

**ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) Meeting Part 3
Tuesday, 31 October 2017 13:30 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: We're back on track. And James, if you would.

James Bladel: Yes, so responding back, James Bladel speaking, and responding back to a couple of statements ago to Jeff's opening statement, which is I am also tempted by the simplicity of what you're laying out. My concern or the thing that I would like to put down is to future-proof these definitions, so that we - we don't know what's going to come out, you know, at some point.

And we've seen how difficult it is to make modifications to this charter. It takes people working for months, if not years, if we find something. And then, I'm saying this, as Pam and I are two people who just recently were tripped up by something that was certainly not aimed to, you know, enter into the realm of the absurdity that GoDaddy is not a registrar.

And I think that just going through all of those maneuvers, to get that cleaned up, and then to get the charter cleaned up, I think my perspective was let's

have the simple definition that you proposed, but let's also have a process. So that if someone says, "Hey, I think this unforeseen new type of entity that we've never encountered before, you know, three years from now, is probably not - it doesn't qualify as a registrar. What do we think?"

That we have a lightweight process that we can invoke to - not to change definitions and not to take a hatchet to our charter but to essentially be more agile and be able to flexibly adapt to whatever is changing in the marketplace, because I think Graeme's nailed it here, is that this is a question of who are we? And, you know, when the simplest answer is it's everybody that ponied up four grand and find a contract.

You know, you mentioned that the registry - those fears never really came to bear. Well there was a little bit higher barrier of entry into that stakeholder group than this one. So I think we do have to guard the gates a little bit more diligently. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, James. Owen?

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong, Akamai. It seems to me that while I understand the desire to protect the organization from organizational capture, when we start talking about excluding the registrars because their concerns aren't the same as different kinds of registrars that are currently in the group, we hit a really nasty and dangerous slippery slope very easily.

I don't think we want to start getting into the realm of objecting to business diversity, for a lack of a better term, just on the grounds that they're different from us. And so, I don't think that was intended by the earlier speaker. And I think it was (Michele). But I think that it is part of what I kind of heard in his statements. And I think we really want to avoid creating that kind of message or those kinds of optics in our discussions and that we should approach this very carefully when we're talking about non-inclusion of accredited registrars.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Owen. I've got Heath, and then Jacques. Oh, I'm sorry. I've got Heath, and then Sophia, and then Jacques, and then Volker, and then Ben, and then Jeff.

Heath Dixon: Heath Dixon, Amazon Registrar. I completely agree with that. I think it's a very dangerous road to go down. I mean you could just as easily say that we only want to represent retail registrars. I mean that could be a perfectly arguable thing to do to prevent capture by, you know, wholesale registrars.

So, as I read the Registrar Stakeholder Group, you know, about us, what we do, the Registrar Stakeholder Group is the main representative body of ICANN-accredited domain name registrars. The group participates in ICANN policy-making process and serves as the voice of registrars within the ICANN process.

Domain name registrars who have to follow those policies should have a voice to represent them in the policy-making process, as long as the voting and only one stakeholder group, or if we want to add advisory committees because we want to exclude - you know, we want to have the same no double-dipping rule for government-owned registrars, that those kind of rules make sense because those are consistent across the ICANN stakeholder groups.

But to impose bars based upon the business model that somebody is using as a registrar and to take away their voice in the policy-making process. To me it seems like the wrong way to go.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Heath. Sophia. Where'd she go? There she is.

Sophia Feng: Yes, so just a question for the (unintelligible), I understand the reasoning for the same little clause. But I'm just wondering, what is the plan of this activity (unintelligible) accredited TLD means? Like what is it - how do you, you know, charge? What is the plan of this activity from? Because from some

registrar's point of view, they do serve as a brand registrar for certain TLD operator, but they also have like (unintelligible) that we are working for.

They also have a big part of the registration business to drive from enterprises in Asia. So if you say, the plan of this activity, this is really unclear. How are you going to quantify it? Or how are you going to measure it? And, you know, the sort of reasoning is there. But you just - I do not think the language here actually is measurable and be able to cope with all kinds of circumstances and different kinds of business model that each registrar has. So that's a question there. Yes.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Sophia. My sense from the conversation yesterday is that we generally agreed that the wording on that was problematic, because what I think it's trying to capture is people who are registries first. But I think the Drafting Team decided to take that question back in or at least they've folded into the rest of the conversation we're having. Someone from the Drafting Team, anyone want to elaborate on that? No. So I don't think there's a short answer. But I think there's a recognition that that language is problematic, and we need to fix it.

Sophia Feng: Yes. And also, I agree, if we have - if that intention, that for -- how do I say it? Vertically-integrated registrar not be able to vote in the RSG? And I think I support Jeff's comments that that language is much more clear than this one. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jacques.

Jacques Blanc: Yes, Jacques, for the transcript. So from what I hear here is what I kind of make of it. First thing is we're changing. We were a much more defined group before the new TLDs. And it appeared that all the new TLDs are changing, kind of changing the game, at least in our perception. I don't know if it will be the case on an economic basis. But we're changing, and maybe at a point we've got to recognize that.

Second thing is we all live under the ICANN roof. And what I've heard, you know, giving us the tests, the charts of ICANN, by which we are governed, is a good thing because maybe it reminds us that we've got to follow those.

Third thing is, going back to ICANN rules, and if I refer to the past, you know, when the new TLDs have been born, the only difference I can remember, and it has been pointed out by this Specification 13, is the difference between a public TLD and a private TLD.

And that was a clear difference for ICANN even. And I mean we had so many discussions, knowing what Specification 13 should allow to private TLDs, because they wouldn't be ruled the same way, because they belong to companies. I mean, just out of my mind, Airbus is not here. They won't be there or any big company; they are of their own registrar. But they won't be here because they haven't got the same direction than we do have. So we might have something here that we want to push forward.

And last but not least, I tend to follow James when he says that we've got to look at the future. And it's so difficult to change a charter that maybe one of the big preoccupations between staying under ICANN roof and abiding by the rules is how - if things tend to change a lot, and we feel concerned in our everyday life, how can we look at a better way or an easier way that we could adapt in the future?

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. I think that distinction between private and public TLDs is interesting. Volker, Tom, then Jeff.

Volker Greimann: I understand the concerns that you're having because we're - that we're proposing unequal treatment that we would cement certain structures into (unintelligible) share them to a certain part. However we do have to recognize that we and the GNSO at least have a certain house structure.

Certain interests belong in certain groups. Certain interests are represented better in certain groups.

There's nothing - if we were to open this up, there's nothing to stop the entire business community or IPC to open up a registrar and outnumber us here within a few months' time. That way, they could dictate policy to control the GNSO without - against those classical registrars. That's something that we should be very afraid of; be very worried about this kind of capture. And there would be nothing to stop that.

Therefore, we have to maintain, in some form or shape, the structure of the GNSO houses and direct those that would like to become a registrar; invite them in; give them the ability to discuss certain points; but exclude them from voting in matters that are essential for registrars to be able - for classical registrars to function simply on the basis that their voting rights should actually belong in a different group because that's where they are best represented.

