

**ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi  
GNSO-Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) Membership Meeting Part 1  
Tuesday, 31 October 2017 08:30 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://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Cherie Stubbs: Board is coming to our room. So I think they thought it was a little bit easier for them to come to us, so.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Thank you, Cherie.

Cherie Stubbs: You're welcome.

Paul Diaz: Of course the board GAC session, if you note, the master schedule is the same time that we're meeting with the registrars. So hopefully they can make it on time and then we don't lose too much of our precious face to face time with the board.

So with that, again if anybody has additional items you want to raise, let myself, Sam, anybody up here know. We'll add it in. And with that, let me turn it over to Denise for SSR2.

Denise Michel: Thank you, Paul. Denise Michel here. I was appointed to the Security Review Team by the GNSO and I'm co-chairing it along with Eric Osterweil sitting next to me. And there are several other Security Review Team members in the room, if they could raise our hands. Thank you. All right. Next slide please.

So as I probably don't need to tell you the sort of overarching principle is most of ICANN's activities is the security, stability and resiliency of the internet system of unique identifiers. And every five years the SSR review is

by law mandated to examine these activities, look at the effectiveness in addressing any concerns over security and stability.

And just to remind you folks, SSR is one of four independent community reviews that's mandated by the ICANN bylaws. It started several years ago when the US was still tethered to the Department of Commerce and the MOU required four reviews to address the areas of security, WHOIS, accountability and transparency and competition and consumer trust review.

Next. The SSR review team is assessing these elements as required by the bylaws. The bylaws are explicit in requiring the review team to assess the implementation and impact of the first Security Review Team that completed its work and was approved by the board. Their recommendations were approved by the board in 2012.

There were 28 recommendations covering a wide range of topics. So we must assess the implementation impact of those. And then in addition to that, we have a whole list of (mays) and various areas that we can get into, dealing with security, stability and resiliency. There's links on our Wiki and other places to the bylaws that are relevant here.

Next slide please. I'm running through these fairly quickly. I know you guys have a hard stop at 9:00. So please feel free to raise your hand if you want me to stop and answer questions. And of course the other review team members may have things to weigh in on too. So as you would imagine, there's a lot of scope of work here, given that SSR applies to most everything we do.

We've had to review an enormous set of materials to establish context. Well, first of all, of course in March bringing together 15 people from literally all over the world with a whole range of different perspectives and backgrounds. Some of them have never done anything on - for any group in ICANN before.

So there was certainly an amount of level setting. And because of the scope of the work here and the bylaw mandate, it's a heavily front loaded review. And by that I mean the first six, seven months is really taken up doing a significant amount of information gathering, wading through over 70 reports, getting every 20 briefings on all the 28 SSR1 recommendations, as well as all the substantial material available that relates to the SSR issues that we're addressing.

So that's been a significant part of our organizing and in-depth research and literature review and briefing for the first seven months that we've been underway. So obviously our goal here is to be thorough and thoughtful to create a report that's helpful. So as you would imagine, this review is not a quick exercise, and one of the more challenging community reviews that's required under the bylaws.

Next slide please. Several of the people that waved at you earlier in the room and listed here. Next slide please. In case you don't know the - like all community reviews, the SO and ACs appoint members to these review teams and the board appoints one member.

So we organized our work into five broad topic areas. The first as I mentioned, is our responsibility for reviewing the 28 recommendations that the staff was charged with implementing back in 2012. And the second group covers the ICANN security, stability and resiliency activities. These activities that for which ICANN has sole primary responsibility.

Third is activities that impact the SSR, the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system, areas that ICANN contributes to facilitate and involved in. The fourth topic area covers the future challenges. Well, I shouldn't say future challenges because most of those challenges are challenges that we're addressing right now. Challenges to the security and

resiliency operation of the unique identifier system, DOS attacks on and other things like that.

We, as you would expect, started out broader to make sure we understood the ecosystem in which we're operating as a review team and then narrowing down our focus as we identify the priority areas we want to focus on. And then the fifth area is looking at the - some SSR elements of the INS stewardship transition.

Next slide these. So we have a general timeline. We convened at the ICANN meeting in March and got to know each other. We delivered our Terms of Reference to the board in May. Here's the timeline. As I said, we've been collecting and analyzing data as a primary activity for our group.

We have a rough timeline of formulating findings and recommendations through January-ish of next year and then our schedule gets a little bit vague. We've got a draft report obviously and a final report next year. And we can talk about our suspension anytime you want. So I'll just finish up the last slide.

So as I noted, some key milestones. With 28 recommendations covering broad areas and with challenges in getting the actual final report of the implementation of the first review and getting briefings from executive staff on those topics. It took us over five months to actually get information and briefings on the first SSR1 recommendations.

So that has been an important focus of our work, in addition to doing the briefings and information gathering. And here's some of the topics we've been exploring. An RFP for a gap analysis on the implementation of the first 28 recommendations is out there.

Given the - it also took an extremely long time just to get that RFP out there. The review team will be discussing whether it still makes sense to go through

with that additional input into our assessments. So we may be updating that. We issue quarterly reports, send it to the SOs and ACs. We have a Wiki. Everything we do is transparent and we're doing - this ICANN meeting has always been scheduled for a more extensive public outreach.

Next slide please. Okay, there we are. Yes, slide nine. There we are. So we are taking an extra day this week to process the input and advice and comments we get from the SOs and ACs and constituencies and stakeholder groups this week. We're very keen to continue the conversation as we perhaps progress through our work. So we very much want to hear your perspectives on our current work plan and focus.

Next slide please. So this is your turn in this agenda item. We've had this meeting on the books for some time to make sure that we touch base with the Registry Stakeholder Group and make you aware of our activities and that we give you a more focused and face to face opportunity for input on our work.

So teeing up that conversation, if you had just one topic relating to security, stability and resiliency of the identifier space that you think the review team should look at, what would it be? We can take a pause there, or we can jump into the board suspending its independent committee review team. What would you find most useful at this point?

Paul Diaz: Okay. Before we get to the board letter and next steps, does anybody have questions about the work that's been done so far, everything Denise presented? Pretty clear. So if you could, Denise, explain to folks who maybe haven't seen the letter and the expectations for next steps.

Denise Michel: Yes. So the SSAC, the Security Stability Advisory Committee, sent a letter to the board in early October with a variety of opinions and a recommendation that the review team be suspended. I think some people have asked whether the SSAC had conversations or had provided formal input to the team before that letter went to the board, and the answer is no.

Then the board here in Abu Dhabi sent a letter suspending the review team. So we aren't clear what the path forward is to the - for the review team. The board - I don't know if walk back is the right words, but added their justification for that or background on the suspension, which they said they had done for the SO and ACs.

Aside from that letter, we haven't received, as a team, any input from an SO or an AC chair guiding our work. So it's, as you know, unusual for an independent community review team to be directed by the board or one group within the ICANN community.

So I think we're in a bit of uncharted territory here. I think ultimately it's up to the community to I think, give us clear guidance, although the board also noted that their - because of their fiduciary responsibility, they have a role in suspending this and I'm not sure what else in the community. So I think there's more issues and questions to unpack there.

