

ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO – Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) Meeting Part 1
Tuesday, 31 October 2017 09:00 GST

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

On page: <https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Graeme Bunton: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Let's all take our seats and get going please and thank you. Are we good at the back of the room? Cool.

All right good morning and welcome. Happy Halloween everybody for those of us from North America who celebrate to these sorts of things. We'll see how long I can tolerate having this silly thing on my head. It exudes authority I know.

I see a couple new faces around the room. So my name is Graeme Bunton. I'm from Tucows. I'm the Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Thank you all for coming. You can see the agenda on the screen. We've got lots and lots to cover today and not a lot of time. I'd like to do an introduction

at least around the table to see who everybody is. And I do see some new faces so we can do that.

So maybe what we'll do is start at the end and we'll go around and maybe get some people to say hello and say your name. And I'd like to encourage participation. Sometimes it can be a little nerve-racking to speak especially if you haven't spoken at an ICANN meeting before. This is a friendly room for the most part. But no one should be afraid to speak up in here and offer their thoughts. And so this is a nice gentle way to begin doing that so let's introduce ourselves and where you're from.

Amy Pont: So my name's Amy. I'm from Namecamp and this is my first ICANN. Hello. So yes very new to domain. This is my first meeting, recently joined the group so I'm just here to get as much info as I can. I'd be a little confused also (help).

Janelle McAlister: And I'm Janelle McAlister from Brandsight.

(Sidi Esk): (Sidi Esk), West Africa.

Alex Schwertner: Alex Schwertner from Tucows.

Sara Bockey: Sara Bockey with GoDaddy.

Tom Barrett: Tom Barrett, Incirca.

(Susie Prover): (Susie Prover), One.com.

Theo Geurts: Theo Geurts, NomCom.

Kristian Ørmen: Kristian Ørmen, Larson Data.

Ben Anderson: Ben Anderson, CSC NetNames, Treasurer.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias Sattler, United Domains, Vice Chair

Graeme Bunton: Graeme Bunton, Tucows Chair.

Zoe Bonython: And Zoe Bonython. I'm the Secretariat to the Registrars.

Pam Little: Pam Little from Alibaba. I'm the incoming GNSO Councilor, one of the three I guess.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell, Endurance International. I'm one of the GNSO Councilors.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Black Knight. I'm another one of the GNSO counselors. And Mr. Chair sort of why you think Halloween's an American thing. It's actually Irish.

Bob Wiegand: Wiegand Web.com.

(Java Briggs): (Java Briggs), (Putts).com.

Jacques Blanc: Jacques Blanc, Pro Domains.

Rob Villeneuve: Rob Villeneuve, Rebel.com.

Eric Rokobauer: Eric Rokobauer, Endurance International and jealous of Graeme's IPs.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Lindsay Hamilton-Reid, (One One). I'm not jealous of your IPs.

Neil McPherson: McPherson 1&1.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller, 1&1.

Jeff Neuman: Jeff Neuman, Cum Laude. This is my first ICANN meeting.

Susan Jang: Susan Jang from Google.

Heath Dixon: Heath Dixon, Amazon Registrar. And not with me today is (Greg Diviasi). Those of you who know him his wife just had a baby three days ago so yes. He'll be here next time though.

Graeme Bunton: Right. So there are people who haven't introduced themselves at the back of the room, feel free. There's a mic up there if you want to engage with us today. You're welcome to do so. There is also spaces around the table. You can feel free to join us up here. You don't have to be anyone special. You can just be anyone to join us.

A couple things before we really got going and I kick it over to James to talk about the GNSO. There are brochures about the Registrar Stakeholder Group by the coffee. They are in Chinese, Arabic and English. So feel free to pick one of those up if you'd like to learn more about who we are and what we do.

The other thing probably to mention is that we've had a bunch of new members over the past couple months I think we're what did you say 108 members currently. So it's yes which is amazing. And I - probably getting close to as big as we've ever been. So new members are Brandma, Brandsight, Ename, (Aptitech), Namecamp. All these people I think have joined up since we were last in Johannesburg so welcome to the Stakeholder Group everybody.

So what I think we're going to do is kick it right over to people who are not me and experts on the particular issues that we've given them. So first off we're going to have James talking about what's happening at the GNSO, council issues, motions, things we need to be aware of. James good morning welcome.

James Bladel: Thank you. Good morning Graeme and everyone. And I apologize for being late. There's a little bit blue rope maze now coming into the center. And I fully expected to have a piece of cheese waiting for me, actually just navigating that but and I also appreciate whoever put outgoing on my name card. It makes me feel very loved.

So the GNSO council met as usual. We met for the entire day Sunday as part of our working session actually here in this room and covered updates from our various PDPs including I think many of you were engaged in those PDP working groups. And I know Jeff is and Michele are part of the leadership teams for a couple of them.

I don't know that we have a lot to report on those particular groups individually unless you want me to go into great detail. I will say that we are and we have a couple of them that are right in the heart of their activities in one the working group that's looking at IGO INGO access to curative rights mechanisms which is a very cumbersome and way of saying can people who don't have brands use UDRP and URS as if they were brands like Doctors Without Borders or World Bank or something like that? And I think the answer we're circling around is yes with some conditions. But that group is going to be winding down and will present a - its final report and final recommendations to the council shortly - kind of shortly after this meeting.

