

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen  
GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting  
Tuesday, 14 March 2017 at 12:30 CET**

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

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

Graeme Bunton: Okay. This is Graeme again for the transcript. Welcome back. I hope everybody found themselves a coffee and maybe a little snack and is raring to go. You can see the agenda in front of you. We've got PDP updates, a couple other things, then we end up in our working lunch around 12:40.

I'm going to hijack the first bit of this PDP update for a couple other things. First, the RRSg has seen a bunch of new membership in the past six months or so and it's been exciting and invigorating. Welcome new members. Could I get a show of hands in the room for people for - who have recently joined the Registrar Stakeholder Groups in the past year? Hey, welcome everybody. Thank you for coming.

And for anybody who this is their first ICANN meeting? Awesome. Welcome. Thank you, thank you for coming. I hope you find this valuable and also we very much value your feedback as newcomers. So if we can make this

is a better experience for you and help you integrate into the Registrar Stakeholder Group, let us know what we can do for you.

So here's a dilemma that we have right now is we have today for substantive discussion and updates about three and half hours at this meeting. There is no constituency day in the middle meeting of the year, so there won't be one in (Joburg). And there is one in -- where's the last one -- Abu Dhabi. Presuming that Abu Dhabi is much like today's session, it means that we have seven hours a year, give or take, in person to discuss issues.

That is not a lot of time. I think we're filling some of the gap with our monthly policy calls, which so far have been pretty well attended and I think right now is a pretty good success. If you haven't attended one of those, I would encourage you to do so. I think we're getting better at those as we carry them on, but pretty good so far.

In terms of maximizing our time in person, we're relatively limited in what we can do, and not all of it we can do unilaterally. And so the conversation I want to have now, we can maybe take five or ten minutes to do, is I want to get a sense from the room about how valuable you find the joint meeting with the registries. So we meet with the registries this afternoon for I think an hour and then we move into our hour and half long board meeting.

We have the GDD Summit coming up in May. Everyone should know about the GDD Summit, which is where just contracted parties meet. That's happening Madrid, where registries and registrars can get together. I've heard mixed feelings from people about whether there is value or not in having a joint meeting with the registries at in-person ICANN meetings. And so I'm looking to the room right now to see whether they find they time, you guys

find that time, valuable or whether you would prefer to be spending more time with us discussing issues relevant to just registrars.

So don't all put your hands up at once. But okay, (Vlad), please?

Vlad Dinculescu: This is (Vlad) (unintelligible). So from what I remember in the past, we tend to walk into the room, we tend to start talking about stuff, they start talking about certain things. There's never really a sort of almost set agenda about what issues we want to address with them and what they want to address with us. So if you can get that more formalized, if there was more structure to the meeting and then we can actually address issues deeply and them may get (unintelligible) out of it. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, (Vlad). So I will say that we end up, and almost will certainly happen again today, spend the bulk of that session discussing what we're going to discuss in our subsequent board meeting. And so we tried to get ahead of that for this meeting by spinning up a small subgroup of a couple registrars, a couple registries to sort of brainstorm and make coherent some of the stuff we want to talk to with the board.

I would say that was not wildly successful. We just did not have enough participation and discussion. So there are some questions we have for the board. We haven't quite divvied them up. We don't know who's responsible quite yet. And so I think we're going to spend the bulk of that hour on that particular issue. I don't personally think that's a wonderful use of time that we have with the registries, so I hear you.

But we collectively need to do some work on that too, which is I would need more registrars to step forward and be like, "Here's the stuff that we should talk about with the board and here's also the issues that we want to see with

the registries." And so we tried to that on the list and it wasn't great, but we'll certainly try that again if we're going to keep our joint registrar/registry meeting.

Anybody else want to jump in the queue on this? No? Stephanie, please.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I'm probably biased but I do think there's value in putting meat on bones for the registry/registrar board session. The sessions are important. We need to figure out framing. We need to figure out the right subset of questions to be posing to the board. So I don't find it to be a waste of time but I agree that we can probably do a better job at how we prepare going into that meeting.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Stephanie. This is Graeme for the transcript. Do you -- I'm going to put you on the spot, Stephanie, if I could -- do you think that there is still strong value in having a joint meeting with the board?

Duchesneau: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you for your succinct answer. Okay. And I'm not seeing radical disagreement there. Fred is grabbing his microphone like he has something to say.

Frédéric Guillemaut: Frédéric Guillemaut for the transcript. Yes I would echo on what Chris just said and if we move that to the GDD, all the things with the registries, maybe we can have more time for policies if we move that hour with the registries.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Fred. So I think there is a dilemma here that if we're going to do the joint session with the board, which felt there was value there, we need to

spend some time collectively working on that. We can't just do it in sort of a small working group. We need to figure out how to maximize our time.

I saw Tom, please.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller for the transcript. I think it's all about the proportion of it. Going to the agenda you can see I think we spent roughly two hours together with the registrars, talking about mainly preset issues, not really coming to turns with discussing them but basically getting updates them. So we don't actually have any time we spent actually elaborating on positions.

And then we meet with the registries to figure out what we should tell the board, even though the registrars itself don't have firm standing on most of the issues. That kind of strikes me as strange. I think we need to make better use of our time. So all of us fly out to all these meetings, which go on for five days, and we meet for two and a half hours effectively, and I think, you know, we should smarten up and actually, you know, spend more time actually doing more things and maybe even introduce some kind of a system of straw polls or something to really arrive at positions.

Currently we're really just going back and forth on a lot of things that are mandated by ICANN. And there are many, many things on the table and some of them will be touched this afternoon, which are really, really important to us and are really important to actually to make the domain world a better place. And we keep talking around that in the hallway but we don't make any progress on that. So I believe, you know, if I had the choice to either talk to the registries or the board or just spend the whole day with you guys in this room and debate things that are of need, I'd rather do the latter.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Tom. I think that's -- sorry, Graeme for the transcript -- I think that's a pretty concise summary of the frustration that I'm hearing from some of our members. I've got Darcy and then (Michele) and then (Stephanie) again in the queue. Darcy, please.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Graeme. Darcy Southwell for the record. I agree with Tom. I think that we should dedicate our time to not just doing updates, we can do those by e-mail or any other forum. It'd be really nice to come into these meetings and talk about key issues and actually discuss them, not just provide updates. In order to do that we need more time.

So I think a blanket rule of always meeting with the registries and meeting with the board together is probably not the best. There may be meetings where there is a crucial issue where we really need to spend a lot of time and be aligned with the registries and make sure our presentation to the board is aligned and presented as a contracted party house, but that can be ad hoc, it doesn't need to be every single meeting so that we can accomplish what Tom's talking about. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: There was some clapping. Graeme for the transcript. I think you raise a good point, Darcy, that -- and Tom does as well -- that we spend a bunch of time here doing updates. And we can do a better job I think of providing those resources ahead of the meeting. But it's going to rely on people participating for instance in working groups to be able to produce a readable substantive summary on what's happening in those places before a meeting.

So it's going to fall on those of you participating in such things to do a bit of work so that we can make sure our members are up to speed ahead of time so that everybody's on the same page when we come into this room and so that we're all prepared to dig into some of those issues. And if there's interest in

that, then let's make that happen. Tom, you've got a follow on to my outrageous statement, please.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller for the transcript. This is a very nice thought that people would show up prepared. The reality is this will never happen. So theoretically, yes, awesome. Practically, no. So that's why I'm saying we need more time. So this is an educational thing, as well as a debating thing. And I think we need to bring our people up to speed why they are face-of-face, explaining what the whole thing's about, getting to know all the acronyms and all the things, the ICANN mojo magic, whatever you want to call it, and then really have a debate about the things that are important to us.

And relying on people in working groups comes later. Once we have a firm position, we can go into working groups and do something in them. We can dedicate people to it. And then they can give us updates. Currently we don't even have position on anything and we leave it up to the people in the working groups to actually form their own minds and do whatever they like basically.