Does anyone else like to - on the team, like to add anything? I'll stop there if some people sitting on the table may also know more about this than we do.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Denise. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. So I agree with you, that it's very unusual for the board to stop the process. And I think that is something that should go to the community if there's thoughts that they should do that. I think that that's really for us to decide as a community. But one of the questions I have and I've been going through some of the correspondence and some of the work and the scope and there seems to be a lot of emphasis on inaccurate WHOIS information on registrar compliance, things that I would have assumed were in either the WHOIS review team or in other areas within ICANN.

So I don't know if we want to have a discussion within just the registry group, but to me it just seemed that this - I mean I have some concerns and going into those areas just because I don't know why we would look into that from a security and stability standpoint, as opposed to just keeping that within the jurisdiction of the WHOIS.

And then if you could explain like why - when I think of security, stability and resiliency, I think of more infrastructure on ICANN providing services to IANA. I don't think - a lot of us I think in the room, don't really think that providing WHOIS information rises to the level of security and stability.

Denise Michel: Thanks, Jeff. That's a great question, and other members of the team may also want to weigh in here. So I wouldn't at all call it a strong emphasis of the review team because some of the 28 recommendations coming out of the first review team addressed DS reviews in this fashion as a threat to security and stability.

And also noted WHOIS, it - we're obligated to review that area and assess the impact of the first SSR1 recommendations. So I wouldn't call it an emphasis, but that is the reason that the review team is obligated to look at that area, because it's one of the 28, two of the 28 recommendations at least actually get into that.

But on the WHOIS, you're right and our intention here is to note that one of the 28 recommendations specifically addresses WHOIS. And I think we've had some initial conversations of course, that it makes much more sense to hand that over to the RDFs/WHOIS review team to take a look at. I don't know if, Norm, did you want to weigh in on this or?

Norm Ritchie: I joined the group in September I guess so I don't have the whole issue of the team. I think your comments are (unintelligible) I assume the last two months looking forward to like excluding the SSR1 recommendations. I have not seen anyone focusing on WHOIS data within the group.

So but the - we are required by the bylaw to look at the recommendations from SSR1. So if that's not what the community wants, I don't know how you address that. Do you change the bylaws or? That's part of our confusion now.

Paul Diaz: A follow up, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I mean I guess - I don't think WHOIS is in the bylaws for SSR. I think it was just - and I have to go back to someone. It was a long time ago and there was so much going on at the time, like the introduction of new gTLDs. And so there wasn't a huge emphasis on it.

I just - DNS abuse, I can make a case for it being under SSR. I just don't - we don't think that - I shouldn't say we, I don't believe that WHOIS abuse is equivalent to DNS abuse and that that should be looked at in kind of the same manner. So thanks.

Eric Osterweil: This is Eric Osterweil. Yes, thanks for that. I think if - I don't know if we want to back to the earlier slide, but I mean we had - you can see the slide number and that we identified several sub areas that we'd focus on and WHOIS wasn't one of the primary areas we were focusing on.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry. Real quick. The only reason I bring up WHOIS, it seemed to be a big part of the letter asking for additional data from ICANN. There was a bunch of - there was a data request to ICANN going back a few months now I guess, that really focused on getting information on WHOIS complaints and inaccuracies and all the data behind that.

And maybe that's just for me, maybe just because that letter focused a lot on it. I thought it was a big emphasis, but and it may not be.

Denise Michel: Yes. Just to follow up. The - so that was part of our due diligence and information gathering on - that related specifically to the 28 recommendations. So everything that was - every reaction that was recommended in those 28 recommendations, we have asked for their - and information about.

So that's what that request specifically is, is that I wouldn't take that information request at all as an indication of a strong focus within the review team, but rather our responsibility to thoroughly investigate the 28 recommendations and their implementation and issue. Žarko?

Žarko Kecić: Yes. This is Žarko Kecić. Just want to point out that our intention was not to look at WHOIS accuracy. That was part of compliance program and compliance is very important in term of when and how it delegates activities. So when we look at compliance arguments, there are a few sections of WHOIS accuracy and just with a bit of other things.

So it is not that our intention was to overlook WHOIS accuracy, but compliance at all.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you all. Keith and then Rubens.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Paul and thanks, Denise and Eric for being here and the rest of the SSR2 review team members. I want to go back to the discussion of the board letter hitting a pause button as they've characterized it. And I think somebody mentioned that this was unusual, I would say unprecedented that the board would take an action such as this to pause an supposedly independent review team.

The board has noted in its correspondence, including the most recent letter, email that came out yesterday just before the public forum, that it has serious concerns about the scope of the review team. And I just want to note for

everybody that the scope of the review teams, the specific reviews are actually outlined in ICANN bylaws.

And while the - I think as a reasonable question, the ICANN board could have reasonable concerns generally speaking that a review team, in developing its scope, could be coloring outside the lines. But in this instance, based on my review or my assessment, I don't think that's necessarily the case.

And I would - I'm going to ask, you know, Denise and Eric and the other members of the review team, for a little bit more sort of context around these suggestions that the review team scope is a serious concern to the board. The GNSO Council had its session a couple of days ago with the board.

Rinalia, who is the chair of the Operational Effectiveness Committee and was sort of overseeing these review teams, said to the GNSO council that there are concerns about the scope.

And so part of the reason I bring this up now is I think that having heard from the board yesterday during the public forum, that while they felt like they have the authority to hit the pause button, they acknowledged it's up to the community, the SOs and the ACs, to hit the play button when we think we're ready.

So I think we as a stakeholder group and the GNSO generally, as one of the chartering SOs, or at least one of the SOs that send members to the review team, that we have an obligation to go back and review the charter and the scope of the review team, compare it to the bylaws, determine whether the review team is coloring outside the lines or not, and then essentially be prepared to make a decision at the SO level to reinstate this process. Or if a course correction is necessary, that we provide that input.

So I think we as a stakeholder group have an obligation here to spend some

time and to assess that. And I think it needs to happen in fairly short order. So this so-called pause doesn't drag on indefinitely. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Keith. Very well put.

Keith Drazek: Sorry, Paul. Just to follow up. I did want to ask Denise and Eric if they wanted to provide any further sort of input or context for us at this moment on that question of scope and sort of the appropriateness of that, or give them the opportunity if they'd like to take that. Thanks.

Denise Michel: Sure. Just briefly and we'll make sure you have our email addresses and the teams email addresses if you have follow up questions for us. The - you know, by consensus the review team earlier on decided to keep its scope, you know, close to the bylaws mandate. So it's very closely tied to that.

And part of the - so since the board hasn't talked to us and SSAC hasn't talked to us, it's hard to know what their interpretation or understanding or issues are. But what I'm finding in some questions we've gotten this week is that people aren't aware of the - necessarily of the 28 recommendations that came out of the first security review that the bylaw requires us to look at.

And so we have an issue of the - so what do you want the review team to do when someone says, you know, you shouldn't look at this? And one of the first review team's 28 recommendations says, you know, ICANN, you need to do this.

