

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Kobe
GNSO RrSG Membership Meeting Part 1
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 09:00 JST**

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

Graeme Bunton: Yes, good morning everybody. We are going to get going. There is room at the table if you want to join us. There's a bunch of empty seats. There's - I see some people sitting in the back. So my name is Graeme I'm the Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

I see lots of familiar faces and a few new ones. We're going to do an introduction, we'll go around the table. If you're new and you haven't been to an ICANN meeting before, this is one of your first couple, please join us at the table. We want to see your face, we want to hear what you've got to say, we're a very friendly bunch and maybe it will seem intimidating but it's not really so please join us up here.

We've got a pretty full on agenda today. There's lots going on and so we'll try and keep moving pretty quickly but everyone should feel free to ask questions and engage. I'm going to make this point now and remind everyone of it throughout the day but the hardest thing I think for the ExCom is ensuring that we have a clear mandate from our members. And a clear mandate from our members is not just listening to Michele talk.

Michele Neylon: What?

Graeme Bunton: I know. It means hearing from everybody or as many voices as we possibly can. Even if you agree with Michele which is a thing that you're perfectly entitled to do...

Michele Neylon: You are going to so suffer today Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: I'm not the one suffering this morning, I think it's you. So, and I don't actually mean it like -- I say this light heartedly -- but I mean it very seriously which is, we need to hear from everybody and so this is one of the best places to do that. We're a friendly bunch and so please, if you haven't shared your opinion before, you know, you're not 100% confident, don't worry about it please put your hand up, we'll get you in the queue, we'll hear what you've got to say and that gives me so much more comfort and allows all of us to do our jobs a bit better, so let's - Zoe's suggesting that you could also write in the Chat and she'll read it out, that's fine I guess but I'd love it if you're at the table sharing your thoughts. So help us represent you, participate, don't be shy, right. So, that's my note for the day.

So maybe let's go around and do some quick introductions so who you are, which registrar you're from, something dumb if you feel like adding it just so we can be aware that speaking at the microphone isn't the most terrible thing.

So I'll start which is I'm Graeme Bunton. I work for registrar called Tucows. I'm the Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I think Moby Dick is a terrible book. It's awful.

Sara Bockey: Yes thanks for setting that up Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: You're welcome.

Sara Bockey: I'm Sara Bockey. I'm with Go-Daddy and I'm also the Vice Chair for Policy Coordination for the Registrar's Stakeholder Group. And I don't have anything witty to say right off the cuff.

Darcy Southwell: Hi, I'm Darcy Southwell. I'm with Endurance International. I'm one of the three Councilors for the Registrar's Stakeholders Group so the GNSO Council. I didn't like Moby Dick either but then again, I don't know, it was a hard read.

Benny Samuelson: All right, I'm Benny. I'm from Nordreg the incoming Treasurer trying to fill the shoes after Ben.

Caroline Greer: I'm Caroline Greer. I am working for CloudFlare Registrar and I'm the Nominating Committee Representative.

Michele Neylon: Good morning, I'm Michele AKA Graeme's punch bag this morning. Michele from Black Knight in Ireland. I'm also one of your GNSO Council Reps. I don't have a strong opinion about Moby Dick but I did try to review (The Seas) and I just couldn't.

Kristian Ormen: I'm Kristian Ormen, I work for Larsen Data. I'm also the RrSG Secretary. And right now we are running an election so if you are the voting representative and didn't get a mail from election body I'm the guy that you should come and talk to.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias Sattler, United Domains on White Shelf Technical Operation.

Pam Little: Hi, I'm Pam Little. I am with Alibaba Registrar. I'm also one of the three Councilors to the GNSO Council thank you.

(Fredrik Himan): Hello, my name is (Fredrik Hyman) and I work for Key Systems and Centralnic.

Greg DiBiase: My name is Greg DiBiase, I work for Amazon Registrar.

Eric Rokobauer: Good morning, I'm Eric Rokobauer and I work at Endurance International Group.

Janelle McAlister: Good morning, it's Janelle McAlister from Uniregistrar.

Vlad Dinculescu: Hi all, Vlad Dinculescu from DNS Africa and a quick question, is there free coffee in here somewhere? No?

Man: No.

Vlad Dinculescu: Zoe what can we do about this?

Frederic Guillemaut: I'm Frederic Guillemaut SafeBrands and I didn't read Moby Dick but I read the information from Zoe and she said there was no free coffee.

Joyce Lin: I'm Joyce Lin from 007Names

Jothan Frakes: Jothan Frakes, Private Label Registrar. I hate tomatoes.

(Susan Jang): (Susan Jang), I work for Google Domains. I did not read Moby Dick and I liked (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Hi, James Bladel from Go-Daddy.

(Ken Taylor): (Ken Taylor) from (Comalade) Registrar.

Neal McPherson: Neal McPherson 1&1 IONOS.

Thomas Keller: (Tom) Keller 1&1 IONOS and I'm doing (unintelligible).

(Kelly Peterson): (Kelly Peterson) from Automattic AKA WordPress.com. I love tomatoes as well. I have read Moby Dick, it is overrated. However Pequod's Pizza in Chicago is the best place underrated.

(Wendy Scott): (Wendy Scott) from WordPress.com also Automattic and I concur with everything (Kelly) just said.