And we are used to (unintelligible), so there (unintelligible) has been basically kept shut by the process over the last couple of years and I think we have to go back to the date, you know, when we were just sitting in a room as like-minded registrars and trying to find solutions. And that means that you have to actually explain what you do.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Thanks, Tom. So Graeme for the transcript. I don't think it needs to be an or, maybe there's an and. We're getting better updates to our stakeholder group ahead of meetings and then we have some more time to, A, update and then, B, discuss. You raise an interesting point there about whether we're actually - the people participating in working groups are doing so on behalf of

their company or if they're doing so on behalf of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and I think it's generally their companies. But we can have people aligned and informed in a way that maybe those are reasonably synonymous a lot of the time.

I've got Michele, Stephanie and then Owen, right, Owen?

Owen DeLong: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: Great. So Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. On the meeting with the board, that's always been a bit of a kind of interesting and fun thing because the board support staff send out a request to the different stakeholder groups well in advance saying, "Hey, what do you want to talk about with us?" They rarely tell us in advance what they want to talk to us about, and often they have nothing specific to talk to us about but feel an obligation to have that meeting.

Over the last couple of years, there have been a number of issue which were of common interest with the registries, so having the meetings joint was something that the ExComs of both groups kind of decided on. This was back when I was chair. But it wasn't something that we said would always be that way or would necessarily continue that way forever. And we still have this issue when we meet with the registries and these meetings that the entire meeting ends up being dominated by the conversation we're going to have with the board.

And while it might be interesting if we have much more time, I'd agree with quite a few other people that it's probably not the best use of our time. Now there is the problem, as Tom points out, around people coming prepared. The

reality is a lot of people unfortunately don't. There's a huge volume of stuff going on that Marika and others in the policy team do a wonderful job with providing us policy updates so people should be reading those.

On our side, (Zoe) has been doing a fantastic job in helping to kind of organize things, so I think there are ways for us to do a better job overall but we do need to spend more time internally within this group to actually thrash out things like, say for example, I don't know, the charter, which seems to be going on forever, the anti-abuse document that is probably on its 20th iteration at this stage and other groups have stopped asking us for updates on them so they think it doesn't exist.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes I want to just agree with both Darcy and Tom about the point around updates. And one suggestion may be to get past that is like we don't have a lot of internal to the registrar groups. Maybe if we had many working parties that worked on this and discussed issues that they could about like I think the cross-field validation is a perfect candidate for that. It's not an external topic so there's no like designated representative yet.

We probably need to have people who are like dedicated week in or every other week to be discussing the topic and then providing updates within the group at a much more regular interval. I do - like I do still see a lot of value in the conversation with the registries. I think there's so much pathology within this community about how we interact with one another and I think that is one of the relationships that has gotten better and we want to keep that.

And especially when I look at like the board's priorities right now. There's a big shift from board just stating topical priorities, we care about new gTLDs,

we care about Whois, to stuff that relates to organizational effectiveness, and I actually think that's a really good shift. I think there's a lot of problems in that and I'm glad the board is kind of shifting their focus. I think when it comes to those meta issues, we're pretty similarly positioned to the registries and there's value in bringing forward a common friend in talking about the meta problems, the strategic problems, issues around staff engagement, which does seem to be a big focus area right now.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Stephanie. Owen?

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong, Akamai. I'm pretty new to this group. I've been on the mailing list for about three weeks before the meeting so I can't speak to the history or what have you, but I will say that as to meeting preparedness, I'm certainly as guilty of being unprepared as anybody at this point due to recency. But I will say that in general in the various groups I've participated in, especially in the Internet governance area, people do what you communicate to them is expected of them.

So if we create an expectation that we just anticipate people coming to the meeting unprepared, people will do that. If we create a well know expectation that people come to the meeting prepared and if you come to the meeting unprepared you're going to be behind and playing catch up and people aren't really going to, you know, do a lot to facilitate bringing you back up to speed versus the group moving on at the speed the group is moving, then people will start coming prepared.

So I think if we do a better job of communicating that expectation that it's vital that you come to the meeting prepared, people will put more effort into doing that.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Owen. That's a good point. I don't think there's any expectation that people can be prepared on every issue because many of us have different business models and different particular issues that they care about, and certainly you cannot physically be engaged on every issue at ICANN, it's impossible. I think most of us pick and choose the places that we feel like we can be most effective. But if we're all doing that collectively I think there's room for all us to have some sort of expertise in different areas and share that and discuss.

So I don't - is there anybody else on this particular organizational topic? No, good. Okay. Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: The ICANN policy team's pre-meeting guides are really great. Like so if people just made sure to read those and actually understand what is in like that, it's like a 20-page document, it's not short but it's not a huge commitment either, that would go so far in terms of removing just like the discussion around the status of the PDPs versus what we need to get out of them.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Stephanie. This is Graeme. That's a good reminder. Let's make sure to do that and certainly before the meeting we'll lean on everybody to participate in that. So I think we're getting better. Certainly we're now producing daily updates of the meeting, which is great. We're putting some of the responsibility on that of people who've received travel funding to provide those updates. So I think that's a nice mechanism.

If we're helping you be here, then you get to contribute a bit back. And certainly the policy calls go a long way too. So good. Thank you for that. I think there was some good input there. We'll - the ExCom will take that on board and have some more discussions and see what pieces of this we can put

in place and test out for the next couple meetings. And hopefully we can continue getting better and more effective.

It's now 11:19. I think we're going to move next into the privacy and proxy IRT update, which I think I put on Darcy. Darcy, if you would be so kind.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Graeme. Darcy Southwell for the transcript. So this is actually one of the things where I think we should have a discussion, Tom, not just an update. I do have a brief update. I think many of you were in the session that was on Sunday. I'm losing my days already. Just generally speaking, the IRT has a lot of registrar members. We have sort of set a target, reluctantly so for some us, to be done with the IRT by the end of the year.

So the idea is to have the draft, what do you want to call it, draft policy document and draft accreditation agreement, published by September for completion by the end of the year. So we had a session on Sunday. I think the critical piece there is the Public Safety Working Group. They have a sub team that they're working on recommendations regarding law enforcement submissions to privacy proxy providers.

They unfortunately didn't give us much detail of what they're working on other than some high level bullet points. But I wanted to call those bullet points out for you because I do think it's something we need to be very sensitive about. Some of these sort of lean in the direction of possibly making new policy, or suggesting new policy I should say, because it is just a proposal they're putting together.

But they're working on things like what they - they say the definition of law enforcement or defining the issue of jurisdiction, some of which is already in the policy document. They also want to define the requirement of what an

acceptable disclosure request processing and prioritization. And then the final thing was about notification to registrants when a submission comes in from law enforcement.

And again, many of these things were included in the policy document, so they already exist. You've heard talk over - probably for years now about how we seem to have an overlap where you have a policy. The IRT, the Implementation Review Team, comes in and somehow it has morphed and the implementation plan begins to start looking a little bit like new policy.

So I wanted to point those issues out. Unfortunately I don't have great detail because they haven't great detail because they haven't shared their actual material yet. We're hoping to have that in a couple of weeks but I think it's a sensitive issue that we need to pay attention to. So I don't know if anyone has questions or feedback or concerns, but.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Darcy. This is Graeme. I'm going to back up a little bit for people who are new, because there are some in the room. Starting I think in 2014 there was a policy development process spun up that came out of the 2013 registrar accreditation agreement to build a set of rules for how domain privacy works and how those services work.

That policy development process wrapped up last year. It was a long, hard fought, contentious working group but got to a reasonable place. And so now that the policy work is done, it's now moved on to what's called an implementation review team, where they take that policy and try and turn it into the actual nuts and bolts rules of how those services will work.

And so there are still questions that come out of that but it's not policy development. And so Darcy's highlighting this interesting piece where public

safety, law enforcement was not participating in the policy development but has sort of been encouraged by the board to put some input into this implementation review team. And I was asking (Amy) and Marika about this earlier about what does it look like when they bring that back to - which is likely to be policy back into an implementation review team. And I think that's going to cause some conflict.