We don't have a very cumbersome agenda for Wednesday. We only have one item up for a vote and it is - would normally be a consent agenda item. But because it is a nomination for a position we're going to have a vote on it. It is the new liaison from the GNSO to the GAC and that will be (Yolf). As many of you know (Yolf) he's a very accomplished person who's been around the council for a while. Carlos our current liaison will be stepping down and will be because he's been appointed as a NomCom appointee to the council. So all of that will take effect on the second half of our meeting on Wednesday at which point I will also be stepping down.

Pam will be stepping into my chair along with the other group of incoming counselors and then the first order of business for that group will be to elect a new chair. And for many of you know Heather Forrest current vice chair is running on a post so I think it's not too presumptuous to say that Heather will probably leave this meeting being the chair of GNSO.

We have a couple of items up for discussion that I think are and particularly really interesting to registrars. One is Whois conflicts with local law. This I have previously referred to as, you know, a black hole or catnip or agenda killer or whatever because it seems to be one of these topics that once it comes up on the table is just turns into the circular firing squad and nobody knows what to do with it.

Michele and I have been working with some of our counterparts and some of the other stakeholder groups to try and put some boundaries around what we want to talk about. And I think the answer is we want to find a way that we can move this forward by speaking with one voice to the GDD in particular a letter from (Akram) about how we can use this process in an intelligent way not trying to cram every GDPR nightmare through this overloaded process but instead using it for those one-off situations like it was designed. And I think right now the question is yes this process could work for registries and registrars but nobody can use it because the triggering mechanisms are essentially out of reach.

I'm trying to think if there's any other major items coming up in front of the council and I'm really drawing a blank. There's a lot of internal housekeeping at this particular meeting. One thing we weren't prepared for coming in to this meeting was that the board had suspended one of the review teams. Maybe you saw that announcement on Friday. They're caught a lot of folks off guard that that was even being discussed as a possibility and I think has also raised some questions about the independence of review teams which prior to the transition were part of the affirmation of commitments and thought to be somewhat, you know, insulated from things with the board. And suspending it

may be perfectly appropriate and may be perfectly the right course of action. But I think the fact that everyone was caught off guard by that decision and sort of left in the blind I think is more concerning than anything else at this point.

So I'll stop there. That's I think you'll see some of these items will come up it looks like later in our agenda including the Whois conflicts with local law. I think you're going to see some of the updates on some of the PDPs so but from that point on I guess I take it back over to Graeme and if anyone has any questions about the council it's a fairly light agenda for this meeting but it's setting up quite a few things between leaving Abu Dhabi and the end of the year. So I expect the November and December meetings to be pretty busy. And of course that's Pam's problem. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you James. I saw Jeff and then I think Michele in the queue. Before I get to either of you to we should note that James has spent how many years on council now three?

Woman: Four.

Man: Four.

Graeme Bunton: Four.

James Bladel: Two two year terms so...

Graeme Bunton: Good heavens and has done an admirable job as Chair of the GNSO Council and served us all really, really hard. And we owe him a debt of gratitude and big thanks so thank you very much. Now Jeff follow that up with a question.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks (unintelligible) I follow that. This is Jeff Neuman. On the - one thing I wanted to be bring up on the SSR Review Team, the Security Stability Resiliency Review Team and I wanted to just bring it to the registrar's

attention because I think it's important. There is the issue of the board just suspending the Review Team and, you know, whether that's decision the board should make or the community.

But putting that aside the reason it was suspended is because there are some groups that feel that the Review Team has gone beyond the scope of what was intended. And one of the reasons I want to point it out for us as registrars is that for whatever reason there seems to be a large focus on registrar compliance or lack thereof in their view and inaccurate Whois information as being threats to the security stability and resiliency of the Internet. It's – I know there's a lot going on but I've looked into some things and there was a huge data request from the SSR Review Team to ICANN on a boatload of information about registrars, about compliance, about inaccurate Whois information. And my fear is first of all we have a Whois Review Team okay. So why would the SSR Review Team need to look at that information anyway?

Second of all the data that they're looking for is all of our data. And so that's, you know, we need to be careful about why our data is going to be used if it's took disclosed to this Review Team. And third I don't necessarily view Whois information to be anything related to the security stability resiliency of the Internet. The Internet's not going to go down from inaccurate Whois information. Usually security, stability and resiliency is looking at core things that, you know, things like DNS SEC and looking at certain types of DNS abuse. But they're trying to lump in inaccurate information Whois information with DNS abuse. And that's how they're kind of justifying its inclusion in the SSR Review Team. So while I don't like the fact that the board has paused it I do think as now that it's being asked for the community for our input we should provide input on the scope and what they've come up with. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Jeff. I see James wants to follow-on that. Do you have the cycle to take a first crack at a letter or a comment on that one?