(Owen Makowski): (Owen Makowski), I guess this is my first meeting here. I've been (unintelligible) so glad to be here. Oh, and I love tomatoes too and all food.

Sarah Wyld: I'm Sarah Wyld from Tucows. I have not read Moby Dick but I have a beautiful copy of it. It sits on my shelf and looks nice.

Matt Serlin: Matt Serlin Brandsight. You didn't say how you felt about tomatoes, I felt that was now one of the requirements.

Sarah Wyld: They're not very good.

Matt Serlin: See, I love a tomato but not ketchup oddly enough.

((Crosstalk))

Zoe Bonython: So, I'm Zoe Bonython and I'm the Registrar Secretariat. I used to dislike tomatoes until I moved to Tunisia and then that changed.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you everybody. I see some staff in the room and there's a couple people sitting in the back, if you're a registrar and you want to introduce yourself, please feel free. Don't be shy. We're clearly a bunch of goof balls. All right. Okay. So, thank you everyone for joining us. We're going to get going, I think. It's just about right on time and with that I'm going to hand it right over to Darcy Southwell for an update on the Generic Name Supporting Organization council because we're not going to use too many acronyms today.

Darcy Southwell: Just for that I'm going to use lots of them, no. So, welcome. This is like not the most exciting topic to jump off with this morning but anyway. So, for those of you who don't know, we have a council meeting tomorrow, it's a public

meeting if you want to come and watch the fun. It's from 1:00 to 3:00. You know, the Council is made up of all the constituencies, stakeholder groups that are part of the GNSO and so there are a lot of issues we look at that probably are not the most interesting or exciting to registrar's and some of them don't really impact the registrar's side of the community but so what I wanted to do today was rather than talk about everything that council is doing is just highlight for you some things that definitely impact the registrar world or are in other ways maybe just interesting to the registrar world.

For those of you who don't know, one of the things that the contracted party has is the opportunity to play someone on the board of directors at ICANN and so one of the things that we have on our consent agenda for tomorrow is re-electing Becky Burr as the CPH - sorry Contracted Party House nominee for the ICANN board. She's finishing up her first term now. And it's something we always work with the registry stakeholder group to select someone from either one of our stakeholder groups.

We have a few other things that are up for discussion. They've been under discussion for a little while now and that's continuing. I'll save you PDP to the last because I know we all love that topic. We are talking more about the PPSAI IRT, which is the Privacy Proxy Service of Accreditation Implementation review team which has been paused for, gosh, probably about five months now. It was paused because of the fact that GDPR has an impact on it, the EPDP is doing, you know, at the time was doing a lot of work and we didn't want the IRT to continue and do work that possibly was going to have to be redone following the EPDP.

There was a letter sent earlier this week that's posted on the council Web site from Cyrus Namazi who's the Head of the GDD for ICANN, suggesting that we continue to keep it paused that the EPDP still has lots of work to do. We have the IRT, I'm sure it'll come up during the GDD update which is after this and we have the space to actually talk about the IRT issues later today but what the council is really looking at is discussing Cyrus's email and the fact at

whether or not it should remain paused. And feel free to ask questions anytime. I'll stop.

A couple of other things, one is what we are fondly referring to at the council level is PDP 3.0. Vlad, go ahead.

Vlad Dinculescu: (Unintelligible) Darcy the questions are if the IRT then gets reestablished or carries on let's say five or six months later, are they expecting the same people to still be there and carry on the discussions or are they going to re-do the grouping or what? How are they essentially going to re-kick off?

Darcy Southwell: That's a good question Vlad. I don't know the answer yet. I think some of it depends on what we really need to do. There has been some loose discussion, not within the IRT because it's not meeting but within our stakeholder group about whether or not the original policy has issues. That was written without GDPR or general data protection laws in mind and there are very likely some pieces in there that need some legal evaluation before the IRT would move forward. That's a registrar position, that's not an IRT or staff position certainly but I think that needs to be considered and then just pending on how we go forward then it would be like, well how do we restart this.

The GNSO at a whole is responsible for the (GTLD) Policy Development within the ICANN community. We fondly refer to it as PDP and one of the things that came out of a council strategy session a little over a year ago was the fact that we need to make improvements in PDP efficiency and effectiveness. Some of the PDP's have gone on for years and years. I think we have one that's - well (RDS) was terminated last year I think after four years with no actual final work product. And there's been some question about whether that's too long and why did it take so long and what are some of the challenges?

So, PDP 3.0 is something that staff and the council put together to make recommendations on how PDP's can be more effective and more efficient. Some of these things recommended are - they're not difficult. It's how do we scope a charter for our PDP better to make sure that the working group has a narrow scope, they know what they're trying to accomplish, we don't ask them to boil the ocean. How do we monitor the progression? What are the milestones they have to meet and part of that is really focused on efficiency, right? We don't want them to get sidelined and take years and years to come up with a policy.

So, there was a staff report that was put out with the recommendations. We've received public comment back through the normal ICANN community public comment process. Majority of them received significant community support. There were three that -- and I don't have them off the top of my head, I'm sorry -- but there were three that there were some questions about. So, at this point we've kind of put those three on the back burner and we're working on the others that you would think of as sort of more typical operational management, right -- setting better timelines, writing better scopes, writing better standards to help everyone understand what it means to participate in a PDP, what are you doing, what is the obligation that you're making when you sign up to work on a working group developing policy for example?