I think there's also, if I can elaborate on some of Darcy's concerns, public safety is not sharing their - A, they're not drafting these guidelines they're going to give to the implementation review team in public, they're doing that behind closed doors, which is probably not ideal and a little bit contrary to the ethos I think of much of what we do inside of ICANN. Because we can't see that, we can't comment on that.

And they're also planning, from my understanding -- and this is what I think Nick Shorey was saying in the session on Saturday, Sunday, whenever that was -- is that they're going to complete their work, they're going to use their mechanisms to get it up and official Public Safety Working Group position. Then it goes up into the GAC, where the GAC will then approve it as a official GAC position. And then they're going to feed it into - they're going to give it to the implementation review team.

So they're going to - have gone through a bunch of sort of checks and procedures to gift us with this guidance that from a process point we may not have the mechanism to implement inside that review team, and from a content point is not appropriate for that implementation review team. And so I'm worried that there's essentially this - and that rejecting that is going to cause extreme consternation within the GAC and Public Safety and set us up for controversy similar to this IGO-NGO, sorry for the acronyms, problem that exists right now at the Generic Name Supporting Organization level.

And so I guess that's mostly educational and thought for you guys. If people have insight or opinions on how we can avoid that and it's not just us, I think that's going to be, you know, a problem for the entire community. But I see this coming and it scares quite a bit. I've got Theo in the queue and then Elliott.

Theo Geurts: So this is Theo for the record. I've been talking to a couple of these Public Safety Working Group fellows and from what they are giving back info-wise they say it's nothing going to be anything controversial. But like Graeme just pointed out, it is going to be the GAC that will actually define or accept what the working group is going to bring to the GAC and that's the real danger there. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Theo. Elliott?

Elliott Noss: Yes I think that if this is where we are now, you know, Darcy -- thank you -- just a question, you know, to proceed my comments so I can understand a little better, so is this confidential approach public? Is what they're doing, which is we're doing this in private, we're putting it to the GAC, you know, nobody gets to see it, we're not sharing it with you, you know, until comes out through the GAC sausage grinder, is that public? Is that their public position?

Darcy Southwell: This is Darcy for the transcript. I would say yes. We encourage them to sort of step back from that concept, Graeme encouraged them I should say, to at least share drafts with us. And we're willing to accept that they're drafts, that's fine, but to not do these things in super secret and go all the way through the process and then come to us and so we're hoping that they will do that, but yes.

Elliott Noss: Yes okay. So I mean this seems, what, fun and easy, you know, because this is implementation, you know, it's not subject -- anybody can correct me if I'm wrong -- it's not subject to GAC advice in the same way that the output of a PDP is at all. In fact, you know, that line between law and regulation between, policy and implementation, is very, very important and need be protected at every opportunity.

So I mean I think at this point we should probably put something out publicly. We should speak with them privately, share our concerns, and put something out publicly, just saying that the point of process we are, you know, and we can bend over backwards to be clear, we are not concerned, you know, to Theo's point, we're not concerned about what's going to come out on the other side, we know you guys are working in good faith, we're sure this is going to be fantastic and helpful, but.

You know, because I think we really want to head off that fight, you know, if and when it would happen. We do not want GAC advice on implementation coming out and I think that, you know, there's two kind of side points here between - besides that line between policy and implementation that are very important that we need to keep reminding ourselves.

In terms of active participation in the policy process, the GAC are near rookies. I think that they are mostly trying hard to be constructive. You know, they've moved from shouting from the outside to being more active in the process. We want to encourage that. I think that's really helpful for everyone. So this is a great learning opportunity.

Two, Public Safety Working Group, you know, if GAC are close to rookies, you know, they are real rookies. They are freshmen. You know, they're just

getting their feet on the ground as a group and I think even more so, you know, they need to be groomed into how the policy process works to make them most constructive. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Go ahead.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Elliott. I think those are really good points. I think one of the challenges is -- and we talked a little bit about this earlier today about how we as members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group participate in policy development processes and implementation review teams -- and we each come to the representing our companies officially in an individual capacity but obviously keeping in mind what, you know, the Registrar Stakeholder Group may or may or may not be interested in or concerned about.

I think that's where they're different is the Public Safety Working Group members are not representing themselves and the way the GAC is structured is that the Public Safety Working Group can't really put out an opinion or a position without GAC approval. So I wouldn't necessarily say it's GAC advice in the official capacity we think of as the communiqué but they kind of have to sign off before the Public Safety Working Group can put something out there. Whereas...

Elliott Noss: So two things on that, Darcy. Sorry, I don't think that's technically right in two ways. One is the Public Safety Working Group, you know, that sort of characterization of the, you know, who you represent. You know, I think we all come to this as community members first and foremost, them too. And, you know, that kind of really strict siloing of their participating I think is very dangerous.

You know, it'd be great if they could participate on a regular basis in working groups actively. And there is nothing -- thank you -- there is nothing to stop them from doing so. We saw law enforcement participate sometimes in processes when they wanted to from the outside. This formalization, you know, has no limit to it that, you know, you've talked about. We're implying that limit, right? We can - well what they say, you know, what they say they can and can't do is really more what they will and won't do. And that's an important distinction.

And so we don't have to accept that. It's like us saying, you know, we're going to close this room, we can't have this room open, something to that effect. It's we don't want to at times. And I really just think we have to be active and not just take something like that passively. Or at a minimum, if we do, let's do that very publically because it really hurts the process.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Elliott. This is Graeme. I think that's a smart approach. So certainly it will have some - I'll have other members in that implementation review team can as well have some sort of back channel conversations with Public Safety, but putting out that statement is something we could do if there's other people who think that's a great idea. And I think it could be - we can do that.

I think we could end up seeing this sort of double unpleasantness of -- maybe it's not unpleasant, I'll withhold judgment -- of where they produce that output from Public Safety and then also issue it as GAC advice. (Mary) was pointing out in the Adobe Connect that there are provisions within the Implementation Review Team processes for policy concerns to be filtered back to the GNSO. And I suspect that's where we're going to end up and I'm sure James is going to super appreciate it when it lands back on his plate.

Owen?

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong, Akamai. It seems to me that the best way to deal with the situation at hand would be to proactively reach out to the PSWG and the GAC and try to, you know, let them know where we are in the process and what constraints that particular position in the process imposes upon our ability to accept their assistance, for lack of a better term.

But I also think that, you know, we should look at why didn't the Public Safety Working Group and the Government Advisory Committee get involved in the PDP when it was still a PDP. And if it's because they weren't really structured and organized enough to do so and didn't understand that that where their input needed to go at the time, we should do everything we can to be as accommodating as possible within the confines of where we are in the process to whatever input they want to provide.

But at the same time, you know, decisions are made by those who show up and they failed to show up, for whatever reason, and we are where we are now and I think that if we proactively communicate that to them, they're certainly perfectly capable of driving the effort to spin up a PDP revision process.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Owen. Those of who participated in the initial policy development process are probably a little bit loath to jump back into that, having spent a couple years in the trenches there. Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Just a note of caution. I think part of what is driving this is the fact that PSWG and GAC right now are not behaving in a unitary way. On other issues we've seen PSWG engaged. It's - like they're not perfectly aligned with us but we've made a lot of progress in conversations with them. We've come closer together. And then it's when the product gets taken back to the GAC,

they're actually different representatives with different priorities and there's - the rift between those two groups is growing bigger.

So I just caution us against like treating it like it's a unitary they because I think there's actually a growing risk, and that's what's creating a lot of this back channel stuff that the PSWG is having its own challenges in terms of how it assert itself vis-à-vis the GAC.

Graeme Bunton: That's a good point. Thank you, Stephanie. Does anybody else have thoughts on privacy and proxy? Greg?

Greg DiBiase: Greg DiBiase. So changing gears a little, one of the things they asked for in that session was what the requirements for a valid abuse report. That is contained in the first half of the abuse reporting document that we've been working on. So my question to the group is should we take that part out and finalize it and give it to them? Is that something to get this abuse reporting document that's kind of been in limbo forever, you know, a way to start it and have something final?