It's very hard to put into words, I know, but that's the ultimate goal that we should focus on because, otherwise, the GNSO will stop working in any meaningful way. And our interest will no longer be represented at all.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Volker. That's also interesting. If I can paraphrase, we have an obligation to the existing structure of the DNSO. Interesting too. All right. (Tom).

Tom Barrett: So I think there's been a lot of great points there. It's interesting to go down the path of saying, "Well we're all subject to the same consensus policies, so we have something in common," but in fact, that falls apart on these several scenarios. I could go into more detail.

I like the idea of saying that if your registrar does not manage domains for any non-affiliated parties, then you're not considered to be a voting member.

And when I think about the scenarios there, the obvious one we've all been thinking about is a - let's take dot IBM. I'll pick on IBM. Dot IBM decides to be a vertically-integrated registry. So all the dot IBMs are going to be held by the IBM ICANN accreditation, straightforward.

Then, they take it one step further. And, by the way, at that model, they're not really subject to the transfer of policy. They're the only registrar, right? And they get, obviously, a waiver from the Code of Conduct. If they wanted to, they could pick me to be their sole registrar. But still, I'm not - I wouldn't be subject to the transfer of policy for that TLD because there's only one, right?

But if they take it one step further, they can say, "You know what? We've got another 20,000 domain names across 100 TLDs. We're going to put them all into our ICANN-accredited registrar. We have dot-coms, nets, infos, right? All subject to all these consensus policies. They could be transferred out, if IBM decided to transfer them out. But they're all owned by IBM, right? And I'm comfortable of saying they can't vote, even though they've got TLDs or domains names and 100 TLDs.

The collateral damage there which again I'm willing to accept, is there are domainers out there who run registrars. And they own all the domains in their ICANN-accredited registrar. Single owner of all those domain names, we're saying they can't vote either. That seems a little unfair. And maybe we need to have an exception. They have to petition and say, "Hey, I want to be able to vote. Here's why." So we have some sort of a way for them to be considered for voting rights. But, you know, that might be some collateral damage for this model.

But it's - you know, yes, it's hard to change the charter. But if it turns out this is too restrictive, five, ten years down the road, we can still - obviously, we can change the charter again. But I think, near term, this is a prudent step to take, because it's very easy for the IPC to all become accredited in a

heartbeat, right? It's two or three hours of their legal counsel's time to get this thing done. And I think it's a prudent measure to at least protect ourselves until we see how this market shakes out.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Tom. I think Ben bailed on the queue. And we go back to Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks, this is Jeff Neuman, and some good points brought up. I just - I think - so a couple of things I want - responses I want to make. You know, the concept of future-proofing is impossible. We don't know what's coming down the pike, right? We can't future-proof anything. And if we try, we're automatically going to make it too restrictive.

The other problem, in addition to some issues we had with the data element of not having registry data within the last - that's gone; that's great; cool; that solves a lot of our problems that we had. But at the end of the day we find it incredibly difficult to find people to actually want to participate and join committees. And we should be happy and encourage participation in our group. To tell someone they could join but they don't have a vote, simply because they have a different business model, we're not sending the right message there.

On the point of, you know, we have to worry about being taken over and the IPC could just come in and immediately - you know, like the same things brought up in the registries, and they were paranoid about that. And at the end of the day it didn't happen. It could have, with 1000 TLDs and with the brands. In fact, most of the brands that, in theory, could have a strong electoral property interest and decided not to participate in either the registries or the registrars. And maybe some of them are in the Brand Registry Group. And the Brand Registry Group is as a collective it counts as one member. And there are ways you can handle that.

The point is that - oh, I'm sorry. Then, it was brought up that we're changing. Actually, I look around the room, yes, some different faces, but we're not

really changing much at all. We've added a couple. But actually in 2005 - well, 2003, 2004, there were actually a lot more of us. So I actually don't think in looking around the room that we've changed at all. So I don't buy the argument that we're changing and therefore we need to do something extremely different.

And then, the notion of (Volker) said of protecting the classical voting rights in the GNSO. (Volker) I don't understand that at all. Again, you're concerned with taking over completely by the IPC and therefore you're proposing these super harsh restrictions. I mean until we actually see something like that happening, you know, I encourage you to go to the voting record. Look at the voting record of, you know, whether it's Ben Anderson's voting record, or mine, or Mark Monitor's or anybody else's, assuming Ben votes, you will find that most of us vote in accordance with all the other registrars.

And also there is a commitment in here. It's almost like a fiduciary duty commitment that says that you agree and your participation of the registrar group, that you're doing so as a registrar. And your best interest or whatever it is there's language in here, which I thought was good. And that covers what you're talking about. About voting as an IPC person, as opposed to a registrar.

And so I just think that this is super-paranoid. And at the end of the day let's have a mechanism to encourage participation because everyone's complaining about the workload, yet, at the end of the day, I'm struggling to find registrars willing to come into the subsequent procedures in other places. Let's not make them feel excluded for a fear we have of ten years down the road.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jeff. I've got (Ben), and then (Michele), but a couple of thoughts from myself on that. One, and this is probably worth noting in the context of voting and eligibility, is that the new charter moves us as far away from possible from voting on issues. So elections will still happen obviously as a

vote. But we're trying to move far more into how we kind of operate currently which is a consensus agenda or a consensus methodology so that voting on issues should happen kind of as an exception. And so it reduces the importance of voting inside the stakeholder group.

Jeff Neuman: Well then everyone's a voting member.

Graeme Bunton: Not necessarily.

Jeff Neuman: It's both ways, right?

Graeme Bunton: And then, I think it was an interesting point, about that piece at the beginning around best interest that you've sort of agreed to that, as joining the membership. I don't know that there's any teeth behind that though. And I have to go back to the charter. So that if someone isn't operating as we all collectively feel in the best interest of registrars, someone shows up and it's just like total stonewalling, I don't know if that would help.

So the charter doesn't, I think, currently have a mechanism. So maybe we need a mechanism to kick people out of the stakeholder group to be like, "You're a jerk and we don't like you." And you're, for sure, first on that list. I kid. I kid. Ben?

Ben Anderson: Yes, Ben for the record. I, for the first time ever completely agree with Jeff.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. Michele?

Michele Neylon: I'd love to have a nice come back on that one. And one thing, Jeff, I think - you know, you're raising some valid points. I don't agree with it. But that's okay. And we rarely agree on a lot of things.

One of the things, I think, that, you know, you may want to consider is that there are companies who qualify for membership of other groups within the

ICANN circus, and simply stating that they are not involved in policy if they're not a member of this group is frankly untrue, which is what you did today earlier on. So I mean there are companies that qualify to be members of the BC, the ISPCP, the - I (unintelligible) the groups are; my brain's not working. The BC, the IPC, the (NCSP), (NCUC), there's a load of different groups where, you know, the people can end up.