So, we'll be talking about that. It's a continuous discussion we're having. At the last strategy meeting that we had in January we agreed to develop a sub team of councilors who are devoted to this implementation. Pam and I are both on it. And so, we'll begin working on that and provide you with updates. I think, you know, ultimately from a registrar standpoint, this is something that's really important, right. They develop consensus policy that affects our contracts and we as a group really need to be significant participants in many of those that effect registrar policy and will eventually affect our contracts.

And so, we'll keep you updated on those improvements and help try to educate everyone about how we can all as a stakeholder group and as individuals participate better in the policy development process. Any questions there? Graeme?

Graeme Bunton: Thank you for that Darcy. So, just to editorialize I guess and see if I can make this particular piece of work resonate for everybody, you know, further down the agenda today Tom Keller is going to talk about the transfer process for 30 minutes, perfectly. And so, I think this is a good example of a thing that we thing is broken or not great, you know. It introduces friction in all of our businesses. However, the process of trying to fix transfers is so daunting, you know, we don't want to end up necessarily an IRTBE that's going to take three years to do it, it's going to involve everyone, you know, it might make transfers worse. And so, there's this, you know, real trepidation about actually starting to try and fix the problems we've got because we think the PDP process is clunky.

And so, this whole process the council has undertaken is excellent and, you know, we should engage on that as much as we can to sort of find the improvements and find the ways that we can solve problems that affect all of us every day and move those things forward without having to feel like, you know, the wheels are going to fall off everything. So, if we put in some effort here and care here then things like transfers get better. The other weird technical issues that we find in our business begin to get better.

I have Michele and then Jothan.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks Graeme. Just on this one particular, this is now about a year into this process of discussing how to rejig, reinvigorate, fix, tweak the entire PDP process. One of the other things that we've been looking at a council is the makeup of the working groups particularly because up until now it's been a free for all. So, you get all sorts of people signing up for working groups and like I say, the (RDS) PDP I think there were like 130 participants or something

like that and then further 100 odd observers. That's just not manageable, that doesn't scale and you know, stuff doesn't get done.

But we've been circulating to the members list some documents kind of covering how this process has been evolving. It would just be very helpful for us on council to get feedback even if it is just simply to say, "looks great." Even that would be helpful because we've put some of this stuff out on the list and we get back nothing. So, we have no way of knowing how you all feel about this if you don't tell us. So, please even if it is just simply to say, "it's fine" that would be helpful. Thanks.

Nancy Southwell: Michele, can you resend that to a list or something so I can see it?

Michele Neylon: There hasn't been one recently. It's a general - when we send stuff out onto the list could you please - if we're kind of saying, you know, this is what we're working on, a bit of input would be helpful. Even if the input is simply, "read this, like this" we're perfectly fine with it. That's all. Thanks.

Jothan Frakes: Thank you. Jothan Frakes, Private Label Registrar. So, I recently - my registrar is going through a renewal process and I received notice from ICANN that I have to go through the mandatory training or have staff go through the mandatory training and some of the interesting things that may spill out of EPDP or some of these things is real evidence of the complexity and interconnection between a variety of related things. One of them is as I went through this training, I was reviewing it through the optics of, you know, how much of this is really true now given the changes that we're going to have to make, given GDPR, the EPDP and some of these other things. So, it's worthwhile to look at that at some of the cascading effects of the changes that we're making in a rapid pace. And that was something I wanted to note, so thank you for that. I know we've had some discussions around it in our Slack Channel and things of that nature but I did want to put that on the record.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jothan. I think I've got Darcy and then Pam.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks, Jothan. That's a good point and I think one of the recommendations in the EPDP final report for example is that given what we're doing with EPDP, there is a long list of policies that ICANN needs to take a look at, likely needs legal guidance on because we've got to get it all aligned. I actually wanted to respond though to what Michele said and I think one of the things that I found yesterday for those of you who went to the Compliance Meeting, I have found the work that (Christian) and Greg have done on the compliance sub team or whatever we're officially calling them, invaluable. I don't feel like I can keep up on everything that's going on. I just - there are not enough hours in the day and I eventually have to sleep or you don't want to see me. I get kind of snarky.

And so, I really appreciate that. And same with Tobias and the Tech Ops group. I mean, I think what they have done providing focus in an area is really good. And so, I kind of wanted to suggest -- and I'm throwing this out there after not talking to anybody else in the ExCom -- but I like the idea of these groups and I'm wondering if there are those of you who feel like you have ideas on PDP's and how we can make it better. Maybe we can have -- and I'm not suggesting a whole bunch of calls, don't get me wrong when I say this -- but maybe we can have a quarterly check in and Pam and I can commit -- sorry Pam -- Pam and I can commit - or Pam or I, I should say -- can commit to maybe checking in with you and getting your feedback.

I know there's a lot that's going on for all of us within our businesses and within the industry and so if there are those of you who feel like you have that interest and you have the time, maybe that's a good way for us to garner some feedback directly from the Registrar Stakeholder Group rather than asking all of you to really think about that intensely if that's not your (bailiwick) or you are buried in other things. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Darcy. I'm going to interject briefly before Pam which is to say, a reminder that we're doing some strategic planning on Friday somewhere around here. And this is a topic that we can bring up then a little bit about PDP's in general and how to make sure that we're engaging everyone in the SG on both the process and the substance of those PDP's. Pam?