And understand of course that the board unanimously adopted these 28 recommendations in 2012 and directed staff to implement them. And then the bylaws that the community approved as part of their transition, obligates us to review those 28 recommendations, assess them and their implementation and impact.

So it puts us in a difficult - well, kind of a bind. So we're not sure which - and

we need, we absolutely need clarity from the community as to what you want us to do. And then may I also just say on a personal note, if the team volunteers, unpaid volunteers from all over the world giving up their vacation time and evenings and weekends to do some really challenging work with probably not the right type of support to - enough support to get it done.

And this is a really poor way to treat volunteers who have volunteered a lot of their time and effort to do this. Conversations about misunderstanding, disagreements about scope or activities, would have really been appropriate in this instance, rather than the type of letters that have been kind of thrown over the wall.

Paul Diaz: Okay. We're going to run short of time because GDD staff is starting into the room. Rubens, you've been waiting patiently, and then Emily, I'll give you a shot as well. Sorry Keith. I put this in. Go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul and thanks, Denise for that. And just very briefly, a little bit of context here. One of the reasons the SOs and the ACs need to be paying attention and providing input into, you know, sort of doing, you know, these checkpoints, is that we as the community have new responsibilities here that we didn't previously have under these review teams.

Coming out of the IANA transition with the new accountability mechanisms and the new bylaws, the SOs and ACs for the first time are responsible for appointing and approving essentially the composition of the review teams, which of course the review teams, once composed, are responsible for developing the scope.

previously, prior to the new bylaws coming out of the accountability work, the responsibility for appointing review team members was up to the ICANN CEO and GAC chair or ICANN board chair and GAC chair, depending on which review team we're talking about.

So we as SOs and ACs have essentially new responsibilities here that I think we need to be prepared to take seriously. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Keith. Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. I wonder why the SSR2 review team asking for information, incorporate information security to ICANN that was not related to the IANA PTI operation because when it comes to IANA, I think it's (unintelligible) scoped to go look into that situation of that operation. But why was the (unintelligible) expanded? So was all information security from ICANN organization?

Eric Osterweil: This is Eric Osterweil. So I think to sort of like maybe dovetail those two questions together, because I think they're kind of related. Really my perspective is that, you know, we as a team, we had a lot of consternation over, you know, only looking at the things that were relevant to our review.

And so the extent to which, you know, there's a sense of coloring outside the lines, I think is really just a miscommunication and we spent a lot of our recent communications with the response of the board, trying to clarify that. So we want to find where that line is so that we don't look past where we should be looking.

In other words, where there are clear lines between PTI and anything else that we don't want to care about so that we don't have to care about it. So I think just to answer your questions, we don't really want to look at that. So I think if there's a sense that we were trying to do that, and I think we've started to become sensitive to maybe there was, we've tried to diffuse that because that was really not our objective.

And I don't think anyone on the team at some point felt that. So, you know, again, we'd love to clear that up.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Eric. Emily, last word and then we're going to have to move on.

Emily Taylor: Thank you very much, Paul. And I'm Emily Taylor for the record. I was co-chair of the SSR2 until this summer. I stood down because of conflict of interest reasons with my consultancy practice, not for any other reason.

I've come here to the meeting to show support for my colleagues on the SSR2 and to really put on the record my deep concern at the board's action, which is not only as Keith said, unprecedented. I think it shows a very cool signal about the board's attitude to accountability and transparency to the community following the IANA transition.

On the, you know, the narrow point of the scope, the scope was agreed by consensus while I was still on the team in May. It has been available to the community since then. It is extremely closely modeled on the ICANN bylaws, which to Rubens's point. Also include an element of looking at the SSR1, whose recommendations range far and wide, including business continuity and all sorts of internal processes to do with ICANN security. So they are within scope.

And also, you know, when you look at the wording of the bylaws, and I'm not going to labor the point, there's language around internal and external, around the cost that's present on the future. So the bylaws themselves give an extremely wide language and requirements for this team to look at.

Having said that, the terms of preference, which has been available to the board and community since May, contain anchoring language to make sure that whatever the outcome of this review is, and let's be clear. This review team has only been working for a few months and is still in the fact finding level.

Whatever outcome has to be closely modeled on ICANN's bylaws and

ICANN's limited scope. And I can assure people in this room and people joining remotely, that there are voices within the team who will very strongly insist that any output from this team is very much kept to that narrow remit.

So I think it's entirely inappropriate for terms of reference to pass the words of the ICANN bylaws to anchor the team's work to ICANN's limited mission and the bylaws itself and to be an independent review, which was part of the deal of the ICANN - of the IANA transition in getting the oversight away from the US government, into the community.

So if the first thing that happens at these community reviews is that the board pulls the plug on them when it doesn't like the way it's going, without any consultation or dialogue with the leadership who are members of those teams, I think that that shows a very much - this is way beyond the detail of what this is about. This is a very, very concerning signal for this community and its reliability.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Emily. We'll put - to come back to what Keith noted and Denise as well. On this pause, the question goes back to the SOs and ACs. So across the GNSO. We will begin coordinating with our colleagues to do the assessment, the analysis and come up with position statements. And hopefully we can do that soon so that this pause can be - we can move forward from it sooner rather than later.

But with that, I thank you very much for coming in today and appreciate you guys making the time. We now are going to transition. GDD colleagues here and I'm not sure where they went. Behind me?

Paul Diaz: Yes. They were all here a moment ago. They must be huddling somewhere. One second folks. Okay everyone. Welcome (unintelligible) are here, Chris and we'll get right into the next seven. So we have the agenda and we're going to go first with names (unintelligible). Is this overall? Russ, do you want to take?

Russ Weinstein: First of all, good morning everyone. Thanks for having us. Happy to be here. This is my first meeting with all of you face to face in this role. So thanks for having me and looking forward to continuing our relationship together. When we're working through the agenda with the ExCom team name and services portal, our new portal for communicating and doing work together was one of the topics you wanted to discuss.

So we've prepared some slides, but it's more future looking. If there's things we should talk about current state, certainly no terms of use is one of the topics we're going through right now with each other. So we can start off with that I think if it makes sense and then talk about future state, which is kind of where we'd really like to get to with all of you.

we put a lot of work into the - building the portal so that we can work better together and want to get to the point where we are - where everyone is on board and using the tools so that we're providing better service for you, there's better transparency and visibility into what's going on with your service requests and we can do them more expeditiously.

So right off the bat, I'll talk about terms of use and then open it up for discussion. You know, we put out the terms of use and certainly got some feedback that - one, that they have some items that weren't appropriate or lacking clarity. And so we took that feedback and worked on a revision.

Part of that feedback was also that you had never seen them before launching and that one, we really understand where you're coming from there and that was a mistake on our part. You know, we just really hadn't thought about it as well as we should have.

So I want to say that first and foremost, we were thinking about it differently. We hadn't used - we hadn't put those kinds of terms of use out for feedback or discussion in the past when we rolled out new systems like GDD portal or

CDDS or - and the applicant portal, it hadn't been an issue in the past and we just kind of continued on that mode of operation, but lesson learned.