Now, some of those groups have the most insanely restrictive rules around who qualifies for membership. There is one company I'm very familiar with that wanted to join the BC and were blocked. They couldn't join. They wouldn't let them, because they stated that, as that company provided services to registrars and registries, they weren't qualified for membership. And that they're not a registrar or a registry, so they don't qualify for membership of either the registries or the registrars. And they're not IP attorneys, so they don't qualify for the IPC. So where does that leave them?

So, you know, it's not - you know, there are, you know, concerns that some of us have, and that we've also seen this in other contexts. If you look at some of the things that happened with (unintelligible) a few years ago where, you know, they - because of the way they're set up, they had given up in the situation where a particular interest group did end up getting a very disproportionate level of control.

Now, there might be a pragmatic way of dealing with and addressing these concerns. And I know, with us, there is a certain degree of paranoia. But just because I'm paranoid, Jeff, doesn't mean you're out to get me; you're not out to get me rather.

Graeme Bunton: Right. I've got (Volker), and then Jeff, and then maybe we'll - and (Tom) again? Oh, who pays attention to the Adobe?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Right. I'm going to do Volker, Jeff - sorry, Volker, Tom, and then Jeff. And then, we'll try and wrap this...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Don't give Jeff the last word? All right. We'll do Volker), Jeff, and then Tom. Tom, you can have the last word. Please Volker.

Volker Greimann: I'm just to echo what Michele said. Sometimes it pays to be a bit paranoid. I mean, as a lawyer, we make contracts and charters not for the good days but to be - where everything is fine, but to be prepared for the bad days where some eventualities that we would like to prevent or would not like to see are - where it would be too late to change them. So this charter should prepare us. It will not prepare us for everything. There is no future-proofing. But it should prepare us for that, by which we can foresee and which we can expect as a possibility.

And finally, I don't think there should be the ability to cherry-pick which community you want to be in. I mean everyone who comes to ICANN has a very clear picture of where they should belong. And they should not be able to choose where they want to vote simply because that's more convenient for the expression of - or the expressions of their interests, or getting the interest across and decided by ICANN.

I think ICANN should be defending itself - should be defending against any capture in any sized group, in any group, not only the registrars. I mean the registries have their voting allocation scale where big registries get more and more votes than others. We don't want that, with various good reasons. But we need to therefore have other mechanisms to prevent capture.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Volker. Jeff, and then Tom, and we'll wrap this up.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thank you. Where do I start? On the notion, Volker, of you don't want people to be able to choose where they are in the ICANN world, Volker, correct me if I'm wrong, but aren't you affiliated with a registry? But you've chosen to vote here. So we have chosen, just like we could be eligible to - in theory, anyone could join the IPC, right? We could. You could join as a voting member.

If you're an intellectual property owner, and that you don't want to, you chose to vote here. Cum laude, my organization has chosen to vote here, because this is where we identify. And this is where we feel the strongest. But to have anyone tell us simply because we may have some - and again, it depends on how you all determine affiliation, or because I may represent a registry on certain issues that's important to them, to tell us that we can't vote here is just the most ludicrous insane thing that I can think of, especially when we're at a time where we're trying to get participation.

So, you know, if you want to keep out registrars that are only registrars because they're associated with the Spec 13 registry, I understand that. Why? Because they're not subject to the same types of policies, and there's exemptions and things. If that's all they do, cool, then make them not eligible. And that would solve your issue of domainers wanting to be registrars, you know, not that I want to encourage that either.

But the point is there are things we can do that are reasonable, that aren't just like taking an ax and chopping off the head. Let's be reasonable here. And let's - the people that want to participate, whether it's the corporate registrars and there's a bunch of us now, or anyone else, if they elect to vote here and pledge to vote in the best interest of the registrars, that's all that matters.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jeff. Tom, last word?

Tom Barrett: Yes. I'm actually intrigued with lucrative - of looking at the model of the registries, and seeing what happened there with 1000 new TLDs, and seeing if it's applicable to us. I don't think it's applicable for two reasons. James mentioned one already, which is the cost of entry. Theirs was 185,000. Ours is 4000 thereabouts.

But secondly, and Jeff, you know this, they have already built into their bylaws a crypt mechanism to protect themselves. And that may have had a - may have influenced some of these brand-related registries and say, "You know what? Maybe we'll just outsource this and not participate." But over there, there's a stakeholder group that doesn't have any crypt mechanism. So "Only the Paranoid Survive" is what Andy Grove said from Intel, right?

One of the reasons why they might gravitate to us is because they cannot capture the Registries Stakeholder Group because of the bylaws. So I think it's an applicable model if the registries (unintelligible). If the registries decide to remove that crypt mechanism, then that would be something that, say, "Hey, I guess it's maybe - if they're not concerned, we don't need to be concerned." But as long as they're concerned about it, I think we should be concerned about it.

Graeme Bunton: You can - you'll be (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Someone can talk after me. If you don't want me to have the last word, I'm totally fine with that. But I've got to respond to that. So as - sorry, it's Jeff Neuman. As a company that represents a large number of brands, I will tell you that every one of them that chooses not to participate on their own here has decided not to join as members of the Registries Stakeholder Group, not because of any weighted voting or trip mechanism, it's frankly they don't give a - sorry. They don't - this is a country that will punish me, well for a number of things.

But they don't care, right? They just want someone to follow what's going on. They don't actually care to vote. None of them do. This is not like a business for them. For them, this is just like a little sideshow. So let's not assume that trip mechanism.

But if you are worried and like, I think Graeme you said, if you want to build in a mechanism for an entity that demonstrates that it's not acting in the best interest of the registrars, I'm all for that, because that seems to me a way to - as long as there is due process and all that kind of stuff, that seems like a way to handle your fears and paranoia. But other than that, again - all right. That's it. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Jeff. And thank you everyone for that conversation. I think that was pretty useful, and good, and interesting, and sort of both perspectives were well represented. And we've certainly reached - it seems to me, have clarity on what to do next, which presents an interesting challenge now for the Charter Drafting Team.

We'll probably have to go back and discuss process a little bit. But it could end up being that we end up with two different versions of this particular bit of the charter. And then, we end up voting on this specific section around eligibility. It's going to be a mechanism. I think we're probably also happy to entertain...

Jeff Neuman: Can you just go into - you say that the charter, we'll take it back, and we'll produce two versions. When we ultimately vote on it, is it by simple majority? Or is there something more - in other words, you provide two options. Is it just the majority of registrars that agree with one over the other?

Graeme Bunton: So I think we could - maybe I'm wrong. Maybe we - I would imagine that happening as a separate vote, like how do we resolve this specific issue, as opposed to approve the charter as a whole? I don't know what the Bible says. I'd have to go back and read. I don't know. But let's - like I don't think

we're also bound by - we don't - so in our current bylaws, I don't think we have too much about how we can amend the charter. There's something in there, isn't it?