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Greg. This is Graeme. Greg is referring to a document that registrars have been bouncing around for probably a bit over a year now and it's gone through a good number of iterations between - sorry, it's a document about abuse reporting and practices around that for registrars. And many of you - anybody who I think was interested should have received an update about two or three weeks ago now on the most recent version. You should check your emails for that and check it out.

What Greg is talking about is it's sort of in two sections. One is the requirements for a actionable abuse report to a registrar. If you fill out all of these things, you're going to have a much better time getting a response from a

registrar. They can actually do something with your abuse report. And those pieces of that are not rocket science.

I think if most people read them, they would go, "Oh yes, those are straightforward. Those are the things that really make getting an abuse report better." And then there's a whole bunch in there which is not so straightforward, which is how should we respond to these abuse reports and keeping that generic enough that it fits in all of our different models and ways we like to operate. And finding agreement on that piece is considerably more difficult.

So I think -- Greg and I have talked about this previously -- but I think it's maybe a good idea is to carve out just the submission requirements from the rest of that document and we can continue working on whether we have agreement on responses. And this isn't necessarily everyone in the RSG, this is sort of a voluntary project for people who wish to participate. So it's not an official RRSB document.

But I think carving those abuse submission requirements out, putting that out to the RSG and then the rest of the community saying, "Hey these are like great things that everybody can use for abuse reporting and helpful" is probably a good idea and certainly will make us look a little bit better and we can continue the discussion about the other half but feel like we've made some progress elsewhere.

Thoughts, comments? No? Pam?

Pam Little: Pam Little, Alibaba. Would it be possible to circulate that draft or the latest version? We, as newcomers, haven't seen it. I would love to see it, see what's in it. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. Thank you. I'll make sure to do that. Okay. So I think that's where Privacy and Proxy Implementation Review Team is at and some of the thornier issues inside. So I hope that is a good discussion for people and a good update and they have a good sense of where that is now.

It is 11:40. We're running a glorious five minutes ahead but that's mostly because I cut out PDP working group updates. We'll move some of that to our regular policy. And if you have particular policy development processes you would like an update on, maybe put that in the Adobe Connect or back channels. Skype that to me and we'll see if we can fit those into any other business. Please and thank you.

Next up on the list is Cross-Field Validation. Do we have someone for this, (Zoe)? No. Who is - I'm going to give a bit of background and then, Theo, are you - how up to date are you on cross field?

Theo Geurts: Actually I'm -- this is Theo for the record -- Im not way up to speed with what's actually going on there. I'm observing it but I'm not engaging it.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Well hopefully I'll give a bit of background and see if I can kick of that discussion and someone who's hopefully a little bit more integrated and up to date on that than me can take over and add some more context.

So this is another piece like the privacy and proxy rules that comes out of the 2013 RAA, registrar accreditation agreement, where there's a bit about when it becomes, I think the language is commercially and technically feasible, registrars will -- and I see Jen Gore is in the room too so I might pick on you a little bit -- implement what they call a cross-field validation, which is making sure that the fields inside Whois makes sense.

So that could be that the, you know, on an address field that the number match is - exists on that street, that street exists in that town, that town exists in that state, and that state exists in that country. And then there are less sensible aspects of that, that the phone number matches the states or something like that, the area code makes sense. But.

So this process had started a few years ago after the 2013 RAA negotiations and then it was sort of put on a break because there didn't appear to be an obvious way to move forward with that. But it's come back up over the past, say, six months or so and there is now a registrar-only working group that has had one meeting so far, Jen? We've had - there's been two. And there's another tomorrow. Do you want to join us maybe and you can give us a little bit of - talk a bit about this please, Jen? Actually why don't you carry on with that update on what it is. Maybe that's a little bit better from you, please.

Jennifer Gore: Okay certainly. So tomorrow we have session on it. We've had two meetings. Tomorrow will be our third meeting. It is a registrar-only session and it is a closed session. Just a couple updates that I'll also be giving tomorrow is that the transcripts and recordings will not be published. They will be available from a transparency perspective on an ad hoc basis, in which both parties will reach an agreement on the way that those are disseminated.

The intent is that we work with the working group to establish a criteria that both parties agree to, determine if there is a solution that is commercially viable, and it will require two-thirds vote by the registrar group in order to move forward and support the initiative to move into implementation.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jen. I should probably also point out that this is not a Registrar Stakeholder Group group, it's open to any ICANN-accredited registrars.

Jennifer Gore: That's correct.

Graeme Bunton: Please?

Bob Wiegand: Bob Wiegand. I think that the - from the registrar perspective, we look at something like that, yes there's the language in the RAA, we understand that, we're concerned about the cost, right? If you did somehow figure out - well first of all, it is even possible, especially when you look at the global address validation. That just is a - how would you even do that, right? So is it really even an option.

If you could figure it out, what would the cost involved with that be? We - for the larger registrars, we have millions of records that potentially would have to be run through that process. So there's additional cost there. So those are some of the things that we're all, as registrars, we're looking at this saying, "Whoa, this is Pandora's box, this is - this makes us nervous." And so for the newcomers in the room, that's where at least I'm coming from. I think a majority of the folks in the room are as well, and maybe James you want to comment as well on some other concerns.

James Bladel: Sorry, my Adobe crashed. So thanks for acknowledging the actual hand as opposed to the virtual one. So we've kind of I think captured a pretty comprehensive list of all of our issues and really all of our threshold questions that need to be answered before we can proceed, like what is an acceptable rate of false positives, what impact is this going to have on emerging regions, you know, that don't - in countries that don't publish their address formats and does this create a barrier to trade if registrars in one country get free access to a postal database and others have to pay 10,000 Swiss francs a year or something like that, all these questions that we keep sending back to ICANN.

So my question is, hypothetically, if we decide on the registrar side of the table that this not technically or commercially feasible to proceed, what happens to this? Does this finally go away or does it just come back again six months later and six month later? Who at ICANN is driving this and kind of resurrecting this zombie thing? Has the technology changed? I mean I really am trying to figure it out how it keeps coming back. And/or what do we need to do on our side to say that this has to come out of the contract, you know?

We had during negotiations with the 2013 RAA. Jeff was there, (Michele), Volker was there, you know, some other folks, you know, Matt Cern and Rob Hall, they're not in the room. You know, we told them at that time this is not something that we can go forward with. And the can was kicked down the road to well if we can figure out how we do it, we want to do it. I don't think we figured it out in four years since 2013 and I don't think we're going to. So...

Jennifer Gore: And that's part -- Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff -- and that's part of this exercise obviously to develop a criteria that will address the pricing component, that will address whether it's feasible in certain regions or certain countries and not in others. But it is a contractual obligation, so therefore...

James Bladel: No it's not. It is a contractual conditional obligation if we find it to be feasibly and technically possible. And I guess at what point do we say it isn't and do we get ICANN to agree it isn't?

Jennifer Gore: I do not have the answer to that question.

James Bladel: And I'm not picking on you, Jen. I know that this was waiting for you when you arrived on the scene and, you know, but I think we need to get some

sanity about this, you know? I mean we can send you all this information, all these questions and...

Jennifer Gore: If you could - I mean as a request, if you could send me the list of questions, that will be helpful because I don't believe I have a consolidated list from the registrars with the questions.

James Bladel: Yes I circulated that to some folks. I don't know if it went to just the ExCom or if it went to the whole list or something. I - we'll send you that.

Jennifer Gore: Okay great.

James Bladel: I mean we'll package it up. But I think the answer can't be well we found something that kind of works and it's \$5 a name and it only takes 150 milliseconds per check, you know, and just all kinds of - and nobody, you know, outside of the U.S., Europe and Canada can use it, so go do that. You know, this is your new obligation. I think what we're going to say is that's something you guys think is a reasonable approach to this, because we don't.