Jeff Neuman: I can certain – this is Jeff Neuman. I can certainly help someone find the materials but I just with the sub pro stuff I don't have any cycles.

Graeme Bunton: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry.

Graeme Bunton: James?

James Bladel: So yes thanks - for that's a lot to take in. So first of all the scope is a huge problem at least that's what the board has expressed. These Review Teams and that's part of their independence has been self-scoping. And so usually we would wait until, you know, after I guess the scope had been established. So I think it is concerning the type of information. They're also asking at least my understanding is they're also making a lot of requests about ICANN's internal information security practices. And that's concerning to ICANN staff that they would – they feel that they're being audited I think is one of the words that they were using that this is an infosec audit of ICANN itself not just the – so there's concern they're going way beyond the scope. That's one.

There's concern that they are not making a lot of progress that they're - they've now heavily, you know, a year now on that they're kind of doing a lot of wheel spending. There's concern that they're– I think there's a little bit of a turf thing going on between them and the SSAC which also believes it's within their remit to perform these analyses. You know, and I think there's also some personality issues between some folks on that Review Team and the staff, the supporting staff that they're leading that that's led to some very heated discussion, some of them on the public record if you want to go look that up.

As far as what to do about it and asking Jeff for cycles or if you want to help Jeff I think the best thing is the SOs and ACs – I'm sorry the supporting organizations and the advisory committees a voice to the GNSO is one, you

know created this monster because when it moved out of the Affirmation of Commitments part of the transition it was that authority was handed to collectively to the community, to the empowered community.

So I think the GNSO needs to respond to this board's action and say, "Here's what our concerns are, you know and here's what we believe to be the path forward." And we need to do that in conjunction with the ccNSO and the GAC and the ALAC and everybody else.

So I'm actually I'm looking to our councilors over here on my left but I think that that needs to begin quickly as far as like, you know, coming right of this meeting we need to start working on what it's going to take to get this group back on track. If that's limiting the scope as Jeff mentioned if it's maybe changing out leadership, you know, I think we should put it all on the table and say what do we need to do to get this thing back on track and get it focused? And that's got to come from the GNSO and then they've got to work with some of the other SOs and ACs. So I can help with that but I, you know, I won't be on council when all that happens so I'm kind of looking for you guys to pick up that and run with it. So and I think very concerned is we talked to some of the other groups and they were just as blindsided as we were Jeff.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you James. This is Graeme for the transcript. And I am terrible at saying my name so reminder to everybody else when you're talking to say your name. It just occurred to me James that there's someone who seems reasonably dialed up on this issue who's going to have some chat time.

James Bladel: I love how's everybody's already spending my spare time.

Graeme Bunton: Just saying so...

James Bladel: I'll help if I can.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. I think I had Michele in the queue.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Graeme, Michele for the record. Now just going back to the general kind of overview stuff of the GNSO Council while Heather will be elected unless something goes terribly, terribly, terribly wrong we do – James' experience in Dublin was interesting. And also bear in mind that there are two vice chairs that will also be seated. Donna Austin will be the vice chair from the Contracted Party House and it looks like Rafik Dammak from the Non-Commercials will be from the other house.

Going – yes another thing that's on the – well up for review, discussion, I don't know what we want to frame it at the council we've been sent something on the ICANN supported travel budget and how that money is spent and what we think about it and what kind of things people should be looking at et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And that budget is out of control I would say.

The number of supported travelers that are receiving airfares, per diems, hotels and everything else has been growing and growing over years. Now the - it's - this – this does not mean that I personally or anybody else has an issue with ICANN providing supported travel to people who are actually attending ICANN meetings and doing work. I will freely admit myself, James and several other people up here we are getting supported travel to be here this week. I've actually no issue with that. We're most of us end up spending half or more of our time at attending GNSO council meeting sessions and other things like that. We're not here kind of slumming around the place and shopping in hallways what (unintelligible) whatever.

But there are a very, very large number of people who are getting support from ICANN and it's not at all clear what the hell they're doing. They're not participating in working groups. They're not taking leadership positions within the community. It's not at all clear what they're actually doing and what they're bringing to the table. And this is part of a larger, broader conversation

about the ICANN budget both for the ICANN corporate and as well for PTI and the IANA functions, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I mean for those of you who aren't familiar the sources of revenue the drive all of this aren't fairly limited. I mean essentially it's registries, registrars and then it's a couple of other bits and pieces that come in there. But the amounts of money involved our way, way lower.

And as James and others would probably remind you all, you know, if ICANN starts running out of cash it's going to turn to those sources of revenue which is something we've already seen in our discussions around proxy, privacy implementation where ICANN seems to think that they can start charging all of us another accreditation fee per year to make up some of that shortfall. So something we need to keep an eye on. And if anybody has a little bit of bandwidth and wants to dive further into that and their help would be greatly appreciated.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Michele. I see Owen at the microphone.