Zoe Bonython: Yes, but that's (unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Right. So I think we have some flexibility here to decide how to resolve this ourselves, so that we can talk through process, as well as the substance. So I don't have (unintelligible) out on the Charter Drafting Team, have a strong opinion on how we should resolve this. So if people have good ideas that they think are equitable, then let's talk about that. But you don't like the simple majority; you're looking like that causes anxiety?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, absolutely, right? Because there's only a few of us that our corporate registrars, right?

Graeme Bunton: So...

Jeff Neuman: And we're - you know, for policy matters, that's fine, right? We agree to that kind of stuff. But something as fundamental and structural, you know, it's like - I think of it almost like a constitutional amendment in the US, which should require three-quarters or something much more. But you can't just take a minority of registrars that have one sort of business model, and then decide whether they can be a member or not in the future. That's ridiculous.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. And so, I guess, as I was looking around the room, as that conversation was happening, I saw a lot of heads nodding on your side from people that were not corporate registrars or other business models. So I was not viewing that as though it was business model isolation.

But let's talk about that process too. I'm happy to do that. I don't think we're trying to have tyranny of the majority on this though. I think, in general consensus, we want to ensure that people are pretty happy with the charter

as we go forward. But I do think, probably, we need something for people to really look at and think about. And so, maybe there are two formulations of this that we can propose, that are sort of representing these different sides and that provides clarity for people to think about. Was that another hand, Michele, on that?

Michele Neylon: And just very briefly, I mean I can understand Jeff's concerns about voting thresholds and all that. If we were proposing to kick him out, but I don't think we are. So I - you know, we were talking - you know, this discussion - this entire section was something that - my understanding of it is, I think, (Volker) articulated quite clearly, but I don't agree entirely with everything he said, was, you know, to kind of protect the roof from capture.

I would disagree with focused characterization that you don't get to choose which area you vote in, because my company would qualify for membership of several stakeholder groups, as would yours. What I would have concerns with, and it has nothing to do - what Jeff does is fine, as long as he's up front. I mean if he's pushing forward an agenda because he's being asked to by clients, that's fine, as long as he's up front about it.

It's the same with (Matt) it's the same with any brand registrar. But it's also the same with, you know, if you're looking at - well, I did look at you across the table. But, you know, there are certain topics when it comes to policy that are of greater interest, greater concern, depending on people's business models. And that's perfectly fine.

I mean if we look to this, I can say the transfer of policies where, you know, some of the companies that serve domainers have a totally different set of concerns to those of us who really aren't in that space. It's the same when we talk of other things like that affects wholesale or affects registrars who (unintelligible) corporate. That's all fine.

Graeme Bunton: All right. I have my mic on that the whole time. Thank you, (Michele). Matt, please?

Matt Serlin: Yes, thanks. Matt Serlin, Brandsight. Just real quick, (Michele), I mean we're all here representing our clients, not just brand registrars, right? So that's point number one. Point number two is, Jeff, I don't know if there's another mechanism in the bylaws that allow a different kind of vote. But the thing I will say is this goes up for public comment, eventually, right? So that's the opportunity to comment to the board at that point, if we would have to, because I obviously agree with you. (Ben) agrees with you. And so, there you go.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Matt. Jeff, did you want to - and we can't keep doing this forever.

Jeff Neuman: No, that's fine. This is Jeff Neuman. This is actually on just some other points in the eligibility. So I just wanted to know and, obviously, it doesn't have to be now. But, you know, there's also an exclusion of not-for-profit identities. And I didn't understand that, you know, again, if whether they're for-profit or not-for-profit. I don't know if that matters, as long as they are a registrar that, you know, again that does what they're supposed to.

And then, the overall comment that, on the entire thing, and a lot of places is I'm a little bit concerned at the discretion that's given to the (xcom) all over this document. It's not that I don't trust the (xcom) currently. But, as I guess, (Volker) said, we've got to worry about the future, right?

And so, you know, at the end of the day, there could be an (xcom) that's got absolutely no corporate registrars on it, and that's totally fine. But there's some discretion in here that allows the (xcom) to do a whole bunch of things that could really prejudice the minority of registrars or different business models. And so, I tried to point those out in my specific comments back.

I think (xcom) should have some discretions to do a bunch of things. But there's a lot of areas where there's just way too much discretion and that it actually should go back to the membership. So I hope - and if you want me to join or not, the Charter Drafting Team, you could put me on. No, it's fine. I wasn't assuming I needed to be. But it sounds like I might need to be.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jeff. It sounds like you've got a lot of good input. So we need to make sure we integrate that in any way. The discretion point is interesting. And I have to go back to your comments on that and read them.

Certainly, I think, as we were dealing with election issues relatively recently, it really felt like the (xcom), in many places, didn't have discretion to make a lot of choices, and that was really frustrating. But that's a pendulum. And so, maybe that has swayed too far the other way. We can come back to that.

So, awesome discussion, everybody; really good opinions; that was great. We need to sort out some process issues on this. And (Christian), actually, I think, pointed out in the back channel chat that it's two-thirds majority for the charter, for a new charter or a charter vote anyway. So that's something.

Yes, that's the whole charter, not if we were separating at a particular section. So we need to talk a bit more about process and how we resolve this particular issue. And then, we have some more feedback to take on the whole thing. So guys, read the charter. It will provide you with specific line-item feedback. We'll organize a webinar that's - were you thinking next week?

Zoe Bonython: Yes, I think, in the interest of time, it will probably need to be quite soon. So we'll be, again, sending that more. Please read it. Please send your feedback. And then, let's go through and make sure, before the Charter Team goes back and prepares the next draft, that we have all your considerations.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, Jeff Neuman. It would be good to have maybe some responses from the Charter Team, to some of the comments, because that was a question - I mean when I said, you know, what is the rationale of the not-for-profit? I guess I was asking a question from the people that were drafting it. So it would be good to not only have us submit feedback but have those on the Drafting Team that drafted that section provide us feedback, so we know what they were thinking, and perhaps there's another way to address those concerns.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. So it sounds like they'll commit to some of that feedback on the webinar we'll hold, so that we can run through some of that first, and then dig into the other comments that people are going to diligently submit in the very near future.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Right. Oh, Darcy has a suggestion, I think.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Graeme. Darcy Southwell. So would it make sense though we need to kind of set a deadline, I think, for maybe registrars to provide feedback? Do we...?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Darcy Southwell: Oh, when is that then? I'm sorry, I didn't (unintelligible).

Zoe Bonython: Well I - as I was saying, I think the very first thing we need to do is just reconfirm between, I think, the Charter Team and the ExCom, what really the process is going to be, because the kind of dates they gave earlier, maybe that might be impacted by this conversation that we've had today.

I had originally said by the end of next week. But maybe - but I don't want to reassure like that because I think the first step is for us to have a conversation and see what is the best - this way, so yes. They're probably

going to be around that - it's going to be within the next couple of weeks - within the next couple of weeks, I think for that.