Jennifer Gore: Well that's the purpose of the two parties coming together and in a contract is that the criteria for the two-third vote in order to support to, if there is a viable solution, that vote will be needed in order to move forward on it.

James Bladel: The second question, I think it's a little easier, what are you guys doing to reach out to accredited registrars who are not part of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and have not been following this at all? How much success have we had getting a hold of those folks?

Jennifer Gore: So we have sent emails to all 3,000 registrars in existence today. We have not had as much success as we'd like to have. We will continue to reach out to them.

James Bladel: Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Gore: You're welcome.

Graeme Bunton: Yes and thank you, Jen, for allowing us to pick on you a little bit here.

Jennifer Gore: Sure.

Graeme Bunton: So just so everybody's on the same page on this, it - the requirement would essentially mean technically that we would need to be able to verify every physical address in the world inside the purchase flow for a domain name. And that, as James I think alluded to, is, A, that database doesn't exist. It has to be fast. It disproportionately would affect the developing world. And then how do you also do it in multiple languages and character sets? So I think we have some pretty deep technical problems with that.

I've got, sorry, Michele, Darcy, Owen, Stephanie, Joyce. Michele, please.

Michele: Yes thanks. Michele for the record. A couple of things. I do like the way James refers to this as a zombie. It's probably the best way to look at it. We need from - Jennifer from your side, it would be very, very helpful to know exactly who we - has the final say on the ICANN side to accept that it is not viable or that it is viable, that - somebody who has the ultimate say on that. Is that the CEO, is that the board, is that the head of Legal? The buck has to stop somewhere on the ICANN.

The reality is this. From our side, speaking as a registrar based in Europe, which some people seem to think is an area of the world where doing this will work, we have an obligation with Nominet to do this. Nominet are incapable of validating Irish addresses. That means as the last time I checked something like 15%-plus of the registrations from my non-criminal registrants, which are basically most of my registrants, have, as far as Nominet are concerned, are not valid because Nominet is not capable of looking up Irish physical addresses, Irish company names, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Ireland and the U.K. are in Western Europe. We are considered advanced. Now I would hate to think what would happen if I was left in a position where I would have to go through this process for my registrants in other parts of the world. I mean essentially the Internet is global. ICANN is meant to be recognizant of that, and this obligation needs to go away. As far as I'm concerned, it's a nonstarter but we need to kill it and we need - it needs to be gone.

Because ultimately if you cannot do it for 100% of addresses in a technical matter and an economical manner, then you're talking not about five or ten domains or five or ten registrants, you're talking about millions and millions and millions. So basically it's like okay you want to play on the Internet, well you're going to have to move to the United States and maybe one or two other countries. Now many that might suit some people but I think for a lot of us it really doesn't.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, (Michele). This is Graeme for the transcript. So I think the room should be hearing that there's a good number of registrars who find this requirement pretty problematic from both a technical and commercial feasibility standpoint. If someone disagrees, I would encourage you to be

brave and express that you don't think this is problematic because it would be good to hear that voice in the room if that's the way you're approaching it.

Darcy, (Owen), (Stephanie), Jeff.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Graeme. Darcy Southwell for the record. So my comment, question also is for you, Jen, and I think James sort of asked this but I didn't hear an answer. So in 2013 we wrapped up this working group and decided that it was not commercially and technically feasible to do this. And then suddenly in - late last year at the Hyderabad meeting all of a sudden it sort of resurrected itself out of the blue.

And one of the questions we asked in that meeting was has this changed? And we were told it has and we were promised some information about what you think exists out there, not the slide you presented, but explaining to us how something has actually changed. And I'm still not hearing that and I guess then to kind of follow up on that, my other concern is are we doing the same exercise again. So.

Jennifer Gore: So the exercise that took place prior to my joining ICANN from what I understand was five sessions, where you looked at various vendors. And I sent a summary out to the working group as far as what work took place then. This exercise is very similar to that to working with the registrar group to develop the criteria. There have been some changes as far as services and solutions out there and that information I'm going to be presenting in detail tomorrow in this session.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Gore: Did I answer your question?

Darcy Southwell: The first part. The second part then is I feel like we're just going through the same exercise. So it feels like I mean honestly we could do this every two or three years for the rest of our lives. So when do we get to the point where we've made the decision? Because we did - I was on the working group the first time. We made the decision. So I'm just trying to get to an understanding of how this cycle works.

Jennifer Gore: I - I'm not aware of a vote taking place, where there was two-thirds vote, the first go around.

Graeme Bunton: And so if that two-third vote happens and it's a no, this goes away forever?

Jennifer Gore: You asked me that question earlier and I said I do not know the answer but I will find out for you.

Graeme Bunton: You do not know, okay. That would be a good one to like - because, you know, I don't think we have any interest in voting on this every three years.

Jennifer Gore: I acknowledge that.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, this is Michele briefly for the record. You know, there was no vote. There was no discussion of a vote. We just hit a complete impasse the last time round. All progress, all work on it was suspended because we were going nowhere, so it kind of went off into a corner and died and then arose again. I come from a Catholic country so I've got all sort of things with rising things again. It's just not good.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Michele. Owen?

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong, Akamai. I had an informal conversation on this topic with (Bobby Fling) yesterday and I think part of the source of this being resurrected is that there's certainly some fraction of the public safety sector that would like to see it happen. In talking with (Bobby) and there happened to be a lady there from I think Interpol next to him when I was having this conversation, she chimed in with, "Well can't you guys just validate against what you can find in Google? That would be better than what's happening today."

And I didn't go into trying to address all the reasons that's just completely silly at the time because I wasn't sure how to do it without insulting her intelligence and I couldn't think that fast on my feet. But I think that if nothing else it would be wise for us to come up with a polite way of expressing why it's not technically feasible and why you can't just, you know, search all the fields on Google and see if Google finds a match and use that as a criteria.

Because this is the mentality that we're kind of faced with on the other side of this issue when we peel back all the curtains and whatnot. And so it might be worthwhile to get at the crux of the matter there and try to find ways to say, you know, this is what we would need in order for this to be feasible and if you governments want to go produce that for us, then maybe we can find a way to use it, but right now it doesn't exist and without it it's not viable. And, no, the Google thing doesn't work for the following reasons.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Owen. This is Graeme. I think what you're talking about there is close to what James was suggesting we produce to Jen, and we had I think the second longest e-mail thread in RRSg history on this relatively recently. I believe it was second only to the great lunch debate of 2014. So I think there does need to be some sort of work product out of the RRSg that highlights these issues for people.

I'm going to editorialize for a sec as Graeme from Tucows and not Graeme, stakeholder group chair. And this is a point that I hear made quite a bit on this issue and I like to share this, is that people conflate verifying transactional data with Whois data all of the time and they're saying, "Well Amazon does this and e-commerce does that all the time." But they are not the same thing and they're deliberately not the same thing. And so whenever someone says X, Y, Z can do this, they are not doing this, they're doing something very different.

I believe I've not got Stephanie, then Joyce, then Jeff. Sorry, Joyce, I couldn't see you earlier. Stephanie, please.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I just want to make sure as we keep the conversation going about what is commercially reasonable or commercially feasible that we force a conversation around whether we're actually solving any problems at all. I'm squarely in the camp that this isn't going to make anything more contactable. If you look at the Whois accuracy pilots, there's like virtually no relationship between syntactical accuracy and contractibility of the registrant.

So it could be true even if we were able to get all of the metrics in terms of speed, in terms of converge, in terms of accuracy that James was talking about down, like there's going to be false positives, there's going to be issues. And if there's no articulated benefit, I've not seen anyone able to convince me otherwise, like any cons are a problem. Any cons push up against the idea of whether or not it's commercially reasonable because I don't understand the purpose. I don't understand what we're accomplishing here.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, (Stephanie). That's a good point and we'll have to make sure that we drive that benefit piece home especially because, as you mentioned, we

can do that in a relatively data-driven way and that's I think pretty powerful.  
(Joyce)?