Owen DeLong: Come on – there we go. Owen DeLong for the transcript. I wanted to address actually two things and I'll do it in reverse order. First in addition to what Michele's talking about with the travel it came to my attention that ICANN is potentially seeking to restore or replenish its reserves fund by taking money out of the what I call make money fast slush fund from the domain auctions proceeds which I think is absolutely a bad idea because I don't think that will turn into a onetime thing. I think it'll turn into the excuse ICANN uses for going ahead and being (unintelligible) with spending in other areas and then well we'll just take it out of the reserves and then replenish that from the domain proceeds and pretty soon we won't have domain proceeds. You know, obviously they're working towards another round of producing an even bigger slush fund but that'll happen later.

Taking another step back with regards to the Review Team and actually it's more generic the comment that I have to make and this may not be the best

place to make it but it seems to me that if these Review Teams are going to be self-scoping we ought to work towards putting a process in place where the first order of business for the Review Team is to establish the scope and then send that out for comment and end up with a concrete community supported scope that they are then working against going forward rather than allowing for this potential scope creep that seems to be at least part of how the SSRT 2 Team has gotten where they are. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Owen. Right. This is Graeme for the transcript. Option proceeds there is a Cross Community Working Group. (Elliott) from Tucows is on that but he is not at this meeting to give us an update on where that's going but I can ask him to send an email or something. I'm sure he's got lots of time too. Do we have any other thoughts in the room on this agenda item on activities with the GNSO level stuff? I see Volker's got a hand up.

Volker Greimann: Yes just something that rose inside the PPSAI Working Group IRT which is looking at whether the IRT has the ability to look at the problem of updating or changing, adding or removing privacy in context of the - of a transfer policy.

Staff has been adamant that we do not have that mandate without the GNSO telling us that we have that mandate. So that's something that I would like GNSO counselors between the meetings bring up to the GNSO and give that mandate to the IRT so that we would be able to say that the IRT can't decide on whether updates to a privacy services adding removing privacy services are or are not, spoiler warning are not part of the IoT process and therefore would not trigger the owner change mechanism. Currently this has been set aside by the board until the GNSO so makes a decision on that. But we never know how long this stay by the board will last.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Volker. This is Graeme. And that's actually on me. So s there's been some back channel conversations between myself and members of essentially the Intellectual Property constituency around how to move that forward to make sure that they're not going to provide a lot of friction when

we push this to the GNSO. And so I need to follow-up on those conversations and make sure we can do that. I think the answer's going to be that we're going to tell them as nicely as possible that what it is we're really looking to do is invite the former members of the IRTPC IRT and for those in the room who don't enjoy acronym soup it will be the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C Implementation Review Team. And we should all try and not use acronyms because for the worst. Invite those members still around in the community to join the privacy and proxy Implementation Review Team to essentially say that that there should be no interpretive action between the policy and the privacy and proxy. Otherwise there's going to be all sorts of pain. So I need to talk with the other side of the house and then hopefully we can move that forward.

But I've certainly been hearing about that from staff and other people so that's important we get that done. Any other thoughts on GNSO issues Before we carry on with our agenda moving quickly which is nice? Okay next up is going to be sub pro Work Track 5 Geo names from Jeff Neuman. And you're going to explain I think what that means.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thank you. This is Jeff Neuman. In fact since we have plenty of time I might just group all the other subsequent procedures work tracks in there. I'll start with five and see if there's other issues. Unless...

Graeme Bunton: Sorry just very briefly this is Graeme again. If you could just because people not might not know...

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: ...what these are give us a good sort of high level before we dig into that. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I was planning to do that. Okay so Sub Pro stands for Subsequent Procedures which is a short form of the name for a policy development

process on the introduction of additional New gTLDs after this last round from 2012. So it's been five years, more than five years now since applications have been accepted for new generic top-level domains. And originally in 2012 it was thought that the next round of New gTLD applications would start one year after the close of applications of the last round. So in theory it was supposed to start in 2013.

Be that as it may there are a bunch of reviews going on of the last round of New gTLDs. And this group that I am one of the co-chairs was established in 2016 I think it was, maybe even late 2015. But it's basically to look at the last round of New gTLDs and propose procedures and processes for the next round or rounds or the opening of application windows in the future. So it wasn't meant to just look at the next round but it was meant to look at the introduction of New gTLDs forever.

And so the GNSO Council had created a or had opened a - initiated a policy development process and there were a whole host of issues that were put into our charter that we should look at. We at that point we divided all of those issues into initially four Work Tracks. Work Track 1 was to look at really general application issues, support, applicant support meeting funds available to those that couldn't necessarily afford to pay for an application and also to find other ways to support those especially from developing countries.

Additionally in Work Track 1 we're looking at the determination of what the fee or how to – the formula by which to determine the fees to apply for New gTLDs. We're looking at whether there should be something called a registry service provider approval process, a preapproval so that ICANN doesn't have to evaluate the same registry back in provider let's say 300 times. So in this last round for example I think Affilias was the backend operator for a couple hundred New gTLDs but ICANN had to evaluate them each and every time 200 times. And so that seems efficient.