Darcy Southwell: So can I make a suggestion? I think - because Jeff has raised a lot of really good points and maybe - I have trouble thinking we can get through all of these issues in one webinar; just my personal opinion. It may help if we give a deadline for registrars to submit all of their concerns. And then we group them together. And maybe, it's two webinars or, heaven forbid, three, but - so that we can actually talk about the meat of the issues. It's not about line by line of the proposed draft, I guess, is what I'm trying to get to.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Okay. I'm glad we did that. That was good. I look forward to consolidating power and making myself Lord Emperor of the Registrars for forever. We are about to dig into some prep for our session with the registries and the AOB. But I'm actually going to punch it back to Thomas Rickert who has joined us again, because he has something he would like to share, around GDPR and ICO.

Thomas Rickert: So you had little time to recover from the GDPR trauma and the feedback again. And actually, I - this is me with the ICO head on now, right? So let's just be very clear. I'm working with an Internet industry association. Some of you are members of that organization. It's ICO Internet industry association. And we have a lot of members from the domain world. You know, out of the more than 1000 members from more than 60 countries, there were more than 150 registries, registrars and the like.

And with the GDPR issue becoming more and more of a pressure point, we have consulted with our steering committee over the weekend. And they said they really liked and supported the idea of ICO trying to help with the creation of a data model for GDPR.

And we've seen a lot of legal assessments floating around. But I think what nobody has done so far is actually take a look at the flow of data from the

reseller basically, through registries, registrars, (unintelligible) and other things that were discussed earlier this morning, so that we have something tangible.

You know, there was hope from many that ICANN would work on this collaboratively with us. And we've been waiting patiently. But we've seen ICANN doing its own legal assessment. (Yuron) has announced that they will come up with their own proposals. But these proposals might not be to the liking and in the best interest of the contracted parties.

And ICANN has always also said it would be good if something came from the contracted parties. And I know that some of you are working on models for your respective companies. But I think it would be beneficial for the contracted parties if we had a consultative approach that can be discussed with ICANN, as well as with the authorities in Europe.

And we would volunteer - we have a little bit of budget for such an exercise to do that in increments where we have a very small team consisting of legal folks and tech folks, coming up with the first straw man or straw person, I think I need to say these days, and then, you know, discuss that further with the contracted parties in the first place.

The steering committee members have requested us to do this as an open and inclusive process. So there will likely be representatives from the non-contracted parties be admitted at some point as observers. And I wanted to reach out to you to see whether you think it's a good idea, because we don't do this for us, right? So we would only do it if there's sufficient traction and support from the contracted parties.

I mean what we've seen from the commission is that I think they are willing to talk, but I think they're willing to discuss when there's something to discuss. So this is not to come up with another legal assessment, but actually with a data model with something that is implementable and in practical terms for

people to discuss, either like or not. But I think if the contracted parties work on this collaboratively, chances are good, that we have something convincing that can be proposed to ICANN and to a wider circus.

And I was - I asked to - for some - for a few minutes to get back to this table to solicit some feedback on the suggestion. I've spoken to the registries a moment ago and, you know, why they didn't take a formal vote or whatsoever. The ones that spoke only supported this idea. So, over to you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Thomas. Does anybody have thoughts or comments on that? I see (Michele)?

Michele Neylon: (Michele) for the record. It would be stupid not to I suppose was the obvious response? I mean - okay, just to go into it a little bit further. If we all sit around waiting for ICANN (unintelligible) to come in with a nice big silver platter and a lovely beautiful usable solution for all our woes, I won't have any hair left. And I don't have a huge amount left as it is. You know, (unintelligible), there will be none left.

And I think, you know, several of you who have nice heads of hair and nice dark hair now will all become gray. People who are - have small children, those kids will be halfway through college. You know, we might - if we can move this forward and control the outcomes a little better ourselves, we'd be in a better position. So I think working with Thomas and ICO, obviously, that makes - seems to make sense to me.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Lindsay?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Lindsay, for the transcript. Actually, I think quite the opposite, Michele, sorry. Thank you for the offer, Thomas. I think everyone's got probably quite different data flows and way of doing things. I think if you're going to try and force it into like one model, let's say, for ICANN, it's too late

for them to step forward now. I think, even trying to engage with them, it's going to be painful.

And so, I think we really need to look at what we want to do as a group to move forward, and then see where it goes from there. We've already started within (1 & 1). We've already started doing a mapping on data flows. We know in fact where the data is and all that kind of thing. And I'm pretty sure that everyone does things slightly differently. Then, there will, of course, be areas that overlap. But I do think we have to be quite careful about that.

And I just think, at the end of the day, ICANN would just be left with a big mess. And they're going to have some sort of reaction. But we've been trying to engage with them. And I don't really know how much more we can push with that. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you...

Owen DeLong: Can I just ask a little follow-up question? So you are concerned about the part collaborating with ICANN? So...

((Crosstalk))

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: I think that would be good to collaborate with ICANN. But we're not really getting that back from them. They've just kind of stuck their heads in the sand and gone, "Look, GDPR nothing to do with us." So that's my concern is the fact they're not collaborating when they should have really taken a stance on this two years ago.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. I completely understand. And I agree with a lot of what (Lindsay) is saying. My concern is, if we as registrars, contracted parties, don't all come up with something in terms of like what the output will look like, it's going to be an absolute bloody disaster.

From the - okay, just even for ourselves, like our own staff across, you know, let's say, one of my staff wants to have a look at a domain that's registered with Tucows, or (1-on-1), or whatever. You know, then, even some of my more junior staff have difficulty reading WHOIS output now on its standard, if you end up in a situation where the (1-on-1) WHOIS looks different to Tucows; that looks different to Mark Monitor; that looks different to the Black Knife; that looks different to the in circa output; that's going to be - I don't know what the word I could use for those.

Other parties within the ICANN circus will lose their minds. I mean, you know, this could actually be the straw that broke the camel's back or whatever analogy you're comfortable with. If you thought the ICANN transition was complicated. Imagine a situation when we go backwards on time.

So I think there needs to be some level of coordination. But I totally agree on the data flows, because obviously, the business model and the systems and everything else you're using is going to have to be something that people look at themselves, but maybe there is some way of collaborating around some aspects of those.

Ben Anderson: Yes, it's Ben here. So, the way I kind of see it, and I completely agree with you, Lindsay, in terms of how we all deal with our end data. We all have different processes. But I think there's a line where the data stream moves over to where we all have the same contracts. And, for me, I would much prefer that we have a single voice as a group, pushing to understand what the impacts and what it is that we can do in terms of escrow and registry contracts.

And I mean I would ask the other members to think about whether or not we should be doing this collectively. Because there is one thing that binds us all and that is the contracts that we have with the registries and with ICANN. And even if we all handle data differently, behind that, we all have to send it

in the same uniform structure downwards. And I think it's something that we should be doing together. Otherwise, we're not going to get anything from ICANN at all.