Pam Little: Hi, thank you. What I was going to add to what Darcy and Michele have already said about the PDP 3.0 was this is not only going to impact our business how PDP - how policy is made within ICANN or the GNSO. It's also now if you have been to the five-year strategic plan session that was conducted by the board yesterday, this is going to be one of the five major focus areas, right, under the five-year strategic plan which is evolving ICANN's governance model. And although that doesn't only just cover PDP or policy making within ICANN but it's going to be - I suspect a big chunk of that because if you look at (sharing), the ICANN Chair's question to the community for ICANN 64, there's this really a pointed question is, how do we make PDP more efficient while maintaining inclusivity, openness and accountability.

So, I would encourage all members to really pay attention to interrelated topic, one is PDP 3.0 that the council is trying to come up with implementation step to implement those improvements or recommendations to make policy making process more efficient and the strategic plans under the governance model as well. So, great idea. I hope we can talk more about this on Friday. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Pam. Do we have anything else for our GNSO Council Team or - oh Darcy's got a thing.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell again, for the record. So, one other thing I just wanted to bring up is what the council is doing with EPDP at the moment. So, as I think you all know we adopted the final report last week in our council meeting and so that's been sent to the board for their review and approval that they have

their own public comment period that's open right now to garner feedback to help them evaluate the situation and make their decision. So, what the council is working on now is phase two. We have a situation where the phase one Chair stepped down Kurt Pritz so there's an open call for a new Chair for phase two. I think it's open until like March 22. The council will vote on that selection of a Chair I think in our April 18 meeting or I think it's something like that.

And then in the meantime working closely with the leadership staff and the current leadership which is the Interim Chair is Rafik Dammack who is the Loop Council Liaison, that's part of the lead on his role is to serve as Interim Chair. So, we're building work plans. I think if you happen to see the council meeting yesterday with the board, they expressed a lot of agreement with us that the pace needs to slow down, that we need to be thoughtful about how we do this and their, you know, legal advice is the best place to start. We have a lot of open legal issues that we need to figure out before we start talking about how to implement.

So, working on a work plan there and establishing, I would say, maybe some key milestones or the goal or at least an end date so that we don't have a phase two that takes years. James?

James Bladel: Thanks for the update Darcy, James speaking. Member of phase one EPDP and on the fence for phase two. So, it sounds like, you know, I mean, - and we were part of the meeting with the council talking about - and we had a Saturday workshop as well where we talked about what the work plan for phase two would look like and I think it's appropriate for us to ask our representatives on council to really hold the line on two things with phase two. And one is that we have the preliminary legal advice that we've asked for in place before we've launched that and two that we have a new Chair in place. There's a lot of talk from a lot of other groups about parallelizing those types of things and doing a lot of things at the same time and of course you run the risk of like any project going back and exercising a whole lot of rework

and I'm going to borrow a phrase from (Vulker) which I love now and I'm going to use it all the time which is, let's not work for the trashcan here, you know, and spend a lot of time in hours into things that are just ultimately going to fall by the side of the road. I mean, for those who have followed the council vote the entire EPDP did not pass unanimously or even overwhelmingly. A couple of abstentions or no votes and the entirety of that 6,000 some odd person hours of work would have just been thrown into the shredder.

So, I would ask us to maybe - I think it's what I hear you saying Darcy is we're going to go slower. We're going to be a little more thoughtful and deliberate and we're going to ensure that we have all of our ducks in a row before we take the next step and launch phase two. And I think it's completely imbalance for us to ask our councilors to hold the line on those points. Thanks.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks James and I think you know, when Michele and Pam and I have talked about this, we completely agree. I think it's fair to say that there are councilors who disagree. They're the same ones who voted against the final report. There is an interpretation by some, I feel as though they think that by not moving quickly, we're not dedicated -- which is ridiculous. And we've been very transparent. Like, you know, we support that this needs to be done but it needs to be done right and it needs to be done at a good pace that makes sense. I love (Vukler's) phrase, that's awesome.

Because I'll tell you during that council vote I personally was on pins and needles listening to people vote yes and no because I knew how many no's we could have and once we have them, if anyone else went that direction we would have thrown that whole thing in the trashcan and that would have been extremely disappointing. And I think it would have been a complete failure of the PDP or the policy development process which would have been so problematic for so many reasons, but.

James Bladel: So, when I was younger and snarkier, I might suggest a comment along the lines of that any councilor or constituent figure stakeholder of a group who voted no on phase one was voting no on phase two and therefore has given up any credibility or latitude to discuss the work pace of phase two. And we can do it quickly. We can do it even faster than a normal PDP and still have nothing like what we experienced in phase one where we all basically surrendered our day jobs to this monster, so, thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Michele for the record. James, I am slightly younger and still very snarky so if somebody wants to remind me to potentially raise that I'd be more than happy to do so. The way that vote played out at council was ridiculous. It was farcical. All of you who were involved in the EPDP over the last few months, I said you gave up your day jobs, you gave up your private lives, the ICANN staff has to work on reviewing all of those public comments over Christmas which is nuts. I mean, it's not reasonable.