And actually one of the coleaders of Work Track one Sara Bockey from GoDaddy is one of the coleaders. Work Track 2 deals with legal and regulatory issues or they were grouped into those. And I really think that this Work Track, Work Track 2 really affects a lot of the registrars. It deals with issues like vertical integration so under what circumstances are registries and registrars allowed to be integrated, what kind of exceptions are there to that rule. It also includes exceptions to those, the vertical integration roles so like .brands have certain exceptions from keeping their books and records separate and other types of requirements.

It talks about the requirement to not discriminate amongst registrars or between registrars. And one that I know Michele pays close attention to the issue of closed generics and whether those should be allowed to go forward. So that's an issue of whether you would let a company like Walmart have .grocery and allow them to keep it only for themselves and not allow them to or not force them to allow third parties to register in this space.

Work Track 2 also considers the registry agreement and part of that or subsumed in that is the requirement that registries have registry registrar agreements with registrars. There's been a concern expressed by the Registrar Stakeholder Group that they'd like to see more standardization with the registry registrar agreements. So that would fit into Work Track 2.

Work Track 3 is deals with things like objections to applications for New gTLDs, dispute resolution processes, community evaluations. So in the last round if you could qualify as a community you were given priority over anyone else that applied for the same string and so those issues are looked at in Work Track 3.

And finally Work Track 4 deals with more of a technical issues of the evaluation criteria both from a technical perspective, a financial and as well a business perspective. It also looks at things like name collision, internationalized domain names and some other technical issues. So it was

Work Tracks 1 through 4 that we had for a long period of time. What we realized over a couple of years is that there seemed to be a lot of interest in the use of geographic names at the top level. For a whole host of reasons there were certain rules that were put into place in the Applicant Guidebook which was the essentially kind of like the RFP for anybody the Request for Proposal if someone wanted a New gTLD. And in that Applicant Guidebook there were rules that set forth certain top-level domains that you could - either couldn't apply for at all or certain terms that you could apply for but only if you got consent. And so things like country names or city names -- things like that were governed under the Applicant Guidebook.

But after the rounds had started there was some names that were applied for -- and I won't go into any specific examples -- but there were names that were applied for that weren't specifically covered by the Applicant Guidebook in certain lists. And there was advice that was given by the GAC, the Government Advisory Committee to either not allow them to proceed or that certain changes needed to be made in applications. So I will get - I guess I'll give some examples.

So .Amazon is one of them, (.spa) which I know many of you knew was a city in Belgium, dot - what's the other one that was a Montenegro .bar, you know, because if you want to have a New gTLD dedicated to drinking establishments you of course know about the city of Bar in Montenegro. So there were objections that were received on those TLDs and a bunch of others that were maybe not what you would think of as geographic but maybe were culturally sensitive so .Persiangulf, .allah I think or .Islam. So there were certain ones that were applied for that were deemed controversial and still are deemed controversial.

So there is a new Work Track 5 that was created to deal with these issues specifically involving those types of names. And because this topic was of high interest to a large percentage of the ICANN community including other supporting organizations like the country codes supporting organization as

well as the GAC and the At-Large we decided to try a little bit of a unique format for this Work Track 5 where although it's still under the GNSO policy development process we decided to have one coleader of Work Track 5 from each of the supporting organizations and advisory committees.

Sol from the GNSO we have Martin Sutton, from - you may know him from the Brand Registry Group. From the ccNSO the countries we have Annebeth Lange from Norway. We have from the ALAC and the at-large we have Christopher Wilkinson who he's (unintelligible) who has been with the ICANN community for a number of years and now you're making me laugh. The Governmental Advisory Committee we have Olga Cavalli who many of you know is very active in the GAC and is actually up for chair. I don't know what's going to happen there but I think that's going to be announced in the next few minutes.

So those coleaders have come together. We're working on a terms of reference for that Work Track 5 to see what's in and out of scope and have just issued maybe a week or so ago a call for volunteers to see who wants to serve on that. Now this may not be the biggest issue for registrars. You know, if you think about kind of registrars in the very narrow sense but from a ICANN standpoint from an existential issue from a macro issue having, you know, this really is about the multi-stakeholder model. And with certain cases of geographic names the GAC has given advice and the board has just decided to accept it without looking as to whether there was a public policy reason or a legal basis behind it. And so essentially the governments were given a veto right over certain New gTLD applications. And that was something that through the transition process that was something we were promised would not happen. That is it's truly a multi-stakeholder organization and governments are not given a veto right.

So what I think is good about this is it's the first time that the GAC has officially agreed to participate in a policy development process along with the ccNSO and ALAC. And once we get through some of the red tape and

demands that the other organizations have made on how this group runs I think once we get to the substance I think it's going to be very interesting. And there's a meeting on I guess it's tomorrow at 8:30 in the morning I know it's early but there's a meeting from 8:30 to Noon to talk about the scope and to have a first face to face meeting of that Work Track. I don't know I'll stop there to see if there's questions.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Jeff. There is a lot in there. I see James has his hand up. James?