We understand where you guys are coming from and we want to make sure it's an agreeable term of use. Want to make sure we're framing it right, that this is really just a term of use for using the portal, the website. It does not affect your rights or obligations or others under the registry agreement or registrar agreement. And if there was any confusion about that, we apologize and we're working through that.

We got your red lines and thank you for producing those and producing them so quickly. That was the biggest surprise for me. And we're working on those and I think we can provide an update. I think what we talked about was maybe by the 14th of November, which is a full week after we get back from this meeting, I can tell you right now, I don't think we'll be able to accept them 100% as is.

so what I'd like to talk about with all of you is what do you want to see next step so we make sure and get the right discourse going and we get to being done with talking about portal terms of use, get everybody on board and using the new system for what it was intended for, so.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Happy to take thoughts, any suggestion. Jon?

Jon Nevett: Thanks, Paul. First of all, Russ, thank you for coming. Thank you for - you know, we were probably - I guess the first to start the issue and you guys hopped on it right away. So I appreciate that. Can you just (unintelligible) in the room with whoever raised these additional points for the red lines instead of waiting two weeks and sending the red line back and sending the red line back.

I mean we're all here and if you could just maybe spend a few minutes with

ICANN legal and I think it was probably Kristina and Jeff and anyone else that raised the issue, just try to work it out. That's my suggestion.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Jon. I had the exact same thought. I mean it probably makes sense to have a small team of those who help in on doing the red lines, just meet with you guys and hash it out. Ping Pong as you were saying doesn't serve our collective interests. So working with the people who are closest and most focused on it and we can help coordinate, get them together. And to Jon's point, even better if we could do it this week if people can find the time.

Russ Weinstein: Great. Is it - who are those people? I know - I think I've heard through the grapevine, Kristina and Jeff, but to me it's a little opaque. So is that the right group of people.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Why don't we take the action on those two for sure and then we'll figure out if there's somebody else. I'll get back to you before the end of the day.

Russ Weinstein: Great. Thanks.

Craig Schwartz: So we'll move on to - I'm sorry.

Paul Diaz: Sorry, Craig. Missed you. Go ahead.

Craig Schwartz: Hi. Craig Schwartz and question for Russ. My understanding is that until the terms and conditions are accepted, you can't actually use the portal, right? So when I log on now, unless I take that first step, I can't read case information. I can't submit a new case. And given the status of this conversation, how do we - what do I do in the process? Or what do I do in the meantime until we solve this process question?

Russ Weinstein: Good question, Craig. So you can always email global support and then it will create a case on our end, but we'll email you back with the information as needed. It helps if that email comes from your current registry primary

contact because that's the only kind of authorization we have - authorization point we have right now with you all. So if you do that, that's how we'll have to do business until you're up and on the portal.

Paul Diaz: Another one. Sheri, go ahead.

Sheri Falco: Yes. Hi. Just a quick question. So I noticed in using the portal that you have a verify number and you can only input one phone number and you get sort of phone call that you have to each time calls, your new enter PIN number, which I guess works pretty well if you're at a home office, but we travel often for meetings internationally.

So I'm wondering how the portal will work when you're away from the phone number that you input, because you might not be able to access it. I guess you go through global support at that point. Do you know what I mean?

Russ Weinstein: If you have your roaming - it's the mobile phone and you're roaming, then it'll find you. If it's the desk phone, then obviously you have to put in another factor. You can set two - multiple two factors. So you can go back to that and set a second factor. That is easier. I think we have ...

Chris Gift: We have Google authenticate is another that we support. So you can do that.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thank you. And everybody, just a reminder, please state your name for the transcript for those - so that was Sheri Falco and Chris Gift. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, dotMoscow. I have two questions. First, during the pilot phase of this portal, first time it was some strange one way and the - yes, which basically said that whatever we share with ICANN is secret, which wasn't acceptable.

And the second phase we participated in provided your team behind the

portal with huge list of well detailed information. Actually, for us it's not the first business to business with this. And given for example the scene that in our country, the call back doesn't work at all. And we provided it during the pilot phase. It was one of the important topics. Nothing was fixed.

The reply we had from the team was like not important, not important, not to be implemented, almost of the least of our concerns. And what is the reason of having pilot testing without actual reaction to the feedback? Is it just a checkbox size of some sort?

It's not - actually in such circumstances, there is no reason to have pilots at all if you don't listen. Thank you.

Chris Gift: This is Chris Gift. Maxim, so a couple of things. One is I'll get back to you on two factor authentication. Again, there are three factors that we often - that we allow. And so at least hopefully one of those should be working for you. It may not be the phone. And everything - I can circle back to you afterwards. I can talk to you more about that one.

As for the feedback, we absolutely welcome feedback. It's not a checkbox that we're trying to check. It's invaluable to us to make the service useful for you, for any of our users, internal and external. And so if you're seeing things as not important, so I'll go back and check the terminology, it may - I think what they're trying to say is the priority of when they're going to do them. We are going to do them. We get feedback. We absolutely want to implement it.

Maxim Alzoba: The importance of - Maxim Alzoba for the record. But in some locations, we don't have access to Internet and if phone call doesn't work in that location, we're done. We cannot access it. So I mean the access from the mobile device.

Adam Peake: Maxim, if I may, this is Adam. How do you solve this problem on your systems?

Maxim Alzoba: Call back could be done by operator usually. And if call back doesn't work or two or three factor of method of authentication were actually almost equal. It's application of smartphone. Instead of, for example having text message, voice authentication and either token or application, you actually have only two methods, use phone and smartphone applications. That's it. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. Thanks, Russ for taking onboard some of the feedback that you've gotten. And a question that I had and maybe this gets to the broader discussion of what the naming services portal was intended to do. But I was wondering if you could speak a little to this new implied obligation to respond to requests from third party users, who you anticipate those folks will be, et cetera.

Russ Weinstein: Yes, Kristina, good question. I think as we'll see in the roadmap, one of the things that we're going to be adding for the registry side users to the portal is the CDDS functionality for the registry side. So you'll be - your CDDS user will be actually logging into the same platform, that is naming services portal and being able to accept or reject or whatever the CDDS zone power requests.

So I think in generating those terms and conditions, our legal team had that headset in mind and was trying to make a sort of common set of terms of use I think. We can talk through it either in this meeting. I've already had some conversations with them about maybe let's simplify the terms and pull that out because it's very confusing I think (unintelligible). But understand the concern there and I think we can work through that one expeditiously.

Paul Diaz: Ronald?

Ronald Schwärzler: Ronald Schwärzler for the record. If you're already in CCDS, is there a possibility to have another user without having super user as they call it that way, to pass - sorry, to just access the CC DSs. So I don't want someone of my employees having the full view of all the TLDs. There must be some other functionality to less - or some user different profiles. Let me call it that way.

Chris Gift: This is Chris Gift. They will have - we will have users that are unique to CCDS and only authorized for CCDS information.