And now, we're hearing from some (quorum) say let's call a spade a spade and see BCIPC into a certain degree (Alack) who for some bizarre reason are now the voice of, I don't know what but it's definitely not (end users). They seem to have a sense of urgency around this which is not reasonable and I don't think we can ask anybody to put the same kind of effort, the same kind of hours into the second phase. I just don't think that's viable. I think it would actually break many other things because it's just not sustainable. If a meeting needs to have breaks then it's too long. And I dialed into multiple of those EPDP calls and you can't focus, not for that limit of time.

Now, that doesn't mean that we are not supportive of getting it done but it needs to be done at a reasonable pace, it needs to be planned, it needs to not cause massive issues and for those of you who will be on the EPDP in phase two, thank you in advance but there's no way that we can ask you to give up your day jobs like you did during phase one. Finding a Chair for phase two, that is going to be a major challenge. While there might be a

number of people who will put their names forward, whether or not they'll be acceptable to the broader community or not is going to be the problem.

At the meeting yesterday with the CCNSO council, I put forward the rather crazy idea that maybe somebody from CC space might want to do it but again they would have to give up and make a serious commitment in terms of time regardless of how many hours per week that group was meeting. So, you know, let's see how that plays out but I think it's pretty clear for us that there's no way we're going to back any kind of insane time table like during phase one. That's just not viable.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. You know, we're going to come back to the EPDP after the morning break. So, maybe I'll talk a little bit more about that then. Anything else on GNSO council business? You guys do hard work. We appreciate it. The council is not an easy task. Pam?

Pam Little: Can I just say something very quickly about the PPSAI IRT pause and the related piece in that letter from Cyrus to GNSO council is asking about what to do with the transfer policy (part C) change of registrar involving proxy and privacy registration piece too because that was deferred to the PPSAI IRT and the decision was not to ask the IRT to deal with that until the public comment of the PPIRT accreditation documents. But now we're pausing the IRT but that issue remains quite pressing.

And I wanted to raise this because James is here because James was on the council as the Council Chair then. The council wrote to the ICANN board seeking that the referral of the matter to the IRT and also for (barrence) of compliance on PP related change of registrar data. But when it came to - when it transpired, compliance is interpreting this forbearance quite restrictively only as if it only applies to turning on and off of PP service not in the scenario where the underlined registrant data change. And where some registrar actually also treat this as a change of registrar and therefore

triggered the 60-day lock. And this remains an issue for a number of registrars.

And so, our thinking is to have the council write to ICANN board or staff to clarify that this scenario should also be covered otherwise it defeats the purpose of the change of registrant which is to kind of minimize or prevent or (unintelligible). And so, can we talk about this later on or can we sort of rev this up here and have some instruction or feedback from our group? Thanks.

James Bladel: Is that okay? Just jump in? Okay. Hey Pam, thanks. James speaking and we had a really interesting exchange with (Jamie Headlin) yesterday was it at 1:30 when we talked about the compliance things and I think we tabled a lot of these concerns about the inconsistent application of the change of registrant as it applies to privacy proxy, whether they're changing the underlined or adding or removing. I think what we should be driving towards is something that ICANN has not done in a long time which is a compliance advisory which essentially - whenever there was this area of ambiguity or confusion we would help them sort of layout some clear consistent interpretation and they would put that out on their blog or something and say, "here's how we view this," and I think - we could probably do (Jamie) and his team a huge favor right now because they're scrambling with a number of issues and staff changes if we would like take a first stab at what that would look like in language and say, "here, why don't you guys put out an advisory that, you know, that does that," and I'd be happy to gather a team to work on that with the end goal of putting out an advisory or at least asking (Jamie) and his team to do so and I think that could help go a long way to standardizing how people are applying or not applying the change of registrant policy.

Graeme Bunton: That sounds great. Thanks James. Good suggestion. And we can come back to PPSAI a little bit later in the afternoon so we can hopefully clarify that a little bit and wrap it up. Anybody else have anything for our GNSO councilors? Everybody feels up to speed on what's happening inside the

GNSO? Good, great. And I think that's just about right on time. Has Andee made it into the room?

Darcy Southwell: He's right here.

Graeme Bunton: Oh, there she is. So, moving right along. It's now a GDD update from ICANN staff. This is Andee. Everybody, Andee. She's taking her seat and then feel free to go ahead.

Andee Hill: Thank you, good morning everyone. I appreciate the time to speak to you. So, we're going to cover a few different topics today. The first fun one is a GDD summit, the next event we all get to be together. As you can - you can move on this next slide. Contracted parties survey and I don't need to read them all to you but - next two slides actually. Thank you.

So, the GDD summit this year, the preliminary agenda has been posted. It's at [ICANN.org/summit](https://icann.org/summit). ICANN staff appreciates the planning committee with a registry and registrar stakeholder groups. They've been great in getting us a quick and early agenda. We are looking to have updates later in April. Probably mostly just description updates to give a little bit better flavor to each session.

Additional events are going to follow this year, ROW, DNS Symposium, and DNS OARC. We are going to attempt to also group with those particular events next year and the event will be in Europe. We expect to be able to announce the actual location on or before the summit this year. Don't hold me to that because maybe his team has, you know, different expectations but I think it'll happen.