James Bladel: So things Graeme, thanks Jeff, James speaking. And this is – this Work Track 5 just underlying Jeff's point this is really important. We had a number of sentiments expressed that these ideas of geographical or cultural or heritage intellectual, cultural intellectual property I've heard terms is just too important to allow the GNSO and multi-stakeholder model to wrestle with these issues. They belong with governments and I think there was a building, a groundswell of support for the idea that this should create a new CCWG that could examine this for years and kicked to, you know, next round, who knows. But I think the characterization I made fair or not was that I'd rather see the PDP swallow the CCWG instead of the other way around.

Jeff and Avri previously before she left for the board and now Cheryl Langdon-Orr have done a great job in rounding up all the different communities to get them to send leaders to this. What we're wrestling with now is that they've all come to participate with terms and conditions attached to their participation like well I want to join this group but I that doesn't mean I necessarily sign off on the outcome or how decisions are made. And we're trying to reconcile that with the roles of how PDPs work and I know Jeff is going to keep a close eye on that.

But this raises so many just fundamental and existential questions. I mean it was really easy the first time around. It's like here's the ccTLD ISO 3166 2 alpha-2 list. You can't have these strings. But now we're getting into words, you know, like I live on the Mississippi River if I wanted to get .Mississippi and

I can trust people to spell that do I have to go to the state of Mississippi to get permission? Do I have to get permission from every state on the Mississippi? You know, do I have to go to the Corps of Engineers, the Army Corps of engineers that manages the river?

Who do, you know, at some point you kind of start to get ridiculous in all the absurd governments that claim that they have the remit to decide who gets to operate these things. I think Paul McGrady made a good point is like if he's from Toledo if he wanted .Toledo does he go to Spain or Ohio, you know? It - so I'm really glad you're taking this on. I don't expect it's going to be a very smooth ride and I think we should all just help Jeff not even if we're not really super excited as registrars about potentially carrying (Geo) names in the next round it's really important that we not allow folks to take a machete to the dictionary when it comes to the possible words it could be used in top level. Thanks.

Bob Wygant: Bob Wygant with .com. I'd like to first thank Professor Neuman. In all seriousness that was an excellent summary of a lot of the issues that are confronting this whole next round of TLDs. So that was Jeff really, really well done. It's I assume in the transcript. That's something that will be really beneficial for somebody who doesn't understand the process very well to go back and read that again. That was excellent. So with five worktracks this is just your personal opinion Jeff, this is going to be what several more years before these issues are resolved? What's your general opinion on about how long it will take to get through five now separate worktracks? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. This is Jeff Newman. Thanks Bob it's a good question and I probably should have covered that. So putting aside Work Track 5 just for the moment the Work Tracks 1 through 4 have been underway for a good amount of time already. And we've already had a couple of comment periods and it's our intent and hope that we can get the preliminary report out for public comment by no later than early April 2018 -- so that's a few months away so is just after the next ICANN meeting -- and that we could have a final report after getting

comments in by the end of 2018. I know that sounds far away but that would be a big accomplishment.

Work Track 5 it's hard to say what the timeline is for that but we will do everything within our power to have that effort last less than a year from beginning to end. So it's going to require work from everyone involved but it is a narrow set of visions. It's not like it's, you know, 100 different issues. It, you know, you can break it down.

So should we continue to protect two characters whether or not they are currently ccTLDs in other words should they be reserved for the country codes? I think most people in the community would say yes right in cases of new country two character should be reserved for that. That's generally agreed.

Then you get to the next step well what about three characters? Currently the current rules are you can't apply for a three character if it's a three characters screen string that's on the ISO-2166-2 which means the short form or abbreviation of country so...

Man: Thirty-one sixty-six alpha-2.

Jeff Neuman: Right yes sorry, 3166 yes, yes. So like USA or C-A-N, CAN for Canada. Unfortunately there are some names that were already taken on that list. So .com is actually the nation and I would say it wrong (Camara arrows) or (Camaros) or (Comros) thank you and there's some others that are already taken. So do you say well there is no confusion because obviously no one is confused with, you know, whatever it is and .com? So that's going to be a little bit trickier. But I sense the community might be able to rally around that because it's really not that many names to agree to keep the same rules in place.

Then you get to the more tricky ones right country names and territory names and city names and rivers and all the others. That's where most of the time is going to be spent on. So again timeline we're looking to be finished by the end of 2018 so that we can really get into implementation then start this thing off. I would love by the end of 2019 early 2020 but, you know, that's all going to depend on the participation of the entire community and what we're doing now so that we don't have to wait for all the groups to throw in their objections after we give our final report.

One thing we're trying to do now is focus more on implementation issues while we're developing the policy. So if you all remember if you were around 2008 was when the GNSO sent the final policy to the ICANN board. And so everyone thought the next round was going to start in early 2009. That was what was promised. But implementation of that took until 2012.

Hopefully - so that's another four years. Hopefully we've handled a lot of this implementation issues so that we don't have to have a long period of quote implementation. And hopefully we've addressed the issue so that those who come late to the game we can say well sorry we've already addressed that, we've already dealt with that, thank you, but you should have been here two years earlier.

