of change being moved around, so if we can cut back on some of that, it might help. Bear in mind there are some people who still think that raising our fees is the best way to fix this, and if you look at the proxy privacy discussions, one of the more contentious issues there is the fees.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Michele. On the CCEG, because it's like - what is it? It's a something else. Anyway. The Internet Governance CCWG, whatever that is. I don't - I think they're trying to scale it back. I still don't think we have any particular interest in seeing it live and trying to sort of revise this thing into a scope that makes sense. And it still feels like a boondoggle to me. James, is that a comment on that particular thing?

James Bladel: Well that's not why I originally came, but. This is James speaking. I was going to comment on something else, but I cannot believe that that group outlived me and my term on the council because I was trying to kill it the whole time. And I think Michele is right.

I mean this is a classic example where culturally a small number of very motivated folks have basically entrenched themselves inside - in between a couple of processes and they are attending different things under this flag of ICANN and saying, you know, I'm here from the ICANN Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. No you're not. You're there for yourself and you're there for your group or your organization, and they're

doing it - well we never did get a straight answer. When you say are you being funded to attend these events it was like, well, there's nothing in the budget, basically you can't prove that I am.

Michele Neylon: CROPP, James, CROPP.

James Bladel: Yes, it was coming out of regional office budgets and all kinds of shell games and so it was just a, you know, maybe I should ask the question differently is did you put your hotel bill on your own credit card and not get reimbursed? So maybe a little bit more direct. But, yes, I think I would urge our councilors to shut that thing down. It is a small group that is basically - it is the flea that's driving the dog and it just - it's ridiculous. So, in case anyone wants to know how I feel, I'm willing share more, you know.

And I don't want to - and again, it's always tied to this discussion like, well, Internet governance is important. Of course it's important. That's not - that's a dodge, that's a diversion. The question is, is this group the most effective way to do it, and the answer is no and no and no. And so, you know.

But I actually came up to ask a question about something I didn't hear from our council reps, which is I'd like to understand the status of the SSR2 review team, which in Abu Dhabi was paused by the board and I was surprised to find out here that it has not been restarted. I actually thought that that was on the verge of being, you know, restarted after the New Year. And I spoke with I believe Denise from Facebook who chairs that and it's still - nobody knows where that's going.

And, you know, while we may have some questions or concerns about things going on in SSR2, I think the bottom line is the ICANN board just invented a new power for itself that does exist in any of the accountability mechanisms, which is if you don't like the way a review team is going, just shut it off. And we should be I think supremely concerned, just as commercial providers. I mean that could happen to a review team on something that is very important

to us and critical to us, in that if you start to push back on ICANN, you know, that they'll just kind of close up the purse strings and send everybody home if they don't like the direction that some oversight work is going.

So I just want to ask if there's any updates on that and if not, can you start to really kind of make some noise on that? And I think the registries, at least last I spoke to one or two of them, are also wondering where that's at? Thank you.

Darcy Southwell: So, Darcy Southwell. Yes so we did talk about it. I think the GNSO support, you know, agrees that we need to move this forward. The leaders of the SOs and ACs have been talking about it. There's a proposed letter that's been drafted at the leadership level. My understanding is there's still one SO/AC leader who hasn't engaged on it. But we talked about it yesterday with the ccNSO and they want to - they're pushing as hard as we are.

So I'm hoping that tomorrow we have an update about it, that something will have occurred today, because we are disturbed that it hasn't started after what's been happening, and there's been quite a bit push from the council leaders that this needs to move forward. So hopefully after tomorrow we'll know a little bit more.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Darcy. Pam?

Pam Little: Just very quickly in response to James' suggestion that our councilors do something to shut down the Internet Governance Group. I'm just wondering whether we - it might be a good idea we speak to our registry colleagues on the council to gather some sort of support on how we can actually go about shutting it down. Every time we raise this about some concern, whether it's budgetary impact, we get the answers there's no budgetary impact.

The fact they keep circulating the draft charter and discussing it on the council is already taking up a lot of resources. So if it's dollar value or not, it's

really it's eating of our resources, I agree we shut it down. I'll volunteer Michele to do so.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele for the record. One of the key players in the zombie group -- I think we should call it that from now on -- he's very upset with me personally because I called him out yesterday on the budget matter. Because if there are human beings who are on the payroll of ICANN who are attending calls, setting up phone bridges, Adobe Connects, et cetera, et cetera, that all comes with costs and it has to come from somebody's budget somewhere.