We are going to have the prescheduled one-on-one meetings as we usually do Monday and Thursday afternoons with GDD staff. And then this year we had an issue last year where we were kind of overwhelmed with the amount of interest in certain sessions that we really didn't anticipate to be that

attended. So, what we're going to do to handle that this year is put out a pole to anyone that's registered and ask them for their interest in which sessions they're going to attend so please register early so that we can, you know, get an idea of who's going to be in which room.

Next slide. So, we are doing the contracted party satisfaction survey again this year. This is the third year I think we have done it. We are again partnering with the (MIDA) group for support in this. The survey was sent on the 26 of February and we will send you a few reminders with the links to it. It will close on April 2. They are anonymous. That's why we have the (MIDA) group send them.

We've really changed the format. It was much longer the last two years. The questions were kind of - you know, they could have been taken either way so we didn't feel like we really got like a lot of actionable changes that we can make so we really revamped the whole thing but still tried to keep it formatted so that we'd have some (unintelligible) from year to year if we're doing better or, you know, worse in certain areas. So, we expected it only take about ten minutes to complete and we have quite a few open-ended questions so it's not clear what we're asking you, you're able to actually, you know, give us actual detail.

Next slide. So, we've been working - IDN guidelines working group has been looking at for a long time actually establishing the IDN implementation 4.0 is where we're at. We're currently analyzing the requirements and building an implementation plan internally within ICANN. We're targeting board consideration in May of 2019 and hoping for approval of the implementation. There will be planning sessions at the GDD summit and we will have two webinars to enable the - sorry, two webinars scheduled 6 and 18 months apart so that we can, you know, give you some guidelines.

Next slide. So, the privacy proxy accreditation implementation, as you guys have discussed earlier today this has been kind of put on a somewhat of a

hold based on the EPDP understanding we're definitely not wanting to implement something that doesn't fit into what's going to come out of that group. As indicated, there was a letter sent out so I'm sure you guys will discuss this further. I'm not sure I have a lot of additional things to add on that. I'm sure we'll get into this within the group later today.

A few additional notes I wanted to just bring to your attention that we are going through the process of the 2013 renewals through the autorenewal program. And we're getting - the process takes, you know, there's a few different steps that have to be taken by the registrar's like Jothan indicated doing the training program, having someone on staff that's actually gone through that program. So, some of those things can take a little bit of time so we just kind of want to put it out there to warn you that please start early. We don't want to have anybody's accreditation jeopardized by, you know, some piece of paperwork that they need to provide or something.

And then also, Jothan gave me another talking point, the ICANN training program. We are in the process of revamping that with in mind that, you know, privacy protection issues may be changing what is required and what we're asking and different policies in place so look forward to some updates to that program. So, there's quite a bit of outdated links in there at this point so we're working on that and it should be out probably in the next month or two.

Next slide. For the RDAP implementation, I've got Gustavo from our Technical Services team so I'm going to hand this over to him at this time.

Gustavo Lozano Ibarra: Hi thank you Andee. Gustavo, ICANN. So, this is how the implementation timeline for RDAP looks like. As you may remember back in August, we published the RDAP profile that was developed by the RDAP pilot working group for public comments. We received a lot of comments and also, we provided some comments.

In February, weeks ago, we published a final version of the profile and this is a really important milestone that was accomplished by the RDAP pilot working group. And at the same time, we also sent a legal notice to the contracted parties requiring implementation of RDAP. And the deadline for that implementation is August 26. I have that on your screen.

We are thinking of having webinars so we can go through the requirements with the contracted parties and answer any questions that you may have. (Unintelligible).

Andee Hill: Before you continue Gustavo we actually wanted to poll this group because in the past we've always done two webinars, you know, living at different time zones and trying to accommodate the different time zones but we have heard back from members of this and their registry stakeholder group that it can be cumbersome because people feel the need to listen or attend both because we're allowing questions to be submitted beforehand and sometimes during the webinars also. So collectively if we can somehow get your feedback on that keep in mind we don't want to exclude any, you know, geographical location but we'd love your opinion. Is this a good idea? Should we be doing two? Should we do one? Looking at translating, thank you. Pam?

Pam Little: Pam Little speaking. I'm speaking personally here obviously from as a registrar located in Asia Pacific region. I strongly believe it'd be a good idea to hold two. And if you could please have the recording available then I hope that would overcome the need to attend both for those who feel the need to attend both. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Michele just speaking on my own behalf. Kind of echoing Pam. I mean, for anybody stuck in this neck of the woods, it's almost impossible to attend anything that's schedule for Europe or for America. So, I think running it twice does make sense. The feeling that people have that they have to attend every single webinar on a particular topic, hard one to mitigate, making the recordings available quickly, being as transparent as you normally are might

help a little bit but there's always going to be some people who feel a burning desire not to sleep and want to stay up all night and attend things in real time. I mean, that's their problem.

Andee Hill: Thank you. That's helpful. You can take it over Gustavo.

Gustavo Lozano Ibarra: Yes, next slide please. As I was mentioning the webinars, the idea is to go through the requirements with the contracted parties. I've seen the three managers and the technical guys working on the RDAP implementation should attend. We assume that the persons who will be attending will have some basic knowledge on RDAP so that idea - we are going to publish the slides in advance so you can go through the slides before attending the webinar and you may provide feedback so we can cover any questions that you may have during the webinar.