So that's my hope and if we can participate that I'd make a plea if anything to have registrars come and participate in the group. You know, obviously Sara participates all the time as one of the Work Track leaders. Michele jumps in every now and then on different issues but other than that -- and I hope I'm not missing anyone -- but it's rare to get registrars that participate. And again if you're going to prioritize any Work Track I would think Work Track 2 would be the most important for you all because that's - or for all of us because that's where registrar issues play in for the most part.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Jeff. This is Graeme again. I think you've really sold us all on participating right? I know I could wait to get in there. Genuinely I say I mean

it's funny but it – that does not seem I'm sure not a lot of people around the room are compelled because it sounds long, fraught and complicated.

So I agree that we don't want to wait till the end to try and blow things up with angry comments because they screwed up but it's a hard sell to get people to go in there and fight this fight on a regular basis and I'm not sure what the middle ground is. I don't see a lot of hands shooting up around the room of people who are like yes I want to get in there. So maybe we need to think a little bit more about how we can help people participate in that or how we can provide some input in a way that isn't, you know, another person going in there for the next three years. I saw Michele's hand and then I'll come back to you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record yes. Jeff as usual has given a very good overview of the state of play. As you mentioned I am following it sort of. The reason I'm not more engaged is literally a case of there only a certain number of hours in the day, days of the week. I do have a day job and other things.

And I suppose that one of the things that it has been helpful with this working group which makes it quite different to a lot of the others is that they do tend to have this kind of forward looking work and specific planning on their schedule of which topics they're going to call cover on their calls. I don't know what the best way is to monitor that but it does mean that when they're at, you know, week X day -- whatever -- at a particular time the working group is going to be discussing a specific topic. So for example in the case of closed generics, a topic with Jeff and I will never agree on I will turn up once every couple of weeks when they're discussing that topic, throw a grenade and I won't come back again for a while. I mean that being a little bit - that's just me being a little bit facetious as usual. But realistically speaking that is very useful because it's not a case of having to dial into every single call, track every single thing that's going on which I know Jeff and others are doing but what for those of us who just don't have the time and the bandwidth I think

that's something which even (Mike) will consider and I - Jeff maybe can explain how they're doing this. I don't know.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Michele. So once a month we do a newsletter that goes out to everyone. And it goes out to all the lists that has a recap of what was done the month before in all the different worktracks. And then it looks ahead a month as to what meetings are going on that coming month and the topics that are being covered so that's very helpful so at least a month in advance.

But what we tried to do in the group is actually planned each session two months in advance. So our goal is hopefully to have, you know, till the end of the year now. Probably hopefully by the end of this week or next we'll have at least all the sessions till the end of the year so you can do what Michele is doing, you know, if you look at that site what topics are being covered. And if you're not interested in the applicant support program, you know, it's in Work Track 1, you know, don't come on that day. But if you're interested in the registry registrar agreements or registrar nondiscrimination issues come on that day. And we do actually plan that out well in advance so I highly encourage you.

One thing that you can do is hopefully there are a couple registrars that would want to participate. But with the registries also do is they have an internal group that takes those issues that are important to the group and work on those as a stakeholder group. So if we know that the registry registrar, standardization of registry registrar agreements is an important topic well, you know, get a couple of people together that are interested in that, write a proposal on it and then have the person or persons that do attend cover it. I think that is a way that the registries have actually submitted very helpful even if we don't agree with all of them they're very helpful and they – it's much easier to provide comments to something that's already written than it is to just come up with these general discussions. So I would strongly encourage something like that.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Jeff. This is Graeme. So maybe what we can do is get you to - you and Sara and Michele feedback to the ExCom perhaps and say, "This issue is coming up. Let's get something going on, the particular ones like so you're going to flag the issues that are probably relevant to us. I suspect you know what those are and we can work in that manner, spin up some comments and get some things out the door provide some input in that before it's not too late." Okay anything else on subsequent procedures? Anybody else have thoughts or comments on this issue? Heath please.

Heath Dixon: Heath Dixon, Amazon Registrar. Thank you for all that Jeff. In passing you mentioned that one of the reasons that the geographic names is a significant issue is that some names were objected to by the GAC. .Amazon was one of those names. If you're looking for something that you can do while you're here just after our meeting as at 1515 there will be a joint meeting between the GAC and the board. And based upon the comments at the GAC during the .Amazon conversation this weekend it's quite clear that one of the critical issues will be a discussion of the board resolution that was passed on Sunday morning on requesting that the GAC provide additional information about its objection.

If you're interested in governance issues and accountability issues in the wake of the IANA transition this will be one of the first major tests of government, the impact that governments have and the control the governments have over the decision-making of the board. So you could attend that meeting and I think just listen in kind of learn about what's going on there.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Heath. This is Graeme. Or you could attend also a joint session with the registries and then our subsequent session with the board. It is very unfortunate there's a number of conflicting sessions this afternoon. And I know that the GAC board session is coming up and promises to be interesting too. So we're going to have to split ourselves for that a little bit. Anything else on subsequent procedures going once, going twice?