Now the Internet governance information that we all probably could benefit from that's something that (Nigel Hicksen) and a few of the other people should be in a position to brief us on in some shape or form. Now I don't know what that should look like and I don't really care, but I'm - I am a bit concerned about how this is being used as a way to rationalize an existence of this group. And, you know, as James said, they kind of then rationalize their appearance elsewhere and stuff like that. It is a big of a problem. I think we do need to kill it.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, councilors. Thank you everybody for participating in that. I think the choice is clear: kill it, kill it with fire. And out of that too, if we're capturing things to do, we need to encourage tech ops to start looking at transfers as a whole at some point and we need to begin collecting what data we think is going to be appropriate and useful, and probably have a little bit of discussion around that as well for providing that data to staff for the transfers report.

And I think we can probably close this topic off a little bit early unless there's one last call for stuff on GNSO Council motion, GNSO-related issues. Going one, going twice. Great. I don't - I've gotten my notes up but not always the Adobe Connect so if I'm missing questions or people in the queue, someone can wave their hands in the air.

Zoe, I - so Jeff Neuman is unable to be here at the moment but really wants to talk about the charter, and so he's asking if we can push that till after - until later. So this is a half an hour chunk we've gotten next. We would need to grab something from this afternoon and push it forward, which could either be in half an hour chunks cross-field or privacy and proxy, which means putting someone on the hook earlier than they thought they were going to be on the hook.

Darcy, would you feel comfortable talking about cross-field before we get, you know, well ahead, if I can call an audible? Is that going to mess you up, Zoe, if we swap those things around on the agenda? You're cool. Right. Sorry. So because Jeff has thoughts he wants to share, I think it's probably useful to make sure that he can share them in the room with everybody else.

So we'll push that charter to later in the day and we'll talk about a cross-field validation now, although we actually have more than half an hour on the agenda for that. But we have a few more - oh no, I take it back. We have 20 minutes on the agenda for that. All right, well let's try and do it and see how it goes. We're flexible, right guys? Darcy, you want to kick this off for us, please and thank you.

Darcy Southwell: Sure. Thanks. Darcy Southwell. Hold on, I'm getting to my notes. Sorry. So I think many of you will recall we had quite a bit of work with staff about doing an RFI. They did not include much of what we requested in the RFI and published it. They've got nine responses. Four of them are the same responses that they - or the same company that responded in, oh, whenever we were in Hyderabad and there was a straw man presentation, so probably about 18 months ago, maybe.

Since then - so they published those. We can send you the link so that you can see staff prepared a comparison of the information that was presented based upon the RFI. Unfortunately the RFI that they put out was missing a number of the data points that the registrars were looking for. As you'll recall,

the RAA has a language that says the provider has to be technically and commercially feasible, and many of the data points that we felt would indicate specifically technically feasible but also a couple of questions about commercially feasible were not in the RFI. So we don't have answers to those.

As a result, there's a small sub team of registrars who have put together a document, which I believe was circulated to the registrars for comment as well -- we've been collecting input from a number of other registrars -- to demonstrate what is commercially and technically feasible. Just a second here.

Is it fair to say -- Sara, I'm going to call on you because I know you were this leading this -- is it fair to say the document's - I mean is it still in development or are we feeling pretty close to having that where we want it?

Sara Bockey: This is Sara Bockey. I think we're getting pretty close, unless someone really pushes back and doesn't like something. I think it's pretty comprehensive.

Darcy Southwell: So I'm going to ask you the next question. So I mean is the intention to then take this new document and go back to staff and say we want - we have more questions, you need to go back to these providers, or what do we intend to do with this letter or this document?

Sara Bockey: I believe the intent is to formally submit it to ICANN staff and say these are our requirements.

Darcy Southwell: I know that GDD staff will be here later and intend to at least briefly talk about this and there is a registrar roundtable I believe on Thursday that this is going to be one of the topics of discussion with GDD staff there. I don't know if anyone has any specific questions or concerns about this process at this point or any of the substance. Greg?

Greg DiBiase: So just following up, we're giving our criteria to ICANN and then letting them decide next steps? Are they going to go to the providers and say here's the additional criteria, can you meet this, presumably?

Darcy Southwell: Go ahead, Jennifer.