Alex Schwertner: Alex Schwertner from Tucows. If we're engaging on this, I would not be hoping on getting anything out of ICANN. And honestly, I think it's - after this meeting, it's too late already to get anything from ICANN that would inform any implementation strategy or the outcome of what's going to happen until May. I think any discussion we're having with ICANN would address what may happen at some point after May, once we've cleaned up this mess. But the mess has been created already, and then, we're there.

So, really, if we are going down that path and come up with a proposal, to me it's not to (unintelligible 20) a conversation with ICANN. If any, it would be, well, ICANN have those. This is what's going to happen, no matter what you do. To me, the interesting part would be if there's really interest from the EU Commission data privacy officer to get some sort of statement.

Probably, it will never be legally binding but some sort of statement that this approach would mean we view it in this and that way; some sort of - it's kind of acceptable; it is totally unacceptable; anything that we can get out of the US guidance because that's what's clearly between GDPR and ICANN contracts. GDPR is the higher risk. So that's what I'm concerned about. So using this process to give some clarity out of it, that would be why I would be interested in doing it.

Man: If I may briefly react to what's been said. I think, Lindsay, maybe I haven't made this abundantly clear. Certainly, it's not for whatever we might call this, the initiative to influence your internal doing. You know, it's about clarifying the interfaces between the various parties, so that we have a joint approach on what's being escrowed; a joint approach for what is potentially being displayed; you know, how - what the relationship between the registry and the

registrar would look like; you know, so that we actually have an industry-wide position.

You know, you can certainly take this further. GDPR has something which is called the Code of Conduct. So you can actually come up with uniform standards for treating data presented through the commission. And if they approve it, then everyone who plays by these rules would be safe.

But that's not what we're discussing now. This is primarily to be able to define the roles and responsibilities of the various parties and (unintelligible) a dialogue, amongst the contracted parties, and how this can be done, I think - even if you want to implement your things by ourselves, you can't speak to the roles of the counterparties, if you're not on the same page.

You know, so I'm not too optimistic in terms of consensus or outcome. But I think we can't afford to wait until ICANN comes up with something, which might not be acceptable. But we should try to establish as much common ground as we can.

And if we do that jointly, then I guess, chances for ICANN to bypass this (unintelligible 58), and with respect to what Alex has said, European Commission, some of you may have attended the GDPR webinar that ICANN conducted the other day.

And I complained that ICANN is doing its own engagement activities at the moment, as if they're going to the commission without having something tangible. And (Catherine) (unintelligible) from the commission, she posted in the chat; Thomas has (unintelligible) something along those lines. We're happy to discuss if there's something to discuss. So let's produce something that can be discussed.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Thomas. I've got Matt, and then (Volker), and then, probably, we should - and then, (Lindsay), and then, we'll try and wrap this up.

Matt Serlin: Thanks, (Graeme). Matt, for the record. Yes, I agree, Thomas, with you. And I think that the contracted parties coming together with ICANN is great. If this was a year or 18 months ago, I'd be a big supporter. I guess my question back to you is what - in your mind, best-case scenario, what does the timeline of this look like? Because, as we all know, those of us that have been doing this for any amount of time, speed is not one of the cornerstones of how we operate here.

So lay it out for me, you know, between from now, what are we? November basically, November to May, we get a group of folks together; look at ICANN; look at the contracted parties; then what? Where do we realistically think we can be in May, even if we, by next week, have a great group of people together? How do we get there? Thanks.

Volker Greimann: In a way, we are in a lucky position, because there already is one model out there that has been, at least for the presentation of WHOIS data, that has been looked at by data protection officials of one country in the EU, and they have said that, "Yes, this model is sufficient for GDPR needs," which is the model that's currently employed by the registries for dot Amsterdam and dot (FRL).

I mean, just last week, the Dutch data protection officials came out with an official letter that stated unequivocally that current WHOIS practice is illegal under European data protection laws and that tiered model that they're employing would be acceptable or is acceptable.

So if we model ourselves on that and analyze that model a bit further, I don't think we have to reinvent the wheel. We just have to look at what models are out there that have been found compliant. There are a lot of EU registries that are employing various different models of data privacy or data efficiency models for the WHOIS displays which look different from (unintelligible) displays that could be looked at. So I don't think we have so much work for,

at least, when it comes to WHOIS in front of us because there are models that have already been analyzed and found to be compliant.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Thanks. Just to get back, about the contracting parties, this has all got to be done by May. So my view, sorry, at the end of the day, if we're going to breach our ICANN contract, we're not going to break the law. And I think a lot of European registrars feel exactly the same way, regardless of what ICANN say or do. We're not going to be breaching the GDPR; end of story.

Do we actually think that WHOIS is going to survive, because even if we do look at new models, there's no way that's going to be ready by May for most registrars or even registries? So I don't know. It's really difficult. It is really difficult. I agree, yes, we could have a collaborative approach. But I'm just not sure how much we're going to get done in the time before we all have to make sure that we're all compliant. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, now, unfortunately, Matt has left the room. In terms of timing, I think we should have a consultation on this in the next couple of weeks. So we rather talk in weeks than months. I know that some of you are on the verge of starting to implement things. And I appreciate that. I think we should build as much as we can on the existing approaches and on the existing plans.

(Volker)'s proposal is also great to look into ccTLD operations. But just a word of caution, we have so many different implementations in the CC world, you know, because they have different relationships to their government and that they don't have to escrow, for example. You know, so the setup is different from what we see in the G world.

And a lot of folks have used the (dot-u) model as a role model because that is authorized by the commission, but actually, the directive specifying what (dot-u) (unintelligible) is currently under revision. And I heard through the grapevine that some of the things that they want to tweak relates to data

protection. So we can't even lean on that. I mean that would be the ideal scenario. We could just copy what the commission itself has drafted, right?

So this should be as short term as possible. Let's see how far we get. But I think, even if we do not manage to get something done and dusted by May for everyone, I think the players need to be able to show a track record of best efforts to become compliant by then.

And, you know, if in the unlikely case that the authorities are knocking at your door on May 26, if you say, "Well we've been waiting for ICANN. But ICANN just didn't come up with something that we could take," that might not be good enough. But if you say, "Well we engaged in, in coming up with the proposal, we did our internal thing that's not related to ICANN," I think that would already help do that track record.

So I think I should leave it there. I think that, you know, there's some support; some words of caution. But I think there is no violent objection to engaging in that dialogue. And so, I take this as positive feedback in general, so thanks so much for having me again.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Thomas. We appreciate the insights and the help. You are a good resource for this GDPR stuff.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. It is 2:36. We have another 24 minutes before we have a break. And then, 15 minutes after that, the registries will be joining us in here. We meet with them for an hour. And then, we move to an hour and a half, 90 minutes. And then, we meet with the board at five something? Five...

Zoe Bonython: We have another short break...

Graeme Bunton: We have another short break. Thank you, (Zoe). I've put half my brain over there. It's delightful. So there are a couple of conflicting sessions. And I think we're probably already losing people because there's a GAC board session that runs at the same time. And then, there is a GNSO session. So we're going to lose some of our GNSO counselors during the board meeting. And that is all unfortunate.