Ronald Schwärzler: Sorry. With different login credentials.

Chris Gift: It's Chris Gift. That's correct.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Great discussion about this. Do we want to move on to next, Chris?

Chris Gift: I'll just move through these slides rapidly. I just want to give you a preview of what's coming up. Sorry. I apologize. This is Chris Gift with ICANN.org. We met - we obviously just launched. We are pleased we got this out and we have the services there for you - for those who are logging in right now.

Next slide please. Coming up in the early first quarter is we are having a registrar beta. For those of you that are vertically integrated, you will have both experiences side by side. So you'll see your registrar information, as well as your registry information should that be of interest to you. And then we'll obviously have separate registrars in the system.

We'll also have registry enhancements. So please give us feedback along the lines if you talk about any, you know, send that feedback to Neeraj Sood I mean who has been working on this, as well as through GSC, through - just open a case and you can send feedback to that.

Next slide please. In the next quarter, we will CCDS, general availability of

CCDS. We are not planning a beta of CCDS principally because it is - the bulk of the functionality is still the same. If you would like to - we're open to having a beta of that, testing it with you guys or ensuring that the user experience is okay, and so within the new sales force format.

We're open to that. And so please give us feedback on whether you want to do that or if we just go ahead and move to a launch. At that time, we'll also be with a register beta two, which should be full functionality, really full functionality of the system, but still in beta mode with a limited number of - with a close different than the number of testers.

And then last slide please. It cut off. We're launching registrar general availability of the service for registrar. Next slide please. Some of the activities that we're doing to improve the knowledge of my own team, as well as I think Russ's team as well with doing some of this stuff, we're trying to coordinate and do this together.

You know, for us to give a better service and create better services, is first to know more about what you do. So we obviously have a users group, our beta testers. We'd like to continue that. We're also looking to do during a life where we actively look at how your people use the system, whether it's here or we're more than willing to come to your office.

It's actually very instructional for us to just sit down next to somebody and just watch them, watch how many clicks does it take them to do things and so on. So we would very much like to do that, and we're working with Russ's team to see if we can piggyback off of some of its efforts there.

You will see focus on app surveys and of course we will continue to do betas when we have a key or important set of new functionality that's coming out. We're also seeking to join the stakeholder group on a summer schedule basis so we can keep you updated on schedule of all of these releases.

We're going to improve also how we notify you. Since we are constantly now updating the system, pushing up beta bug fixes, we're looking to send out release notes so that you better understand what's changed since the last time you logged in. So we'll have that as well.

And just a reminder, if you have questions, we do have business analysts and engineer here in Abu Dhabi. So if you want a full demo, if you haven't logged in yet and you want a full demo of the system or just having some issues, or you want to even - if you don't like the way your accounts are structured and you want to restructure some of those accounts or how it looks to you, go down to the GDD booth and you can make an appointment with Von and he will help you with all of that. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Chris. Any questions about the timeline or new term expectations? Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. When I go in to send invitation to the - for the registrars to participate in the beta, I mean could it - please, Tom, one slide there. Yes.

Chris Gift: This is Chris Gift. That should probably be going out within the next couple of weeks. We're going to talk about that more fully in the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you all. I think Russ we probably should move on to the next item in the agenda. Are you comfortable summarizing our discussion today? You want me to switch to application fee, usage of applications keys?

Russ Weinstein: Sure. So I think our next agenda item - excuse me, was the use of application funds. You sent us a letter in response to our most recent letter back to you. So we understand the feedback we received about the way our

response was perceived. And apologize if it was perceived as cold or shutting down the conversation, but that was not the intent.

And we had a good meeting I think with a few of the interested folks on - was that yesterday? Yesterday morning and we'll be working towards responding to the most recent letter before the end of the calendar year and talk through kind of some good ideas of how we can work together.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I'm not seeing any questions. We look forward to the communication and obviously when we see it, a lot further discussion within the stakeholder group. All right. Then we've teed up registry registrar agreement. Russ, I guess it's you again.

Russ Weinstein: This is Russ again. So you're probably wondering why this is - why we're talking about this. So the Registrar Stakeholder Group had filed a complaint with our complaints offices. You guys probably remember, Krista, regarding the handling of a registry registrar agreement amendment transaction that occurred over the course of last year. And so we're following up on the complaint action.

So the registrars had expressed concern that they were not offered the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the changes to the registry registrar agreement and that ICANN didn't do its job of determining materiality in time so that the registrars could have that opportunity for feedback.

And so we worked through that, the GDD and the complaint office worked through to produce a complaint report. That's available now and some of the reaction - the real reason I wanted to talk about this is we took some of the action items in that complaint report and I wanted to talk through those.

So we'll go to the next slide. So there were essentially five-ish actions that we took coming out of that complaint report, kind of corrective action type

behavior. So process improvements, and those have already been implemented where we're differentiating between complete and incomplete request more clearly now and providing better quality of communication, I think back to the registry operator during this transaction. So it's really clear where we are in the process and what the next steps are going to be.

That's facilitated by the new naming services portal, which actually has dedicated workflows for different service requests where it makes it really obvious where we are in the process and what the timelines are expected to be. So we're looking forward to getting you all on board under the naming services portal so we can enhance the quality of service we're able to provide.

The two pending items or three pending items were, we committed to making some better educational materials, maybe a how to guide associated with this so it's really clear to both registries and registrars what the expectations should be during one of these transactions.

And then the two main ones are we wanted to gather feedback from you all and from the registrars regarding additional opportunities for process improvement. So one of the challenging points with all of you when we go through one of these transactions, and I wasn't really - we can, but I wasn't really focused on having that discussion right now. It was more of, how do we have that discussion?

So if this is something the group believes is a worthwhile effort, should we, I don't know, put a small working group - discussion group together and work through it, or do you guys want to consolidate your list and provide it to us and we'll work through it from there? But really wanted to just create the opportunity for dialogue here.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Russ. Craig?

Craig Schwartz: Thanks, Russ. So first, I'm not familiar with the case that was referenced on the prior slide, but as a registry that's gone through this before and we'll likely we need to do it again because we're anticipating some changes, what's the timing of this effort that's outlined on the now next slide, in terms of getting feedback, revising the process? Like how quickly can we as a community get this done?

Russ Weinstein: So like I said in the top of the slide, we've already made some of the process improvements that are referenced in the complaint report. And then the feedback is really kind of I think paced by what you guys want to see, so.

Craig Schwartz: (Unintelligible) what they need to sign.

Russ Weinstein: Yes and to really reap the benefits of some of the process improvement, we need to get everyone on the portal.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Okay. Thank you, Russ. Thank you, Craig. I think this is an issue that is of real importance to certain ones. Why don't we come back to you with a short list of folks to continue the dialogue? And then as we try and figure it all up here for now. All right. With that then, we're good. Move to the next item, which is the techno compliance initiative and Francisco I'll turn this to you.

Francisco Arias: Thank you, Paul. Hello everyone. This is Francisco Arias from ICANN.org. And no worries. And Nikola please. So this is an initiative that we have talked with you before and in the context of the RSP discussion group and in the (unintelligible) subsequent procedures. I forgot which work track.