Jennifer Gore: Hi everyone. Good morning. Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff. So the intent is, based on our five responses that we received, that the Registrar Working Group, we created a sub team, is pulling together criteria that they can deem as being technically and commercially viable, and staff is also pulling together criteria.

We'll take the two, we'll marry them together and then determine where the gaps are to see if that there - and then compare those back to the RFI to see if there are workaround solutions in order to get a point where we can present something to the Registrar Working Group that can go forward with a vote, based on the obligations in the RAA.

Darcy Southwell: So before you go away -- this is Darcy Southwell -- do you feel that the RFI responses contain all of the information that's going to answer that question?

Jennifer Gore: No. The intent of the RFI was to determine to do an update on service providers that are in the marketplace, since the last RFI that took place were cross-field address validations over five years old. So we did that. We know that there's, you know, nine potential parties out there interested. We need to make sure that we have a formal criteria from the registrar working group that is in development and that ICANN staff has a formal criteria. We can bring the two together in order to determine where the - do a comparison to figure out where the delta is.

Greg DiBiase: So where is the basis for providing ICANN's criteria? Because in the RAA, right, it just says the Registrar Working Group will decide this.

Jennifer Gore: We do offer that up as an option.

Greg DiBiase: Okay.

Graeme Bunton: Just a reminder -- this is Graeme Bunton -- to say your name before you speak everybody. Thank you.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell. So you said the last RFI was five years ago.

Jennifer Gore: It was roughly five years ago. I'll have to go back and look.

Darcy Southwell: So in Hyderabad, which I believe was October of 2016, you presented us with a straw man...

Jennifer Gore: Straw man based on those responses.

Darcy Southwell: So the straw man given less than a year and a half ago was based on material that was five years old?

Jennifer Gore: Some of it was, yes absolutely.

Darcy Southwell: Okay I didn't realize that in Hyderabad but okay.

Jennifer Gore: I was presenting a straw man based on the information that had been collected as I inherited the project. And that was obviously the purpose of going out and doing an RFI to make sure we had updated and gathered updated information. And as you mentioned earlier, staff put together a summary of those nine RFI responses. And that's available on the wiki page along with each of the nine submissions.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Jennifer. So Darcy Southwell. So I guess my next question is, again, if we have a criteria that is necessary to determine what is technically and

commercially feasible and we don't have that information, what is staff's intention?

Jennifer Gore: Well staff would recommend to the Registrar Working Group -- and we'll be talking about this at the registrar roundtable -- I didn't think that we were going to get in depth to it, based on that current agenda. I don't see my name associated to this topic this morning. So staff would recommend that we put out a report with - along with the Registrar Working Group stating this was the criteria and we believe that there is not necessarily a provider in the marketplace that can deliver that criteria and we will look at it again in X amount period of time.

If we don't have a solution that's acceptable, I don't see the purpose of necessarily going to a vote, but I look for the Registrar Working Group to provide that input.

Darcy Southwell: No, that's helpful, Jennifer. Thank you.

Jennifer Gore: Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jennifer, and apologies for putting you on the spot (unintelligible) this morning.

Jennifer Gore: Oh no worries. That's okay.

Graeme Bunton: I've got Volker and then Michele in the queue.

Volker Greimann: Yes just one question. I mean sometimes you do the work and use your best efforts to determine the things that you think that would be knock-out criteria or criteria that we would have to have but sometimes you just don't think of something.

And then when you see the offer on the table by a certain provider or maybe even at a later stage you find out that hey wait a second, we didn't consider this thing that they had hidden somewhere in their contract and now that's a big problem and that means that the feasibility that we thought we had is out the window. Do we have any mechanism with dealing with such a situation or are we really on the spot of provide everything you can think of now because afterwards tough luck?

Jennifer Gore: I don't think that that's necessarily the situation, Volker. There's still recourse if the registrars vote it down by two-thirds, whatever the solution is that the Registrar Working Group and staff put forward. If there is something that is unforeseen that does appear, obviously I mean my response would be that I think we'd have to work together on that but I'm not familiar with anything that's on record or in a formal process today that exists.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jen. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks. Michele for the record. I suppose the simple question I would have is how do we kill this once and for all and now have to revisit it every couple of years? A couple of things you said there, and I know we've had these discussions previously, I don't want to see this again.