Zoe Bonython: No, it was cancelled.

Graeme Bunton: It was cancelled?

Man: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: Oh!

Man: We killed those.

Graeme Bunton: That's great. That's delightful. So, right now, we've got about 24 minutes to prep this up. We want to talk about with the registries. We can talk a bit about what we want to talk to the board about. And we have some room for AOB. I suspect that's going to eat up the next 24 minutes pretty quickly.

So let's start first with stuff we want to talk to the registries about. And so, we'll open the floor to that. A big one that I think that we should talk to them about that has come up once or twice today is how we're responding and how we're going to respond to RAA amendment, our registrar-accredited - RAA amendments sent to the Registrar Stakeholder Group in the light of the GDPR.

And if we are being consistent, as we have rejected, and so far as we can do such a thing, the (ComNet) one, and we've received another one, as (Neil) was pointing out this morning, that is also likely problematic, it's probably a blanket rejection for anything that has, you know, data control, data element

control provisions inside it, if we are going to be consistent and fair across registries.

And so, I'm kind of curious if, A, people think it is a good thing to bring up; B, if they're objecting to that approach. Any other thoughts on that particular matter? And then, also, other things that we think we should be talking about the registries with. Go ahead, (Neil).

Neal McPherson: I mean maybe a swift discussion, very briefly, is the element of the change within that, within the amendment (unintelligible) just updating something as simple as - absolutely nothing to do with data, and maybe we let that go through, to be fair. But if it's starting to talk about data or data requirements, then we should definitely (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes, this is Jeff Neuman. I want a second. Data for registry comes to us with a change that's completely unrelated data. It's not really fair to them, right? They have to come and get a change to their agreement, even if it's as simple as - I don't know, changing - well some of them are - you know, some of them have pricing in their agreements but - or policies. Yes, we shouldn't just have a blanket. But if they come like (ComNet) that has changes for the data provisions, then that's something we should put on hold or reject.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. Yes. That's reasonable that we can - it doesn't have to be a (unintelligible). We can be a little bit more scalpel-like in that.

Michele Neylon: Just a new topic, talking to the registries, you know, kicking off some discussions around what we want to do at the GDD summit, so we can make that more useful? This would be one topic, I suppose, that we could broach? And also, as well, you know, the TechOps thing that (Tobias) is leading? Again, you know, that's something that there is (unintelligible). Are they participating? Are they aware of it?

I mean, again, that's the kind of collaboration that we might want to be looking at. I don't know if you're covering in about anything around the transmission of things like premium lists, reserves lists, that kind of thing, at least what came up for the GNSO Council. The other day was with the IGO, NGO protected names that there's going to be a new list or an expansion to an existing list, which people will have to deal with and, you know, how that gets communicated, as we run into some interesting issues in the past.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, (Michele), a couple of those TechOps things are already on the agenda. I've got (Volker), and then Alex.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I raised this earlier. I think we should just point the registries within those - the need that we have to, for some of them, to change their agreements. Those registries that require us to provide them with underlying privacy data, these clauses have to go.

There's clauses in there that prevent or prohibit privacy services for individual citizens. Those clauses would likely have to go. Otherwise, we would be in a position that we cannot offer these TLDs anymore or risk be out of compliance with GDPR. So basically, the registries should allow us in their agreement or should remove any provisions that do not allow us to be compliant with GDPR.

Graeme Bunton: Right. Thank you. And that's a good point and a good topic to raise with them. It adds another layer to our previous bit about RAA amendments, which is any amendment coming through that has - trying to collect more of something or doesn't - is not removing those requirements to collect data that we find problematic. Because if people are submitting now amendment changes, we're like, "Right, we get it. GDPR is problematic. We're going to remove these requirements from RAA. Then, we should probably accept those."

Neal McPherson: I just want to, again, kind of following on that is that we've got a wave of amendments coming through the door (unintelligible) all have to resign. And is there any - maybe it's a little naive and optimistic of myself. But is there any way that we can try and somehow centralize that, to say, "Hey, these are the clauses that we'll all accept."? This is something that we can all live with rather than every registrar dealing with every registry at an individual level?

Graeme Bunton: That's a good point, (Neil). Thank you. This is (Graeme). Probably, we should work with the registries on that. And that's - so we can have this conversation with them. And then, we can say, we have this little team, this RAA amendment team. Let's work with you guys with a couple of members from over there. And we can come up with some language for those registries they want to engage in that process. You want to follow up on that or did - no, Alex gets this. Alex.

Alex Schwertner: Yes, that's what I want to bring up a couple of minutes ago. I think it's fine that we're not accepting any amendments right now. But I think, ultimately, we want this covered. And did we ever communicate it back to registries, what it is we need from them, from the rest of the community to figure it out, before we can go into any language and then finding it?"

Maybe, (unintelligible), I think, ultimately, we all want to get there. And maybe it's a good signal before 20 registries try to redraft their agreements that we'd tell them right now is not the time because these number of things need to be done, and then, we will talk.

Graeme Bunton: So it's the conversation then that we're asking registries to be, "Hey, heads up. If you try and get cranky with us for these particular elements, don't. Let's hold off until after GDPR. We can then have the time and space to come back to these agreements, but don't get all registry compliancy because no one has the cycles for that at the moment."? It seems reasonable to me. I don't run a registry. Maybe there is someone with more

insight that's going to say like, "No, they can't." But it seems sensible.
Volker?

Volker Griemann: We should also be very clear that this fast track that we are proposing for amendments that would remove certain requirements will only be applicable to change requests that only deal with these issues. If they try to bundle in other things, then, on the long haul, the big pile they go.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. And yes, agreed. Also, you know, there is the ICANN bottleneck that - and ICANN legal has to review all of these things before they get to us too. So, you know, even if they all submitted agreements tomorrow, I think there's a good chance that they don't actually end up on our door for quite some time. ICANN has traditionally sat on those for a while, although there are timelines baked into that process.

Okay. So that is - those are that RAAs. And (unintelligible) with agreements, I think, is a nice dovetail and a good topic for the registries. GDD and TechOps, it's already on the agenda. Do we have anything else already for our agenda with the registries? We've got 90 minutes with these people; delightful colleagues. Did anybody else have topics that they would like to raise with the Registry Stakeholder Group? I see Heath's hands.

Before I turn to you, Heath, we're going to spend a good chunk of these 90 minutes talking about that meeting we're about to have with the board, as is the way at every ICANN meeting, when we have a meeting with the board, so heads up on that. There are lots of questions that I - oh, right, sorry. So backing up, we're going to prep for that session with the board. We're going to be nominating people to talk to particular topics. It's going to predominantly be GDPR almost certainly.

I'd like to talk a little bit in there about (unintelligible) and make sure that the board understands that linkage between the (ComNet) RAA, VeriSign's ability to move (unintelligible) without having a new RAA in place, and our inability to

agree to that RAA without clarity on our contracts because of GDPR is a topic for the board. We can also think about those. Heath?