Next slide please. A very important topic that when you start boot strapping source part of that (unintelligible) histories, they need to provide in the (other) response a link to the registrant out of server in which more information provider as a main name could be found.

So, obviously during the conversations with the RDAP pilot working group the group realized that all the register's asking for the same information will be something that it's too complicated and maybe it's not - you won't get anything of any value, right.

So, the idea is to have a center repository for that registers base URLs so that registrars can go to that file of registry, get information and populate the other response. So, the (unintelligible) registrar boot strap.

Next slide. And the idea here is that you will populate that information in (RADAR's) and the functionalities (unintelligible) available by April 2019. So, it's really important that you go to (RADAR's) and put that information in there

because registries, they need this information to comply with the requirements of the profile and the deadline is August.

So, if - I mean, that's the important message (unintelligible). Please by April 2019 go to (RADAR's) and populate this field for your (unintelligible) that's pretty important.

And that's it. I don't know if you have any questions.

Andee Hill: Thank you Gustavo. Next slide. We wanted to give you an update on the NSP portal road map and Chris Gift is here to handle that for us.

Chris Gift: Good morning everyone, this is Chris Gift. This is Graeme's favorite topic. So, next slide please. Oh yes, already up. I think this is a - this is a slide we had presented I believe about a year ago showing the road map of what we had planned, the remaining work we wanted to do in NSP. This group was displeased with this road map, understandably so. It's long, right. So, it goes out quite a ways. So, we really took that to heart and we did quite a bit of work afterwards and looked at what we could do to speed things up, having multiple teams looking at different things that we could do in sales force, using things such as lightening and as well as working on our own internal processes to see how we could do better.

So, we did that over the summer and the fall and I'm basically hear to report on the outcome of all that work that we did. So, if we can go to - so, keep in mind the date, right. Basically, C5 is the smart forms so that would be rolled out in Q1 of 2022.

So, next slide, please. So, this is up the updated road map. The numbers don't quite correspond because we've done quite a bit to reginal things and make this - and improve this. So, but basically, the outcome is that by this time next year -- so two years faster -- we, huh? We are done. So, by this time next year we don't want to obviously have exact dates yet, there's still

quite a bit we have to do but yes, never done. But that's the basic outcome, right. So, we have - we listen, we've tried our best and this is where we're at with the green line. We saw the number releases to go but at this time next year we should be on NSP with not just the bulk of the register functionality but compliance as well.

All right, yes. Next slide please. Go ahead Michele.

Michele Neylon: Chris, Michele for the record. I mean, I know it's early in the morning and we're generally a kind of pleasant group but haven't we had these promises of launches and releases and other things for like this portal at least, I don't know, four times now. I don't know Graeme, have you been keeping track how many times they've promised us this? What's difference this time I supposes is the bottom line?

Chris Gift: I don't think we promised things in the past. We've been very clear it's going to be a long ways out. I think that's all we promised. So, what we're promising out and what we're committing to now is that it's going to be a lot faster. And we have, you know, we have had problems. There's no doubt. We've had problems in the past in terms of releases but for the past about a year, year and a half now releases have been on time with respect to NSP and they have rolled out with the expected functionality. So, I think we're on track there. Yes?

James Bladel: Can you back this slide up one to the timeline? I really appreciate the velocity with which you have (unintelligible) things but as I look at the sixth item there for example, I see who is (unintelligible) tool completing before our implementation date in August that Gustavo just described. So, you might have hit the gas a little too hard. Could you explain that?

Chris Gift: Yes, that's a great question. So, that is not an external tool. That's an internal tool used by our compliance to compare who is records. It's just something that they do. It pulls up who has record multiple times over a period of

whatever time they want. It just compares the difference. So, it really has nothing to do with your (unintelligible) stuff or anything like that. It's more of a tool for us internally to do things. So, that's what that is.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to say some of us are caffeinated and paying attention.

Chris Gift: So, the next slide, please. Just very quickly this is just the work we have left to do in terms of the releases relative to you and then estimated time of completion is first quarter of next year calendar.

Graeme Bunton: So, this is Graeme for the transcript. Thank you. That sounds great. We look forward very much to having this functionality in place. I'm impressed you found two years of work to shave us or compress, that's delightful. Yes, great. Can't wait.

Man 1: To quote Gandalf is it secret? Is it safe?

Chris Gift: Is it secret? No, it's not secret although this is the first time, we're sharing it. Is it safe? Yes, it's safe. We're comfortable with this.

Man 1: So, as long as you're not shaving off any time from testing security of the data that's going into this, I think we are fine. We just don't want to see anything like the new (GTLE) application portal where one applicant could suddenly see data on other applicants. This would not be nice for registrar's either.

Man 2: So, I'm kind of new to this whole thing, being out with a register now so I'm experiencing things from a, you know, I know it was there as an ICANN staff and so I'm trying to get access to NSP and only the primary contact listed in (RADAR's) will have to do so which has been - for registrars is there plans to open that up or can I, you know, I don't want to have to - okay, so that would be when...

Chris Gift: V2.

Man 2: V2, okay. All right, so for now we just got to go through the one credential?

Chris Gift: Yes.

Man 2: Okay, thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. Did everybody catch that? So, the third quarter of 2019, more than one person can use the portal at a time from your registrar.