I mean if we finish putting together the list of criteria that we have been working on and the answer is nobody - there is no vendor out there that can provide the technical data and economically it's a dead duck, we don't want a situation where this comes back in six months, 12 months, 24 months or whatever just because somebody in the GAC woke up one morning and read a section of the RAA and didn't understand what the hell it meant and made a phone call or whatever the hell it is that started this down this silly route. So the question is how do we definitively close this?

Jennifer Gore: Well that's one of the items that I have listed on the registrar roundtable for Wednesday. The session's Wednesday at 6:30, so I'm hoping that you all will

intend. I'm sorry about the time that it's scheduled for. I didn't have anything to do with that. But I think it's a matter of us talking through that, right? I don't have the answer for you but I know that going through this exercise under my former predecessor, there wasn't actually a final report put out that stated what was deemed as being commercially and technically viable by the registrars.

So we're actually taking that step now. And in order to I believe to produce a report of substance, we need to be able to present what the registrars believe to be the case. But in that report, we could state something to the effect of we don't believe that there's necessarily a provider based on the RFI responses we've received that can meet this criteria. But that would be a decision made between staff and the Registrar Working Group with the help of the sub team within the Registrar Working Group.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. So I guess first apologies. What we should have done is probably started this with a brief making sure everybody understands what the heck we're talking about. Cross-field validation is a piece built into the 2013 RAA that says registrars need to -- I forget what the actual language is -- but essentially work to figure out at some point if validating fields across Whois data is commercially and technically feasible. So that would be like address exists on street, street exists in town, town exists in province, country, et cetera, et cetera.

Jennifer Gore: It is in the Whois accuracy spec.

Graeme Bunton: Right. And so this working group is sort of underway. It is registrars only, with ICANN staff, and it's been a bit of a bumpy road to try and figure out how this is supposed to move forward. None of us around the table actually believe that such a solution exists and is reasonable or possible. And so it's making sure that we go through this process and we do it extremely carefully, you know, to get to the outcome. So that's what we've just been chatting about for the past 25 minutes in case anybody was a little lost, I'm sorry.

Jennifer Gore: And I have one quick slide on it in the GDD update scheduled for 10:30, so we did kind of put the cart before the horse. So if anybody has any questions related to this, let me know and I'll be happy to answer them for you.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thanks, Jen.

Jennifer Gore: Thanks, Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Anybody else have - Tom?

Tom Keller: Tom Keller. Just one question. So we learned from Thomas Rickert that apparently in the (unintelligible) whatever thing ICANN proposed to fix GDPR there's apparently a thing saying that this exercise of cross-field validation should be (unintelligible) at a point of time. We're not able to police that anyway. Is that having any effect on that working group? I mean we don't really, you know, if this is going away with GDPR, do we still need to endure that working or can we close it down? Have you guys looked at that?

Jennifer Gore: So I acknowledge the fact that in the click book there are some information around accuracy related to GDPR. I can't name the actual section within in the GDPR that talks around address accuracy. I know there is an obligation in that. During the Registrar Working Group session on Thursday I also had out on the agenda for us to discuss the potentially impacts of GDPR on this obligation and was hoping that we can get some additional staff members more familiar with that topic than myself to speak on it. But I will make sure that we will take that question back and get it answered.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jen. Tom, so I think there are members of the community that are conflating -- and this is Graeme for the transcript -- that data owners, so like registrants in this case, have the ability to make sure that their data is accurate inside the GDPR and there are members of the community that are saying therefore we need to have cross-field validation and absolutely perfect

addresses inside the Whois. But that's a unique and interesting interpretation that I don't think anybody else believes to be true.

So there is nothing, and Thomas can clarify this for me because I think he's going to join us to talk about GDPR later, but I don't think there's any sense that push from other members of the community have any real basis in GDPR.

What else do we got on this particular topic? Did I see your hand, Pam? Was that...?

Pam Little: Just a very quick one in response to Jen's comment about data accuracy in the GDPR. There's also a principle of data minimization, so I'm not clear and don't know whether our members are clear. Are we going to, under the GDPR, still continue to collect postal address?

Graeme Bunton: Oh boy, Pam.

Pam Little: I'm just trying to understand why we're doing this cross-field validation at this juncture.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Pam. Because this is ICANN and nothing makes sense. Let's maybe park that question for some of the GDPR conversation. Tobias, do you got a - is what? Volker, did you want back in?