Joyce Lin: Sorry, Jennifer, I didn't mean to beat you up, I did not. But I think the whole crux here is validation. It's ICANN's mentality of the feel-good mentality. And it's a problem that that mentality is under the umbrella of the consumer safeguards, okay? So just ICANN's trying to show the world that they have done the best, trying to find out the bad guys, the bad apples, the bad players in this space but let's say that if one day the technology is there, let's say today everything is available, and we present everything 100% correct validate data, what can ICANN do? What can the law enforcement agency do about it, right?

So there are more urgent issues. Yesterday when I went the presentation, it really scares me when they did the analysis, DNS abuses. VeriSign has 140 million names. They've ranked top one for abusers, malware, phishing, you name it. Do you know who's the second one? It's (unintelligible). It's a new gTLD and all the remaining other new gTLDs. So there is more urgent, more important issues that ICANN has to deal with but ICANN's just hiding underneath their so-called validation, so-called consumer safeguards, that big umbrella but they couldn't do anything about the more important, more serious issue there.

So to me, it's really a feel-good approach, the mentality that ICANN has and I'm absolutely against that at all because they couldn't do anything about 100% validated data. What are they going to do, right? So Graeme, I have a suggestion. When you take the vote, two-thirds vote, we might want to say that we do not like to ICANN raise this question again, this issue again forever.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Joyce. You raise a good point that -- this is Graeme for the transcript -- that this is certainly not the lowest hanging fruit within this space. Jeff, who do you work for again?

Jeff Eckhaus: Jeff Eckhaus, Rightside, Name.com and a few other registrars. So I'm - well, one, apologies for being one of the people responsible for capitulating on the 2013 RAA with James, no. We have to - this was one that we had to put in at this point to get pass and sort of, as James says, kick the can down the road. And I think it's about time that we just sort of need to crush that can and I think sending lists of issues and questions and points of why we think this doesn't work and let's try and do this, I think - I don't think that's going to work, or why is this needed and how is it going to help, and if we send data that shows contactability doesn't mean anything, I think none of that matters.

You have a group on the other side that has nothing to lose by - to keep on pushing this forward and I think we just need to end it. And the only way to do that is for us to officially take the vote that we want to do, say we don't believe that this is commercially and technically feasible, full stop. We just don't believe it. And then the agreement states, you know, the registrars in ICANN have to jointly agree. If we disagree, there are mechanisms in there for next steps and if they don't disagree - if they don't agree with us, then there are steps and we should go down that path.

But I think right now we're just talking around it and we're trying to come up with here are issues, here are other ways, like let's just take a stand and see what happens next and let the chips fall. Because right now I think it's just going to be an endless debate that's going to chew up e-mail cycles and maybe one day overtake the lunch debate e-mail, which I hope will be the winner forever. So I would like to just end this and let's listen tomorrow. I think we can listen to it. I mean they could surprise us with some crazy

solution that we didn't expect and they say it works for 100% of the countries, even Ireland with no postal codes and, you know...

Michele Neylon: We do have postal codes now, Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: And let's see what happens. But after that, let's take the vote. We're all - I mean we can't take the vote here because it's - I believe it's two-thirds of registrars, not registrars in the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Yes, the registrars, right. Two-thirds of the registrars, so. And I know that there are certain large registrars with over a 1,000 credentials that are not here.

So either way, let's just take that next step, let's move forward. Because if not, I think we're just - we're going to keep discussing it in circles. And let's take that step, hey listen, I might be in that smaller one-third and two-thirds agree the other way but I think let everyone's voice be heard and let's take that vote and see where it stands. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jeff. This is Graeme for the transcript. I think that's a good point that we need to keep move forward on this. I think we're really good at saying how much we dislike it and generating really excellent points about how bad it could be. Let's get that in one place. Let's get in the room. Let's get that done. And we can free up more time to discuss other fun things.

And I think it's - just on the technical voting issue, I think it's two-thirds of the registrars participating in that group in that day, and collapsed by family too. So if you have 1,000 creds, you don't get 1,000 votes -- or members, if you're feeling crazy.

I think I've got Darcy, (Stephanie), and James in the queue, although Darcy and (Stephanie)'s hands might be old ones.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I'm old.

Graeme Bunton: Darcy's hand is old too. Stale hands. James, I think is new.

James Bladel: Yes I just wanted to respond to something that (Stephanie) had said, and I see Jen is back in the room. I thought you'd left. Wouldn't miss it for the world. Yes, a good point about the problem that we're going to solve. I mean I think we articulated - we haven't had a call in awhile in this group but we did have a call where we explained that, you know, a true criminal, or someone who's actually doing something wrong, will have a perfectly pristine validated address that resolves to a car wash in Indiana or something like that. You know.

We said at that last call, ICANN the next time we get together on this, please come back to us with a problem statement. Is that a part of our presentation on Thursday? So you have a defined problem statement and how this cross-field validation is going to address the problem statement?

Jennifer Gore: Yes.

James Bladel: I am not going to miss that session for the world then because I want to see how you've solved cyber crime. Thank you, Jen.

Jennifer Gore: Hopefully you like the problem statement.

Graeme Bunton: I mean this is a momentous day. It's the 14th of March, 2017 when Jen Gore solves cyber crime. I think we're all very excited. I saw Tom's hand and then I feel like we might be able to move past this topic.

Tom Keller: Tom Keller. Thanks, Jen. This is really great. I really like what Jeff was saying about, you know, getting the whole thing to a vote and maybe get it over with or not. But I think one thing we need to do in this situation where we have issues at hand that are not really solvable that we have to, you know, define the next steps to move forward, right? I mean it's the same - this can be the same issue in Whois, which is probably never be fixed, but it can go on forever and ever and ever.

So I would suggest, you know, that we basically ask the ExCom to actually come up with a set of a possible solutions and a way forward and then we as a constituency vote upon that here and then take action. I mean we have to do something. I mean we can talk about sense or nonsense, whether it's feasible or not feasible and what ICANN wants to do or not to do, but there's a resolution to it. That's a vote. The question is do we want to actually prepare for that and we need to do some lobbying around that. And if we all say yes, let's do it, right, and quit talking about it.

Jeff Eckhaus: Graeme, can I add two more points. One today is, for all in the U.S. convention or reading things, is 3-14, which is Pi day so I don't think it's going to - Jen will overtake Pi day as today is 3.14. But on Tom's front, thank you for reminding me of something I forgot to say with going through on that vote. I think another path we could take is -- and this hopefully would appease some folks -- is think about as a group if we could come up with some voluntary steps that we said we would take to help on some of the issues.

Because from what law enforcement and others want, they - they're, you know, sort of like the, hey, why don't you look it up on Google or something like that, like there is a gap there but we could come up with some voluntary sets of standards that we said, you know, they're not standards that we guarantee we would adhere to but something that we would call best practices

that it just completely voluntary. That could help bridge that gap when we say no on the other front.

And I think maybe that is another way to do it versus just being adamant and saying no and saying that's it, but saying something that is not a hammer that's a part of the contract that if we fail this on a contractual compliance basis we can lose our accreditation versus something we will try to do to make the data better to work towards it and put that hand-in-hand with our no vote, or maybe a no vote. We'll see what comes out. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jeff. This is Graeme. That's an interesting idea. I think we'd need to sort through a little more. It could be just as simple as, say, putting your own address in there, like Jeff Eckhaus and then just all domains 100% verifiable Jeff's house. Please?

Lucien Taylor: Lucien Taylor, Netistrar. We've been building our own control panel from the ground up on the 2013 RAA. We've tried to bake in validation right from the start and, reflecting (Michele)'s view, it's rubbish. It's really hard to implement. It's hackable. We couldn't - we use kind of address validation APIs that - they're high quality APIs but they're not exhaustive. We couldn't find our own business in there so we just phoned them up and put our business in there. Then we could find our own business in there.