All right. So it's 10 o'clock now. We have a break in 15 minutes and then we need to think for a moment for what we can stick into that space. Actually I know there's one thing which I think (Carlos) wanted to introduce himself if you could do so please.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes thank you very much. I'm Carlos Gutierrez and I have been assigned to this house by the NomCom as a new councilor, a new old counselor. It's very good that I can introduce myself while Jeff is still here. I was with the GAC until early 2014. I was with the regulator of Costa Rica so I was involved in the advice on Patagonia and Amazon. I later joined the Council as a nonvoting member in October 2014 and I had my training in geographic names by being the co-chair of the ccNSO GNSO use of country in territory names. We work for the last 2-1/2 years and we recently presented the results of this.

It was not a policy process. It was an extension of a previous work of the ccNSO. And we could only cover two letter codes at the top level domain. And the results were not conclusive. So independently of any new work that the Contracted Party House wants me to collaborate I'm very interested in participating in Work Track 5. And I have already put my name down for that activity. Other than that I spend the first hours the first hours - first hours with the registries.

I don't know what – how to spend my time, how to divide my time between the two – between the three group - between the two groups that (Chris) gets started talking about the services, the new page for. And I have to shut out there because my technical knowledge is very limited so I still want to spend as much time as possible with both groups.

In terms of the counselors most of them have seen me around and I know enough about Michele and Pam and Darcy. So I'm very happy to be able to collaborate at the council level. Thank you very much.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you for joining us and let us know if there's information we can give you or - and this is Graeme for the transcript -- you'd like some more content on who we are and what we do. We're always happy to help but you're welcome to join us for our monthly policy calls for instance. That might be educational. I'll get -- so we can make sure we get you an invite so welcome and thank you.

While we're on slightly NomCom related things we should also probably say a thank you to -- oh is (Tom) still here? Oh no never mind, (Tom) doesn't get a thank you right now because he left the room. Maybe we should just give it to him anyway and he could have missed it. All right 10:05. Can - do we have something else we can slot in the next ten minutes? Do we have a ten minute conversation?

Michele Neylon: We could spend ten minutes sucking up to how wonderful James was or something.

Graeme Bunton: He got my cursory thank you. I mean...

James Bladel: Save it for the next chair who might be, you know, if you need to smooth over with a little bit of sugar. Okay you can't get - I can't do anything for you anymore, you know, because...

Michele Neylon: Come on now. I mean look I'm - I don't know it's just so I don't know, there's something about that James character.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I guess we're like an old married couple.

Graeme Bunton: Cool, okay. Reminders from people around me thank you. This is Graeme again. The budget vote I think just wrapped up. We passed our budget. Thank you everybody. Thank you Ben who also left the room. So just a heads

up if you would like to be appreciated if you could exit now we'll be sure to thank you.

You should have in your emails a vote on the privacy and proxy interim spec extension. For those of you who don't know in the 2013 Registry Registrar Accreditation Agreement there was an interim spec for how privacy and proxy services should work. It had a sunset clause of January 1, 2017. Thank you James Bladel for that.

And the premise there was that we needed to encourage work to get a privacy and proxy policy done and implemented. And so that was a mechanism to ensure that that work happened. So that work is still underway. The privacy and proxy policy is done. It's currently in implementation review and we're going to talk about that later this afternoon I think we have that or later this morning in more detail.

But last year we extended that interim spec for a year by a vote and so it expires again January 1, 2018. And so we need to vote again on whether we extend it for - whether we extend it at all and if you choose to extend it do we do that for a year or 18 months? The request from ICANN staff was to extend it for about 18 months because their hope was that the Implementation Review Team and then standing up that process and getting new privacy services accredited is going to take about 18 months.

That work is actually proceeding reasonably well and it might be a little bit less time. So the year to 18 months may not matter so much but that's in your inboxes. You should vote on that and whether you think it is important to extend that out or not.

If we don't vote to extend that interim spec it means that from January 1, 2018 until that accreditation regime actually comes into play there will be formally no rules on how privacy services operate. So that's the thing. If you have questions on that particular vote process you can feel free to ask me.

(Unintelligible). Oh and another bit of housekeeping is that now they we've past our budget the invoices will be coming out for your membership fees which are always funny. I don't know if you haven't paid it already. Thank you Zoe. So those are coming. Thank you.

Oh you - oh Ben's back. Thank you Ben for working on the budget and getting that done. So pay your fees promptly please and thank you and don't make Zoe do too much work hunting you down for that. Yes please?

Ben Anderson: Yes Ben Anderson here. I know there was something on the list about the methods by which we're collecting the membership fees. Zoe and I are just working on a few different ways that you can send them to us. And the reason why that is is because we received very varied amounts from people based on currency conversions and the way that they send them. We just we want to make Zoe's life a little bit easier. It actually takes us a lot more time trying to work out who's paid and how much they paid less or more. And so if you just bear with us will try and work out a way to actually setting the fees in a - like a businesslike matter. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Ben. This is Graeme again. Okay so I think that the housekeeping I have 10:09 right now. We have the breakouts till 10:30. I want butts in seats at 10:29 so that we can carry on with our agenda please and thank you. I'm giving you a very generous extra five minutes use it wisely. All right thanks everyone. We'll be back shortly.

END