Volker Greimann: Just to Pam's question, I think we will collect the address but not because we are forced by ICANN but we want to do that as a business precaution or to be able to deliver the service or some part of the service. So we will certainly collect the address so we know who our customer is and where to send that invoice.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. So I think that - with that we can kind of wrap up this cross-field piece. No? I see Zoe waving her hand. Zoe?

Zoe Bonython: Chris Pelling has his hand up in Adobe Connect but he's also written a question in the chat so I'm not sure if he'd prefer to just speak it or I should just read the question.

Graeme Bunton: I can read the question, which is he can't remember but is the vote only open to cross-field RRSB Working Group or all registrar members? And it's actually not all - the working group from my understanding is all ICANN-accredited registrars, so it doesn't matter if they're a member of the SG or not. We don't have any say but that's a good question, Chris. I don't know if it's open to all registrars or just the working group. Do you know, Jen?

Jennifer Gore: Let me look that up real quick and I'll clarify and put it in the Adobe as a response to Chris.

Graeme Bunton: Most kind. Thank you, Jen. Okay so we're moving along pretty nice. Thank you everybody for allowing us to move that discussion forward. It is 9:54. We have a break in 20 minutes. What do we want to do with 20 minutes? Oh did you find it that quick, Jen?

Jennifer Gore: No I didn't. I was just going to volunteer that I could run through some of my slides because I know that a portion - the majority of the 10:30 to 11 for the GDD update I think that ya'll are going to be interested in -- ya'll, did you hear that?

Graeme Bunton: Yes. Wow.

Jennifer Gore: I've been in the south too long.

Michele Neylon: Wow you really are from the south, aren't you?

Man: (Unintelligible)

Jennifer Gore: I think you will be interested in hearing more about the naming services portal. And (Chris Gift) is going to be speaking on that and the functions associated to it with the email that went out to the primary contacts earlier this week.

Graeme Bunton: Oh I haven't seen that. Okay. So if we've got 20 minutes, let's - you want to work through some of your slides to leave more room in that session for the portal is what you're saying?

Jennifer Gore: Just if you were looking for something to fill the time.

Graeme Bunton: I mean yes, sure, that sounds good. We can move some of your update forward.

Jennifer Gore: I'm putting Zoe on the spot to pull them up.

Graeme Bunton: She has yet to fail us.

Jennifer Gore: I promise not say the word ya'll any more.

Graeme Bunton: If you want to join us up at the table, there's a seat by Sara Bockey over there or beside me. Or we can kick Michele out.

Jennifer Gore: Morning everyone. Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff. I'm have a Global Domains Division update for the Registrar Stakeholder Group. So we'll park the naming services portal version 1.0 and the portal roadmap for the actual 10:30 GDD update spot on the agenda, but I will quickly go through some announcements related to the GDD Summit, the global party satisfaction - or contracted parties satisfaction survey, some policy updates around privacy proxy, the IRTP review, Whois accuracy, with the cross-field validation we touched on that a second ago, and just a plug for sessions later this week, which is the registrar roundtable and the Thursday session for contracted parties and the GDPR interim model.

Thanks, Zoe. So on the registrar announcements, we are set to have the GDD Summit, this is the fourth summit, in British Columbia. So if you have not gone to the website recently, the agenda - the draft agenda with the topics and the sessions have been posted there. I know that some of you all need that for your travel arrangements, so please go there to see the agenda.

And on the Thursday the last day of the three-day summit - or the summit will run Monday through Wednesday, on Thursday, the day after, there will be a registration operations workshop, also known as ROW, in the same facility, if you're interested in that.

On the - can you - thanks, Zoe. The contracted party satisfaction survey, this is the second year that we're running this. GDD has partnered with the (Mida Group) to conduct the survey and the results will be shared with ICANN and the contracted party anonymously. And we'll use those key learnings and the results of that for engagement and our action plans. We'll be comparing the results of the 2017 survey to the 2018 survey, and that invitation to participate in that survey went out to the primary contacts. So if you would please participate in that before the deadline of April 13, that would be appreciated.

So program status updates. Privacy proxy, we had an IRT meeting earlier this week. From our perspective we believe that IRT is in the final stages of the reviewing the draft materials, which include revised LEA high priority request languages out for the IRT review right now and the reporting specification that we're also seeking feedback on.