And we have been working on developing the requirements for a new system that we - in terms of developing what we call technical compliance territory. This study is intended to monitor compliance with existing contractual and policy requirements for both registries and registrars.

We're focusing on doing all the automated checks and we think that we will be able to automate the verification of approximately 80 provisions from the policies and registry and registrar agreement. This would be in addition to existing monitoring system like the isolate monitoring system. And we intend to fully integrate these with the compliance system that is already in place.

And next slide please. This is the timeline. We intend to publish the RFP. This will be a system that we intend to outsource and we intend to publish the RFP next Monday, the Monday after that the ICANN meeting. At this point, we don't have agreed date. It would depend on the proposals of the criteria to select the providers, what we think would be the timeline to develop the system. And that's it. Just a heads up to you.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you, Francisco. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I have a question. Policies are actually legal documents and I'm not sure it's possible to find the solution on the market of automated check of contents of the, I'd say websites and the services from the legal perspective.

I think it should be divided into technical checks and simplify the assessment, the tools for the compliance for example. So there'd be person and not machine does the final check in case of policies. So there is always sanity check after the initial processing. Thanks.

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco. Thank you, Maxim for the input. That's a good point. We're not intending to monitor everything that is contained in the rights agreement or the rights agreement on the policies for that matter, only the things that can be done fully in a fully automated way.

So I think instead of - we're probably not going to be checking the contents of web pages that are intended to be addressed by people. It's more about

things for example, the WHOIS output to ensure that it's according to the specs that (unintelligible) is offering WHOIS and DNS, that the zone is properly DNS assigned, that kind of thing. The more clinical aspects of the contracts on the policies. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Francisco. And Sophia.

Sophia Feng: Hi Francisco. So trying to understand. Does the system also contain all the SOAs monitoring? It would trigger the tickets to send to us, or how does it replace the current processes and procedures on the technical monitoring?

Francisco Arias: Thank you for the question. This is not intended to replace the (unintelligible) monitoring system. This will be in addition to the SLA monitoring system and other compliance reports that are already in place. What we will be doing is adding more checks. So it would be the (unintelligible) users that can be monitoring now (unintelligible).

So we try to replicate the model we have with the - for example for the SLA monitoring system.

Sophia Feng: Okay. And another question would be, like we address seven different locations about - like (unintelligible) is addressing different locations when an SR is triggered and to send to us the notification, there was a technical issue. There's no exact script of what's happening. So would this system help that processes or there's a separate project that will address that?

Francisco Arias: I'm sorry. Would you mind restating the question? I'm not sure I got it.

Sophia Feng: Sure. So when those SOA notifications, our team have got the feedbacks there was no specific details about what is actually happening. So we would like to see if there is any system and then can provide more information so they consulted in real time. So how does the system - is the system going to help that processes or there was a separate project from you with that?

Francisco Arias: Thank you. This is Francisco Arias. So that is something that we have intended to do and (unintelligible) would support as part of the improvements to the SLA monitoring system. One of the things that we are doing in these Abu Dhabi meetings, we have a session on Tuesday 9:00 a.m. in which we're going to present an API to the SLA monitoring system.

I don't remember if you are using it, but there are a few of you here that are already using a pilot of that API We intend to release that API introduction next - early next year. And so we're going to introduce that. That may help a little bit on the product.

The results are pending improvement to be done to the system in light of what you said and others phrased (unintelligible) in regards to providing more details on what is exactly that we are seeing from our systems and that's planning to be developed. It's in the roadmap for the SLA monitoring system. Thank you.

Sophia Feng: Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you both. Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. This may be just a general aspect or requirement of ICANN's RFP process, but can you tell us whether or not you anticipate that the RSP will effectively exclude existing contracting parties and their affiliates from being considered?

Francisco Arias: Thank you, Kristina. This is Francisco again. And the RFP will have as part of the requirements for the providers to - those requirements in regard to avoidance of conflict of interests. And I don't think we are putting it the way you are putting it, as in if you are a contracted party, you are automatically out.

But I think the intent is to avoid a conflict of interest or even perception of conflict of interest in the provider that it would be selected for developing the system.

Akram Atallah: Kristina, I would assume that yes, we will not have people who are just being checked by the system to be actually providing the system.

Paul Diaz: Thank you all. For the record that was Akram Atallah who just responded. Okay. Obviously an important issue and once the RFP is out and we've had time to think about it a little more, we may come back to Francisco and ask for further clarifications or inputs.

Akram Atallah: This is Akram Atallah again. We should look at it from the perspective of how can you make - take advantage of the system to help you mitigate issues that you have. So when you think about the system and what you are developing, you should put your mind - your user hat on and let us know what features you would like to see in the system also to help you work with it, because the idea is also not to just find out who's not doing what they're supposed to do. Is also how to fix it. So we want to be able to send out the fixes quickly. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Akram. Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. Francisco is EPP monitoring coming to SLA monitoring, or it will be still postponed for the time being?

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco again. And I'm afraid EPP is still in the - in future plans, not yet.

Paul Diaz: Please.

David Peall: Hi. David Peall from Domain Name Services for DNS Africa. As with the current SLM monitoring system, the API is still not quite where we would like to see it in terms of being able to poke into the system automatically from our point of view.

And adding actually further checks into a system where we're not quite clear on what the compliance issues are when they get reported to us is going to add a significant burden to our side of the compliance monitoring. So are there employees who have extra high available to the registries when you release those notes as a future plan, as part of the initial plan of your release?

Francisco Arias: Okay. Thank you, David. Let me see. So you're suggesting we have an API that, or extend the API to allow you to see these - the information presented by (unintelligible). Okay. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, David, Francisco. Any other questions on this topic? Okay. Why don't we move on then? Next is update on the summit. I don't know who wants to provide. Cyrus? Thank you.

Cyrus Namazi: Good morning everyone. Cyrus Namazi with ICANN's Global Domain Division. Just a brief update for you on the status of the GDD summit. By now hopefully you've seen an announcement that the 2018 GDD summit will be hosted in British Columbia in Canada, hopefully in Vancouver. And the reason we actually put British Columbia in there is because of the short time between now and May for us to secure the right venue, the right size and all of that. So my leading team wanted to have a bit of leeway.

So delighted to and looking forward to seeing all of you there, and again working with you in the construction of the agenda and the format of it. We're actually co-located with DNS symposium if you recall in Madrid earlier this year. I'm afraid that year they won't be co-locating with us. But I'm very optimistic that we will actually have the board sort of co-tailing the GDD

summit next May and we'll actually host a workshop in the general vicinity of our location in British Columbia.

So we'll be able to take advantage of that. As soon as that is confirmed, we will share that with you. one of the things that I wanted to actually put on the table perhaps for a brief discussion here and then later on is that my meetings team is actually sort of revolting against me because we end up giving them very little time to be able to secure the right venue at the right time for us with all the sort of bells and whistles that we need to have the right sort of production on the summit.