Chris Gift: That's correct.

Graeme Bunton: Okay, cool. Okay, thanks Chris. Back to you Andee. Are you done?

Andee Hill: We are done.

Graeme Bunton: Great. I have a couple things and then we'll open up to more general GDD questions. Maybe going back all the way to the GDD summit can I maybe get a show of hands in the room for people who are going to Bangkok for that? Okay, quite a few. I was a little bit concerned that it was far and filled with deadly peanuts and people like me want to avoid it but here we go.

Zoe Bonython: Graeme, it's just for one night though.

Graeme Bunton: Wow, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: I don't get it, is there a...

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: Anyone born in 1980 or later has no idea what that joke was.

Zoe Bonython: Just to update, last year we had an issue where you couldn't see the attendees so that has been fixed. You can actually look at the attendee list as of now online just like you do at any ICANN meeting. I think we're around 100 attendees. I want to say there was two or three board members that were attending but I'll follow up and check.

Graeme Bunton: Great, back to RDAP. We've been talking about this inside the stakeholder group for a long time, signaling everybody that it's coming, it's now clearly very - it's happening soon. I think there's a sort of real diversity of experiences with RDAP inside the stakeholder group so I, you know, I think (unintelligible) has built a thing on top of RDAP already. I think people haven't looked at it yet and are still trying to figure out where to prioritize, you know, RDAP work in your Dev cycles. I think GDD is going to be a great resource for people, lean on them. But also, I think we can lean on each other to a certain extent too. If you guys have questions about RDAP, you're trying to figure it out, I think collectively we've got a lot of experience and can be helpful there so let's also talk to each other.

Chris Gift: This is Chris with ICANN Org, just a quick question for the group I guess, is we are working on an RDAP client. I think people are aware of that. Yes, there had been discussion about open sourcing the code for that client and I know we've mentioned it to several registrars. Would that continue to be an interest to people here or?

Michele Neylon: It's Michele. As a general rule, I support open source software as a concept so anything that's put out there, yes but for the love of god, not in JAVA. Sorry, like I don't know. Maybe some registrars at this table are using JAVA but a lot of the registries get super excited about JAVA and release code in JAVA that's of absolutely no use to those of us who have zero JAVA in our stack.

Chris Gift: I think more that (drink) java than use JAVA.

Michele Neylon: Well I totally appreciate the idea of drinking java but we don't have any java in the room which is rather sad.

Graeme Bunton: Jothan?

Jothan Frakes: Yes, so I would second what Michele's saying. I think Python, PHP, or other languages if you're open sourcing it. Is it in JAVA Chris directly? I thought I would just directly poke the bear rather than go friendly Irish way. So, the, you know, moving that over to Python or other languages is helpful. Although there are some folks who are looking at innovation within blockchain and using authentication blockchain things that sit in the browsers that are JAVA script base...

Michele Neylon: Did you have to go with blockchain this early in the morning?

Jothan Frakes: I used the B word, I'm sorry. But there are people looking at, you know, RDAP as a new way to potentially build things in the JAVA script might be helpful but not JAVA.

Graeme Bunton: Okay, thanks. I think GDD staff are hearing that no one likes JAVA so great. My next question is maybe for Cyrus who's hiding behind me, and I was on vacation part of this meeting so maybe I missed it but we have historically had like a sort of dedicated registrar rep inside of GDD staff. And I don't believe we do at the moment or we do and I've missed it so maybe an update on where that's at and what you're thinking for how we - you know, I'm happy to direct everything your way Cyrus in your new exalted position I expect that maybe you would prefer to do that.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you very much Graeme. And good morning everybody, this is Cyrus Namazi from ICANN GDD, good question. You're not without actually

representation within GDD. Andee is obviously dedicated, (Mukesh), (Howard) -- it's just that the role of sort of the Head of that department is something that we're looking at. And as you likely know that the departure of (unintelligible) and my recent appointment to head GDD, I'm actually taking a holistic look at the entire organization of GDD.

I'm hoping definitely by the GDD summit timeframe we'll be rolling out a slightly different organization that will address some of the resourcing issues that we've had particularly on the registrar's side. And then for us and of course for you also, realize some efficiency and added effectiveness but any time that you all feel that you're not getting a response and the support from us, do feel free to reach out to me but meanwhile like I said (Mukesh) and Andee and others on the team are still 100% dedicated to support you.

Graeme Bunton: Great, thanks Cyrus. I think maybe what we should do is circulate contact information for Andee and (Mukesh) because I think maybe many people don't have that so we'll get that back out to our mailing list and sort of remind people where the best place to go for questions and stuff so that's front of mind. Do we have any other questions or bits and pieces for the GDD team while they're here? Going once? Twice? All right, well thank you for joining us. Thank you for that update. It was helpful. Looking forward to the portal any day now.

Oh, so right. We're five minutes ahead of the break. You get a 20-minute break instead of 15 because we're running ahead of schedule. So, back in your seats at 10:30 and we're going to get going on the EPDP. Come back soon. Thank you.

Zoe Bonython: Can I just say that there is supposed to be tea and coffee. There's not normally but that's because we're here they're going to be serving it out in the main lobby area but because we're a few minutes early then it may not be there yet but it should be coming, thanks. And can we pause the recording please?

END