So those two particular items are the open items that we see that we need to hopefully reach an agreement. I'm optimistic that we will. And the other materials that are out to the IRT right now for review are the agreement itself, the accreditation agreement, as well as the guidebook.

So from a milestone perspective, these are just target dates. We're seeking feedback on accreditation agreement by the 23rd of March and hope that if we're able to close out the two open items that I mentioned previously that we would target public comment for March 30.

During the comment period, the IRT will consider the transfer policy issues referred by the GNSO Council per the direction of the council. And the GNSO Council has invited me to come speak on that tomorrow, Wednesday. I don't remember the time. I'll look it up and let you know. I think it's 1 or 1:30. So I'll be presenting that to the council tomorrow, along with the IRTP review.

So last week staff sent to the IRT - sent to the GNSO Council a letter in regards to the review required under the IRTP. That was incorporated into the final report. Recommendation is for the GNSO Council to consider ICANN to convene a panel to collect and discuss and analyze relevant data, determine if the policy updates resulted in improvements to the IRT process and dispute mechanisms and identify possible remaining shortcomings. GDD has proposed to deliver a post-implementation IRTP status report to the council by the first of May. Yes. And there's the session tomorrow at 2 o'clock.

So moving on is the one that we just talked about around Whois accuracy. As Darcy also mentioned, we received nine responses. We provided a top line summary of those responses to the Registrar Working Group, and that's available on the wiki page today. The registrar sub team was formed to draft formal criteria for a solution.

The registrar services will also present acceptable criteria for the sub team for their review. And there I incorporated some tentative next steps regarding the sub team and GDD to share the acceptable criteria and compare the gaps and then present the data to the larger Registrar Working Group by mid March tentatively.

And just the last slide, this is a plug for our other two sessions later this week and I hope you all can join us for the roundtable on Wednesday and the GDPR session on Thursday at 12:30. Any questions? The good stuff is the name your service portal.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jen. This is Graeme. I'm sure we look forward to hearing about the portal, given that it's been like four and a half years or something. I think we all look forward to the GDD in beautiful spring Vancouver. Technically it's (Richmond), which is like the (Restin) of Vancouver. It's actually not that far out. Anyway, it's lovely, so I'm excited for that. Do we have any other questions on those bits and pieces for Jen while we have GDD staff in the - and you have a hand there, Zoe.

Zoe Bonython: Yes there's a comment from Chris in the chat. Can you please read?

Graeme Bunton: Oh I did see that. I think the short answer was that out of the contract, it's the working group members that vote, not necessarily all ICANN-accredited registrars, so the people participate - so, sorry. For cross-field validation where this working group is created and we get to vote on whether it's feasible or not, the language says that it's the working group members, not necessarily all ICANN-accredited registrars. So it's those of us who participate. So if you're participating in there, get in there and when we get around to that, we'll vote.

Jennifer Gore: And if you'd like to join, just let me know.

Graeme Bunton: It's really not such a bad working group because it is only registrars, which is to say it's - anyway.

Michele Neylon: There are ICANN staff on there as well.

Graeme Bunton: Of course. Anybody else have comments or thoughts for Jen while we've got her here and before we - we've got proxy and privacy on for this afternoon

and so we've got I think more time set aside for that because we need to have a more fulsome discussion than I think we can have in the next ten minutes between now and the break.

We keep moving quickly through this agenda. Anyone else? Questions, hands, comments? I don't know what we can do with ten minutes. Zoe knows what we can do with ten minutes. Yay!

Zoe Bonython: I don't take credit for this. This is Christian's suggestion. We could do the tech ops updates if Tobias is only ten minutes.

Graeme Bunton: Delightful.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias speaking. So tech ops update. Yes we met yesterday and had a nice discussion for one hour about our - all of our topics. So just a short update on that. So actually I guess everybody read their recap that Zoe sent. So it's nothing new besides the recap.

We had a discussion to do the other calls and biweekly instead of monthly. We will stick to the rotation plan that we currently have for the calls. We - on the registry maintenance modifications thing, we have a new version for the draft, the IATF draft, and we will submit that by the end of the next week when the IATF will allow us to submit it.

We also have some new topics that discussed, like standardized registry reporting repository, which is led by Neal McPherson. The idea behind it is that we will get SO registrars a standardized repository and reports to pull from registries. There was a survey that Neal sent around. Do you want to say something to that, Neal?