Heath Dixon: Do we want to talk about the GDD planning with them? We talked about that in TechOps.

Graeme Bunton: It might be...

Heath Dixon: So I don't know if...

Graeme Bunton: So (Michele) raised that as a possibility too. It might be a little too early to talk a bit about that. But we can, I think, have a high-level conversation about how we - what we want that to be. And so, the general sense amongst the (xcom) is that it needs to be tracked, so that we have - and like it's not one big monolithic room. We have track sessions that are following, you know, thematic lines.

There will be people who can't - who want to attend two things but can't. And so, we'll have to make sure there are summaries and things like that. But, at an (xcom) level, we seem to be aligned that that's the way we see that moving forward. If there's disagreement in the room, I'd like to hear it. But really, we need to make that more operational for sure and give a bunch of that to the joint TechOps group to drive that.

Man: And I think that's a great idea. I just think that we should start talking about it rather than waiting, and then having the ICANN staff put together, as I've mentioned that that's not what we actually want to cover. So I'm just suggesting that we bring it up as a subject, if they start getting ahead of it.

Graeme Bunton: Cool, Neal?

Neal McPherson: To the GDPR topic, it's for the analysts. They also have a very clear Registrar Stakeholder Group position (unintelligible) the discussions that

we've been having. But what kind of - it's been our position what we want to discuss with the registries and take to the board, kind of having it out to colleagues (Lindsay) or Alex, as well as kind of "Hey it's too late. We're going to do our own thing now." And ICANN is just going to just sit back and watch and deal with it; just kind of a couple of that, of the opinions that I've been hearing, a few other ones? What do we want to put forward there?

Graeme Bunton: You're right that there isn't like a unified registrar position on what we want the board to hear. I don't think we're going to have time to cook that up and have a concise punchy thing. There has been quite a bit of discussion about this in the GDPR sort of subgroup that's a bunch of registrars and registries. And so, if you're not on that mailing list and you would like to be, we can get you added. That's not a formal structure in any way.

But it's just a bunch of contracted parties talking about this topic. And in that has been a bunch of GDPR questions for the board. And so, there is some prep in there for this interaction coming. And I don't mind - I don't think sharing that with the mailing list. I don't see why not at the moment anyway. Does anybody else have other stuff that they'd like to talk with registries about? No? Okay.

Anybody else have topics for the board that aren't GDPR-related? We talked a little bit in the back channel about whether the GDD portal for registrars is a topic for the board. It feels like ICANN does not - is not - deliberately not giving the registrars the resources that are required to get that project to happen. It's been four years. It's a management issue. And so, maybe the place for that conversation is the board. Maybe people feel that's not the case. But I'm happy to hear opinions on that too.

Okay. Chris Pelling has a comment in the chat for registry discussion or AOB. "We would like to put a motion in action and request the (xcom) to create a small team to discuss between themselves about registries putting

domains on a server-fold and not allowing deletion, but still charging the domains indefinitely.”

Right, I remember this. This has been kicking around for a bit. And there is a draft, I think, cooked up by SafeBrands. And I think Chris worked on this too. And so, we haven't any action to this. And that's probably my fault for forgetting all about it. I'm sorry, Chris.

Right, we can bring that up within the registries section. But it is likely that we need to go back to that documents that you guys worked on and kick that over to the registries to see what they think. If you have that handy, Chris, and I'm pretty sure you're listening, could you send that my way, again, please? And we can try and get that moving. Great. Other thoughts or comments prior to - oh, (Michele)?

Michele Neylon: Thanks. How about expenditure?

Graeme Bunton: At the ICANN level, the ICANN budget?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: So I think that's a good point. And I have not had the cycles to deal with this. And, in fact, we should probably have a group or a few interested registrars be looking at the ICANN budget every year, because there's all sorts of spending that happens. They are - you know, I think registrars contribute a huge amount to the ICANN coffers, if not the majority of their revenue. It's got to be close.

And we don't pay enough attention to how it's being spent. And it's being spent in some ways, we think, perhaps inappropriately. We're not getting the portal resources. The travel funding, as (Michele) has noticed, is expanding rapidly.

Michele Neylon: Out of control, I think, was the word - the phrase I used.

Graeme Bunton: So maybe there's some financially-minded people that we could get together as a sort of group of registrars to do that once a year, because I don't think it's a huge amount of work. ICANN tries to provide lots of transparency into their budget. So you can see it and find it. It's not like you have to dig too hard.

Man: (Unintelligible)?

Graeme Bunton: Oh, it's a treasure of responsibility in the charter. So (Ben) will help run that. That's delightful. I love when the charter services - these little goodies. So probably, another person or two, if you are interested in that, please talk to Ben. Don't make me (vol) and tell you to go and do that because I'll just pick people. But that's a good topic for the registries too. And I think they actually do that. I think they've got a little sub-team that digs into the ICANN budget every year. And so, we should see if there's a joint comment, perhaps, to be made?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Yes, they do. Go ahead.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Graeme. This is Darcy Southwell. I think, on the same topic, the council is committed to creating an actual, I don't know, committee, or sub-team, or whatever we're going to call it that does this every year. There was some chatter that I think the staff is going to try to move the ball - or the drafting up a little bit to give the board more time to interact with the planning? But the council is going to have a team too.

Graeme Bunton: Great.

Ben Anderson: Hi. It's Ben. Darcy, does it make sense to do that all together? I mean I'm sure there's probably differing opinions. But is it a collective thing? Or do you think the registries and registrars sit and do their own analyses, and then bring it all together?

Darcy Southwell: That's a good question, Ben. I mean I think we might be very aligned. It probably makes sense for us to maybe have a sub-team that works with the registries and see where it lands?

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. Actually, I don't see why we wouldn't be aligned. We brought this up to the joint ExCom meeting the other day. And I'm trying to imagine a reality in which a bunch of capitalist swine like those dirty, filthy registrars and those dirty, filthy registries over there wouldn't be aligned on this. I mean we haven't all become Communists since I last checked.

Graeme Bunton: I haven't, but that's a good point. So let's bring that up in that joint session. Okay. I have been feeling like I've been sitting for forever and my legs are dead. And so, we've got a 15-minute break starting at 3:00. This will wrap up the joint registrars. We meet in at 3:15, back in here with the registries, and then move to the board.

Thank you, Zoe, for all of your help today. I really appreciated it, our translators in the back, and ICANN staff and the meeting staff who have been keeping us going. Thank you, all of you, for participating today. I think we've had some really good, really interesting discussion.

And I hope, for those of you who are new, come say hello. And I hope you found this valuable. And we always, (unintelligible), always appreciate feedback on how to make these meetings better for you. So if there are things you don't think we're doing or there's information you wish you had, please let us know, so we can continue improving this setup. So with that, have a lovely break. We'll see you back here in about 24 minutes.

Zoe Bonython: (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: No? Fifteen - well 19 minutes; I take that back. "I'm sure", she says. Thanks.

Zoe Bonython: Thanks again.

END