And I mentioned this to Paul and some of you earlier this week that I would really like to be able to secure the location and the timing for 2019 and 2020 for our GDD summit. And in the interest of sort of fairness and following the process and protocols that ICANN meetings have followed, we really should seriously consider to actually have a semi rotation skiing into the process in terms of the geography where we end up hosting these meetings.

As you know, the first GDD summit was in Los Angeles and we had two back to back in Western Europe. Now we're going back to North America. I'd like to put on the table that for 2019, we seriously consider Southeast Asia as a place to host it. And then perhaps bring it back to Europe for 2020, and then to North America, sort of get into that rhythm.

I don't think we need to go to other places like Africa or South America where we have very few contracted parties. It wouldn't make sense, but that kind of a rhythm I think would help us in sort of having a fairness for our contracted parties that are in those locations in the world, and also from a planning perspective would help us tremendously to be able to get the right venue in place, have enough time to perhaps actually co-locate with some other symposiums, conferences, things like that and perhaps be able to even get more bang for our traveling bucks so to speak.

in terms of the format of the summit, one of the things we have been discussing with the small team that have been - we've been working with in the construction of the agenda for it is that we would like to actually work on what I call the track based approach to - for the 2018 summit.

So we'll have like a marketing track and a technical track and then perhaps, I don't know, operations track. I think that would help us actually have smaller rooms, multiple sessions concurrent instead of having say four, 500 people in one room for, you know, an extended period of time, which I think from a size perspective, is getting to a level that is getting to what I call diminishing returns.

So this is another proposal on the table. We will continue to work with you, the small group of you that has been working with us and the registrars. Shortly after Abu Dhabi, I'd like to kick off again our small team to start working on this track based approach.

Hopefully this is at the right effort from your perspective, with the idea of having an agenda completely based and designed and posted by the end of February. So let me stop here, see if there are any feedback questions and comments, Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Cyrus. Any immediate reactions? We will circulate. Yes, Donna.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin from Neustar. Thanks for the updates, Cyrus. And I'd really like to support the idea about rotating this through, you know, Asia Pacific, Europe, North America. I think that makes so much sense. And I think some form of trying to be equitable in the way that we do would be really helpful. So I support that idea. Thanks for that.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Donna. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: I just wanted to say that yes, really good update and I think it's a good direction. So we have seen planning in advance, no last minute decisions and that all the members of various community could - provided the input and saw the most important topics.

So you have the most important topics to discuss from your past point of view, and we have the most important topics from our point of view to discuss there. It's really impressive.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Maxim. Yes. The importance of planning ahead is the way summits have gone, in particular the last one with the growth and participation, it's impossible to keep doing the same old, same old. So we talk about a tracks approach and all the rest. That requires more planning and more input.

And looking even further at scheduling, identifying where we'll go a couple of years in advance, much like ICANN does for these big meetings, creates all sorts of potential benefits for coordination and better planning, et cetera. To that end, we will work with staff and circulate a survey to begin to flesh out where we would like to go for '19 and '20. Look for that as soon as we can.

Okay. No other questions then. Happy to move on to the next one, which is the contracted party survey results. I think that (unintelligible). Sorry. The contracted parties surveys both. Go ahead Russ.

Russ Weinstein: The deck for this? Okay, great. Thanks. I haven't memorized this one. So as you know, many of you participated, and thank you for those who did in the survey we put out back in the spring, or I should say in the first quarter I think, calendar year, where we surveyed both sets of contracted parties on a number of dynamics.

And that was an activity related to our - part of our response to the letter we got back in December with your feedback about how we were doing at that

point in time. So we took the survey and we had you take the survey. We got the results over the course of the summer and distributed those in early September.

And then our next action item was sort of, we had identified areas of opportunity, but our next action item was then to propose a more concrete action plan of what we're doing to help drive results towards a positive anywhere we can.

I thought it was important if we started kind of reminding ourselves of what we believe our role is as part of the GDD. So this is information that Akram and his executive team have worked on to kind of help scope for ourselves what we're trying to accomplish.

I don't think any of this is new information. We've had this for a couple of years and I believe we've shared it publicly in the past. But just a real important level set here. I'm not going to read the whole slide but just trying to talk through purpose. How we do it and what the goal is which is to be respected for operational excellence. We've been a trusted global market for domain name services.

Next slide. Pulling down from that, Cyrus's team, the DNS industry engagement team has worked on a mission statement of our own support for the GDD one. And this is one of the unit of ICANN respond - or the unit of the GDD that's responsible for managing ICANN's relationships with all of you, the contracted parties, implementing and supporting the lifecycle of policies, services and contracts and providing subject matter expertise across the ICANN community.

We started to foster trust, innovation and diversity in the global marketplace and promote a healthy, stable and secure DNS ecosystem through strong relationships, training and outreach and well informed policy development and excellence in service development and policy implementation. A little bit

wordy there. We're working on it, get even more focused. But I thought it was a good level set just to kind of help understand where we're coming from.

Next slide. So for those of you who don't remember the links to the different materials we published about the survey, are here. They're on the GDD metrics page of ICANN.org and that's that first link. There is the detailed survey results from the MIDA group that kind of walk through each and every question and tell you the percentage of answers in different dimensions.

They also did a pre-recording of a webinar and to those slides that's about 20 minutes. It's a real helpful way to digest the information. And there's a summary memo that they provided that's about a page and a half that also summarizes even more convincingly. And then we put out a memo of our own, reaching out to all of you to inform you that these materials were available.

Can we go to the next slide? The key take away from that memo is these are the opportunities we identified from the data to gain a better understanding of the challenges facing the contracting parties and improve our knowledge of how the domain name marketplace is functioning so that when we're interacting and providing solutions or working through challenges, we're really understanding how it affects your business, which goes into the second one, your business, the regional issues impacting your business in the communities you participate in. So trying to get better at being your partner essentially here.

Number three is about improving the quality of our communication so that we're providing more context and rationale for our discussions. That was kind of a theme in the feedback we got so that we're providing that so you know where we're coming from and we can have more informed discussions and less arguments.

And then the last one is, then that helps us focus our efforts on designing solutions with greater emphasis and simplicity so that when we roll out new policy implementation or other services, that they're easy to use for all of you and that it makes it easy to comply while still being effective.

Next. So now we're getting into action plan side of this, the better understanding of the business and regional sensitivities. We're taking an active effort to better educate the staff in terms of understanding the domain name industry business and the impact of the various policies that get developed here at ICANN on your business.

So we want to learn from you. We'd like - we've done a few day in the life activities over the course of the last few years, but we'd like to come see you at your place of business and better understand how you guys do the job day to day. we're going to be attending the non-industry event - the non-ICANN industry events to get a better understanding of what the discussions are there that are happening and how they might have an impact on the way you use or the way your contract is structured and the way you use various services in that contract.

And developing better mechanisms internally. So once we gather that information, to share it so that it transfers to the people who need it so we can offer the better services.

One of the ways we're going to do that is we're going to be partnering more with our global stakeholder engagement team. That's the team under Sally Costerton, which helps us extend our reach and impact, especially for the areas where we don't have boots on the ground and they might.