Neal McPherson: Neal McPherson for the record. Yes. So we put together a very rough survey to try and get some feedback with regards to the reports. There was some questions from the registries and the registry, registrar tech ops group with

regards to the report, so the survey went out to all of the tech ops members I guess late last night but I can forward it again to the members.

Tobias Sattler: Thank you, Neal. Tobias speaking. Yes and we'll do a working session during the GDD Summit on this topic. Furthermore we submitted the letter last week on Thursday to Akram regarding GDPR impact on domain in transit and registrants changes. He confirmed that he got this letter. He will publish on the ICANN GDPR page, which hasn't happened still now.

We also discussed what might be our next steps so - but we came - I think we came to the conclusion that we will wait till ICANN gets back to us or least post it on the website.

Another thing is the GDD Summit itself. So as far as I've seen there's one and a half days reserved for tech ops sessions on this draft agenda. So we will try to set up working sessions on roundtable so it's not getting too large. The topics - the proposed topics were standardized registry reporting repository, the future of domain name transfers, registry/registrar administrative maintenance and registry mapping.

So on the registry/registrar administrative maintenance it was brought up by Jim from Affilias. It was regarding how we can keep or maintain the current contact information for registries and registrars. So this is an open discussion because right now we have (Radar) and we will hopefully see it sometime a new portal, then see how we can actually do something. And we have this registry mapping.

That's an idea that came up from - through IATF Records Working Group to describe technical aspect of registries and TLDs through XML. I think Jody knows more of that than I do, if you want to share something on that, the registry mapping. You want to say something to that?

Jody Kolker: Hi this is Jody. So GoDaddy's been working with Jim Gould from VeriSign on this. Basically a registry mapping is something that would allow registrars to be able to determine how a registry is configured, for example, renewal grace periods, auto renewals, redemption grace periods, that type of thing. And what we're hoping is by implementing - if registries do implement something like this, registrars would be able to download that and be able to configure their own systems and would implementing new TLDs much quicker than what we currently have.

Tobias Sattler: Thank you. Yes, that's more or less an update from the tech ops group.

Graeme Bunton: Cool. Thanks, Tobias. This is Graeme. So for those new people in the room or people who have somehow missed that, we have -- again, I apologize, I'm doing these things backwards -- we have inside the RrSG a tech ops group. It's where we send our technical people, our product managers, some engineers, to get together and - on a regular basis and discuss and sort through the operational technical issues that we all have and begin to build solutions for those things.

It also meets semi-regularly with the registry side of the things to do with the registries. They have their tech ops. We now have a joint tech ops so that we can sort out those issues where we have technical issues with registries as well. They are doing great work. They came up with this piece on transfers recently. My sense is that we didn't have quite enough time in the room the other - yesterday because there's lots to discuss.

So if you're not involved and would like to be, talk to Tobias to get yourselves in there -- or Zoe probably, Zoe and Tobias -- because more good, strong technical voices in there is really helpful. And I also think this is just a wonderful example of the value that the stakeholder group can provide to members so that it's not just sitting here rambling about policy like a bunch of goofballs for forever, that as a member you get this access to this technical

expertise and begin to be able to participate in resolving thorny technical issues.

I saw a hand from Neal.

Neal McPherson: Hi this is Neal. I'd also add to that, Graeme, that's maybe not even relevant for the people in this room, right? So they don't even need to get involved. Maybe go back home to the office and get some of your tech people involved. It's a group where light involvement is completely okay usually. You don't have to cover or follow the topics for years, right?

So you can just jump in and jump on maybe, for example, this repository one or standardize transaction reports. You can just jump in kind of for a couple of weeks, give some feedback per email, you don't have to jump on the calls. Just any kind of involvement is - and ideas are very welcome.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Neal. That's true that it's not a heavy lift. I can't wait to get in on the standardized transaction reporting, because oh my God, do I hate having to reconcile registry transactions. Who names a file text.txt? Anyway. Grumble.

Ten-thirteen. Thank you for the update, Tobias. Anybody else have questions on tech ops or anything else we've covered this morning? Great. Okay. So let's take I think we've got a 15-minute break now. You're welcome. It's 17 minutes, given that extra two. We'll see you back here ready to go at 10:30 sharp, please and thank you. We can pause the recording.

END