I think there is a sense of desperation here and I support the last view that we don't actually just kind of just say no, it's not going to work and we say no here. I think we should try and sound a bit more helpful and willing to try things. We've ourselves implemented the Nominet system, which is kind of pretty poor and we've explained to Nominet how it doesn't - it's not really good, what (Stephanie) was saying. It doesn't actually lead to any kind of valid lookups of people. And they're happy with that.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. Luchen, was it? Lucien. Okay. I don't see anybody else in the queue. I think we've hit this pretty hard. Thank you very much for the good discussion on that. There's a couple concrete steps I think we can take and there seems to be a real desire to move forward, put this behind us, great. All right. So we can do that. Let's do that guys.

Next up is a topic that was floated on the list relatively recently. I'm not super up on it so I can't speak to it, although I know it's certainly very important to my company but I'm far too policy focused and not operational enough to really tackle it. And I think Tom on the spot for queuing this up. So, Tom, if you could. (BTAPA), bulk transfers, take it away.

Tom Keller: Thanks, Graeme. Tom Keller for the transcript. I have to admit I'm not so much more prepared than you are. I'm knowing about that now since a couple of minutes that I'm on the spot. But I think it's a very interesting idea to actually talk about the bulk transfers and how we can make that better.

I'm sure you're all aware of that there are different kind of schemes how you can bulk transfer a domain name from one to another, and they're very restricted and they're very pricy, depending on how you do it and depending on the registry and whether they really want to play along or not.

So the good thing is that this is one operational issue that has to do with our contract and doesn't have to be resolved by policy. It could be resolved by policy but it doesn't have to be if the registrars really come to terms and come up with something they want to do and then talk to ICANN about that and talk to the registries about that.

We're currently in an environment where we see a lot of consolidation ongoing and it makes complete sense to get away from this very old and awkward processes we have and find a new framework to make that easier for all of us.

There's another aspect to it as well which you might tackle at the same time. If you talk about bulk transfers, there's a regime with the registries currently that they can switch providers whenever they want basically and the registrars have to take on the burden of all the transitions from one registry backend to another registry backend, which effectively it's a bulk transfer as well, which is not regulated, which is not priced, we're not getting any money for our efforts, but we just have to do it because the registry wants to do it and save some money most of the time.

So that's two things. And I think the question we have at hand is whether we actually want to address it as a group or not. We as a company are one of very interest into that out of obvious reasons, I don't want to hide them, but I heard that other people in the room are likewise very interested. And so I think the discussion we're going to have today in the next 20 minutes is not so much about whether we really want it or how we want it but whether we want it and how we want to tackle it. So please help me figuring that one out. Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: Go ahead.

Graeme Bunton: Oh sorry. Before we get to Jeff, and James is also in the queue, I just want to make sure that everybody understands what bulk transfers are. Does anybody - be brave, throw up your hand if you're not sure what we're talking about just so we're - everybody's clear. Good, great. Okay. Carry on. Jeff and then James.

Jeff Eckhaus: I'll defer to James. Go ahead.

James Bladel: Thanks. Yes just to build on Tom's comment, I think that - but I do want to disagree with one point, which is I do think we need policy. The good news is I don't think it needs to be a controversial policy and I think we can probably expedite it because I think that everyone is in agreement that this would be a useful thing to have.

There is a concern I think, a small concern, that we would have to steer around, which is that the transfer was - the transfer policy is meant to ensure healthy competition. So we wouldn't want to introduce accidentally any anti-competitive elements by making it too easy or taking the registrant out of it.

But I think it particularly in cases where we're moving a bulk transfer from one affiliated registrar to another affiliated registrar as part of the same family, I think that's a really important - and this is not just to reflect consolidation, this is just generally when we talk about things like backorders, you know, or aftermarket transactions that occur on one registrar and need to move to another registrar.

I think that this would be a useful to have. (BTAPA) is there. It sort of works sometimes. But, you know, if we could get something that's standard that all registries would adopt and that has some sort of uniform and predictable fee structure that we can work with, I think, yes, let's, you know, let's work with that.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thanks. Jeff Eckhaus here. So I would say in the past 60 days I've worked on four separate bulk transfers, (BTAPA)s, and they are an incredible pain to go through, and incredibly expensive. So. But I do think that there are two separate things we need to think about when talking about the bulk transfers

because if it was for - within affiliated registrars and two separate non-affiliated registrars. Because two separate non-affiliated registrars, it is part of the policy and is an RSEP for the registries that they have to get it added to their registry agreement, the (BTAPA). So there is specific policy around it.

So I don't think that somebody - I think Tom you said it's up to the registrars, it's in our control. I'm not 100% - I'm not expert on that part but if it's in their registry agreement and it's part of an RSEP, there may be some other policy around it where we can't do it. But I think that, yes, simplifying it, hopefully lowering the cost because \$50,000 is incredibly expensive for a transfer where the actual registrars are doing all the work, preparing all the lists and getting everything ready.

But I think with - I would say if we want to do it within affiliated registrars, that's a different conversation, possibly easier, and I think that might be an easy one to pass and to get through. So we might want to think about it in two separate tracks as we go forward, or bulk transfers between affiliated registrars and non.

Because especially - I know it's going to be an issue for, as we said, there are some registrars now, between 500 and 1,000 credentials, and some of those would like to move some of the domains very easily between their own registrars as some of them pick up in the credentials in the drop. So I think you'll have a lot more - I think it will be simpler and you'll have a lot more support on the affiliated side than between competing registrars. And it also helps on the competition part as well. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jeff. And so many this is like a two-stage process, where we - if we're going to tackle this we start with the affiliation first because we think

that's a little cleaner, a little simpler, and then move to the non-affiliated. I have Tom Barrett and then (Michele).

Tom Barrett: I actually would speak out against this particular proposition. I certainly do not want to start with helping out registrars that 100 or 1,000 creds and prioritize that over bulk transfers between unaffiliated registrars. So if you break it out, I would oppose it. I don't think we should make - do special favors for people who have 1,000 creds. You know, that's a business model. We have no reason to make their life easy. I think if we're going to do it at all, it's one process for all.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Tom.

Jeff Eckhaus: Can I just - one thing to be clear on that, that just was one example. Another one would be Graeme who's' up there, for example, they recently purchased (Enom), right, so they might want to be moving two names between (Enom) and Tucows and that would be something between affiliated registrars. And that's not necessarily their business model but I think somebody else had brought it up there, it's consolidation in this industry. It's definitely happening and it's not to make people's lives easier who have a large number of credentials. I wouldn't want to frame it like that.

And also I - so that's why I think that it could be a simpler process for because it's within the same registrar family and not two separate registrars in two separate entities. So think about it that way, not trying to do favors for somebody with different business models. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you both. And thanks, Tom, for being a contrarian. It's not always the easiest. Speaking as myself, I do take Jeff's point, I think we have three creds

but certainly bulk transfer is suddenly very important to us. Next in the queue is Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. A couple of things. I mean the moving of the domains between affiliated registrars, I agree with Tom to a point in that, sure, it's their business model but I mean, as Graeme says, they've got two or three creds, they don't have thousands of them. So it makes sense to be able to move stuff around without having to jump through too many hoops.

The other thing is, and this is just from my own perspective, when - dealing in the ccTLD world, you go from being an agent/reseller or something to becoming accredited. And in many cases there is a clear relatively straightforward process which allows you to do that so that you can actually have those domains move directly to your - under your management. In the ICANN space, it's a total bloody mess and there's no way to do it.

Now obviously we probably don't want to be kind of, you know, helping our competitors at a ridiculous level, but from a practical level it's an absolute bloody mess. We as a company have ccTLDs spread across multiple registries and registrars and we move stuff around and that's fine.

When it comes to the gTLD stuff, up until the change in the transfer policy we were trying our best to move stuff away from one particular registrar we'd been dealing with to ourselves but there was no simple way for us to kind of go write: dear registrants, this is what we're doing, do you have an issue with this? Because I think, you know, informing them is very, very important, especially with all the kind of jurisdictional things.

You know, there's some way of actually, you know, processing that and moving it forward as we have in the Cs would be really handle in the Gs. Now

I can see WordPress.com obviously would have an interest in this, and I can understand why, and you're not the only ones. There's a lot of us who have this kind of situation.

And again, it's just not covered by the current policies and processes. And then you end up with kind of weird, funky things where some companies manage to get some weird side deal with a registry behind closed doors, God only knows how, and a bunch of domains get moved between one registrar and another. And if you're the registrant, you might find out accidentally somehow by accident but they're completely ignoring the actual policies and processes. So I agree with James. There needs to be policy. It doesn't need to be really, really complicated. If the ccTLDs can do it, why on Earth can't we?

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Kellie?

Kellie Peterson: Michele's absolutely right. At WordPress we have a very significant interest in this. You know, we happen to have had a long and wonderful relationship with the folks at GoDaddy but we are a accredited registrar and we want to make sure that our customers have a unified experience. I personally have been on the other side of that as well during my time at Neustar and, you know, we would get accredited registrars going through the same thing.

You know, Jeff's been on the other side of that, you know, with his relationship with (Name Cheap). Business evolves and we need to be able to help our customers and work together, registries, registrars, the ICANN staff, and make sure that we're taking care of the end users. So wholeheartedly in favor of doing this, you know, addressing all of the various business models accordingly but this particular one is of great interest to us.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Kellie. And nice to have you in the room. Welcome to the RRSg automatic.

Kellie Peterson: It's good to be back.

Graeme Bunton: Sarah?

Sarah Wyld: Sarah Wyld. I just want to also emphasize we should be focusing on the end user. I think what if a customer has a thousand domains across five different registrars, ten different TLDs. There's no good way for them to bring them all into one provider, which I know a lot of customers want. So they can't use the (BTAPA) in that process. We should give them something that they can use.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Sarah. So what I'm hearing? I'm hearing that there is a pretty reasonable interest in this and that is, you know, not just about consolidation either. There's plenty of good practical reasons, and from a whole perspective, if I can, again, editorial as Graeme Turows, not RRSg chair, we certainly see scenarios where resellers have grown and built the scale as automatic as to become - switch from being a reseller to their own accreditation and then they're in all sorts of pain making that happen so - although they're perfectly welcome to use our hosted registrar platform if they so desire.

So I hear everybody. This is clearly something. It does still I think feel like two different mechanisms or there's an easier problem we can solve and then - which is the registrar family and then the inter-registrar. We don't we don't necessarily have to tackle them in that order but we can tackle them as slightly different problems.

And I think how mechanically that's going to work is probably that the few of you that care about this need to put your heads together and we can help

facilitate that to figure out what that solution looks like, what you'd like to see, what the best way to pitch that to the registries, what's the best way to put that to the community is. So if this is important to you and you like it, heads up. We'll start trying to put that together in the near future.

Michele, you had another thought here?

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks, Graeme. Michele for the record. I think maybe what we need to do then is to try to kind of draft as list of the scenarios we're trying to deal with because like for me personally I have this kind of you big guys going off buying each other as you like to do, giving you - making yourselves more powerful and making us feel smaller. That's nothing something we're involved with. But we as a company obviously are interested in some of the other things.

But I think one of the things we - Sarah mentioned, I think it's really important, we do need to make sure that the registrants, our customers, are informed or at least kept in the loop because I can't stress this enough, the jurisdictional thing around this is going to become a bigger issue. I mean let's call a spade a spade. You know, we have clients who have extra language in their contracts with us for hosting that we - that their servers have to be physically located in Ireland and can never be outside Ireland.

And I think the same kind of thing happening as we move forward with the changes with both in Europe and in other countries where registrants will want to be sure that they're dealing with the data and, you know, that the registrar they're dealing with is in particular jurisdictions. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Thanks, (Michele). That's a good note and we should make sure to feed that into the people who are going to tackle this soon. And I'm sure (Zoe) is

adding a - capturing a note that we're going tackle this and look for a e-mail probably to get some volunteers.

12:30. You've got more on this, Tom?

Tom Keller: Yes just one more question. We will have time in the GDD to actually talk about that in length? I don't know (unintelligible) but maybe that would be one of the discussions that a few interested people could have face to face instead of going to an e-mail list again.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Tom. This is Graeme for the transcript. That's a very good point, that this is a pretty good topic for the GDD Summit and so that schedule is sort of a draft is done. If people haven't looked at that, it's on the GDD Summit website. You should go and take a look and give us some feedback actually to see what else you would like to see happen at the GDD Summit. But that is a good topic for that, especially to see what the registries have to say. Cool. Thank you.

Anybody else on bulk transfer. Tom?

Tom Barrett: I don't know if Sarah made this point. I do think the - we have to make sure we frame this from the perspective of benefits to the consumers and so it doesn't look like we're solving a business problem among registrars and registrars and registries, but in fact this is beneficial to consumers. And so, you know, that might be the best use case to start with. But, you know, I'm concerned about us forgetting about the role of the consumer and whether or not they would need to opt in to a registrar bulk transfer and so on and so forth.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Tom. This is Graeme. I'm hearing that pretty clearly from both you and (Michele) and Sarah. So we'll make sure - well the people who are going to tackle this topic will have to make sure that that's accounted for. I see Jeff at the microphone. Jeff?

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, for those who have not gone through many (BTAPA)s that I have in the bulk transfers, there is a 30-day notification to the registrant to let them know that if they don't want to go to the new registrar, they are free to transfer away at - I think it's at no cost to the registrar of their choosing. So. There is that built into the current process right now.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jeff. And we would make sure to include something like that. Kellie?

Kellie Peterson: This is Kellie Peterson. One of the things that I think is great at about the (BTAPA) is it's an opt out. From a perspective like ours at WordPress, we might like to talk about the potential because we've always been the interaction that the customer has. It would be fantastic if we could simply send them, you know, a notice. So there is a difference between a (BTAPA) situation as it stands today, which is you're actually changing who a customer goes to for support and billing, whereas with us it wouldn't necessarily do that. So that is a point of differentiation that I'd to at least consider.

Graeme Bunton: Yes. Thank you, Kellie. Tom?

Tom Keller: Sorry. This all goes around the question of changing from one registrar to another. So another topic I brought up was about registries changing their backend providers in that way, having bulk transfers done as well. So just a question in the room whether someone would be interested to talk about that as well.

Because from our point of view, it becomes a very, very big annoyance that every registry provider who wants to save a couple bucks is changing the registry provider as soon as they can, and this doesn't stop. And this is part of the flood of all the changes we've seen coming in from the registries which is causing a lot of work for all of us because, at the end of the day, we have to do to just negotiate with someone.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Tom. That's a whole juicy topic I think we could tackle maybe as part of the conversation around RAA amendment two. We've got about six minutes before lunch and I think it's ready and hot, so I don't want to delay that.

Do you have that list? Can you put that on the screen? So here is something that we need to do it more often I think, which is recognize the work that lots of our membership is doing around the ICANN community. Because there are some of us who are out there all the time on calls, and if you haven't done it it's not always a wonderful party. So this I think is a list of all the different groups that are going on around ICANN right now, how many members are participating in all of those.

And it's - so at this moment right now it's us recognizing those who are participating and meeting. Thank you to all of you because it's a bunch of work. It's not always fun. Thank you to your companies for allowing you to participate in this sort of stuff because it's not all immediately business relevant and we've got some pretty wonderful participation out there. You can see a list of names of people dying in the RDS working group.

And then we get this wonderful list here with the number of groups and things that people are participating in and the list. So I think this is the Theo, Sarah,

and Volker memorial lunch we're about to have. So thank you to those people for working so hard and committing so much of your time to registrar issues and, you know, not just Theo and Sarah. I'm not going to read the whole list, but thank you to all of those people. Your commitment and participation is greatly appreciated.

So thank you. Now we're going to take a - we have - we're going to end this session about five minutes early. You've got 15 minutes to get some food and get back to the table. We're going to start again for a working lunch in 15 minutes. So I think that's 12:50. Thank you everyone.

Zoe Bonython: Thank you. You can stop the recording.

END