Obviously we can have maybe closer relationships with those contracted parties in areas where we're not and be able to partner better, be able to hold smaller engagement activities and produce better materials focused, so we

can be both a global organization and act locally as well to help you meet your needs.

Is there something like a policy or maybe and give a chance for you guys to react?

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Russ. Anybody have any immediate questions? As we noted in chat - one sec, Donna. As we noted in chat, we'll circulate this deck. There's a lot of information there, a lot to absorb, early in the morning. But Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Paul. It's Donna Austin from Neustar. Just in relation to GDD partnering with the GSE to extend our outreach - reach and impact. Does anybody in this room have any contact at all with the GSE team in terms of regional events or anything that they do? Maxim, Rubens? Okay, great. I just wasn't sure that we had that - any connection with them at all. So it's good to know.

On the flip side of that, it would be good to know in what context that happens and what material you're providing, whether you find that it's worthwhile, because I think that we do probably lack in that regard in being able to understand what happens in other ICANN areas that might be beneficial to us.

So I think it would be good in the flip side to ask to have a better understanding of what GSE does and how we can use them as well to help with some of our education maybe arrangement stuff.

Akram Atallah: Thank you. This is Akram Atallah for the record. Donna, I think that also it's important for us to hear from you what - how we can leverage the resources that we have to help you more. So I've heard from some people saying, you know, why can't we get from the GSE team some information about certain markets where, you know, we're not there?

I don't know if that's something that either the GSE team knows how to do or not. But if you let us know, then we'll explore, right? We will figure out, what can we do to help you? And if they have boots on the ground, they can answer if there is some policy coming up in some region and they have information, maybe we can do a webinar.

Maybe we can - so there are ways that we can leverage them, let us know and we will actually work with them to get you the information.

Paul Diaz: Cyrus and then Maxim.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you. This is Cyrus. Donna, thank you for your question. In addition to what Paul - what Russ and Akram mentioned, to put a bit more detail into that statement about the partnership enhancement with our GSE team. So there are two sort of major components to that. One of them I call a reactive component.

so we have obviously contracted parties in all corners of the globe and not all of them are as engaged and actively participating in sort of the ICANN ecosystem as we know it, as you all know it. So it actually helps us to be able to reach them, both in a proactive way, providing training, actually helping them understand how ICANN works, how they should really be engaged and involved in say our policy development process in the - sort of the organized way the stakeholder group is organized.

And then there is a reactive component to it. So sometimes, because of lack of - perhaps the lack of training and knowledge about say the provisions of their contracts or some other things, we actually react to on issue that say for example has been identified by our compliance team.

And having the extent and reach of our GSE team helps us actually be able to be in the same time zone, most likely the same language, be able to reach

out to them and help resolve issues. And then as Akram mentioned, there's this whole other sort of dimension to it, which is being able to actually get perhaps more eyes and ears in other parts of the world, in many parts of the world to collect market knowledge, market information that will help all of us.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Cyrus. Okay. We have 10 minutes left. I see Maxim and Jon. Fortunately the way we've planned the schedule, I think the remaining items are more updates, but let's just be aware of the time. And obviously if anybody has AOB as well. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually it's quite a good idea to reach local conferences, because not many registrars over the world have like enough funds to attend all ICANN meetings. And given that in current situation, engagement team basically there are like people, yes?

They are not into technical side of operations. Now they're expected to be. And even the presence of one person who is slightly aware of technical side of things, and more of less aware of operations side of things, would be great because he will be able to like understand how the - what section they have, how they think and most probably, you will know why they've been off the space. And you might be able to invite them. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Maxim. Jon?

Jon Nevett: Just really briefly. You know, we have "boo" napkins. I thought this was a subliminal messaging. But I want to say yay! Thank you for all this. This is great stuff and look forward to working with you on this stuff and keep taking the feedback is great and from the survey and it looks very promising. So thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Jon. Good one. Okay. Russ, are we good at this? Should we move on?

Russ Weinstein: I think there's a couple more slides, but we'll get these posted where the other materials related to the survey are so that we don't have to go through it all in detail here. And yes, you're always welcome to come back and let us know through your engagement managers and through global support how you feel about it.

Cyrus Namazi: Are you sure you don't want to quit while you're ahead, Russ?

Russ Weinstein: That's what I'm doing.

Paul Diaz: all right. Then if we're going to go back to the agenda, next up was an update on RSEP. I guess we can just provide a high level overview. The drafting group had a session with staff, Saturday or Sunday, whatever, over the weekend. Happy to report the momentum continues. Had good exchange.

The key takeaways were sort of going to move in parallel tracks. There are some more philosophical let's say, deeper dive that needs to be taken. So we're going to plan the schedule, a conference call in mid-November, continue those discussions.

The other track, staff is committed to sharing with us some proposals to provide efficiencies to the processing that currently takes place. Lay that out for us in writing and they'll do that by the 1st of December. So we should have some substantial information to dig into in the coming weeks.

But importantly, the key takeaway is that the discussions continue. There's good momentum and, you know, this is an example of the way we want to see the relationship between stakeholder group and GDD staff going, is a good example of collaborative efforts.

Okay. So with that, let's just keep moving. Stéphane, quick update on the RSP issues efforts over the weekend.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Paul. This is Stéphane. Hi everyone. We had a very - what I felt was, and I think many people in the room, felt was a very productive meeting yesterday and that served to help confirm that face to face meetings really do help thrash out some of these issues very effectively.

As many people, I'm sure everyone knows by now, we have six work tracks. I don't want to go into the detail at this stage, but we went over all six work tracks. Heard from all six work track leaders and the result of that is there is, on most of these work tracks, we are close to finishing some kind of preliminary output.

And we also heard from the SubPro Working Group that if our work is to be of significance to them, they would need to have some output from us by the end of this year. The reason for that being that they are planning to put out a preliminary report sometime in April of 2018.

So in order for them to have time to collate all the inputs that they're looking to collate, and then they really need it by the end of the year. So that was very helpful for us in understanding and framing the timelines that we need through and the goals that we need to work to.

We also touched on how we would report to this group and how we would structure our output. And I think that's the most interesting thing for this discussion here is that to us, the RSP discussion group being just that, a non-official discussion group, we do not feel that we should be providing any output to anyone but the SG.

We feel there are - we are looking to provide a single document that would be a stretch document covering the work tracks, and that document would be submitted probably by me to Paul for review and analysis by this group, and for this group to decide what to do with it, with our recommendation being that

it be sent to the SubPro working group leadership, and also serve as the basis for an ongoing conversation with ICANN staff.

As a reminder, one of the goals of our group and our work is to smooth out some of the operational issues that are being counted around the whole RSP issue. So that is the way we're looking at progressing right now, and it would be great to get some feedback, maybe not now, but at least at some point from this group on whether that methodology is acceptable to everyone here, and that's the way we should be looking at doing things Thanks, Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thank you. Anybody have any initial thoughts just on what Stéphane just offered? I mean, it's encouraging that we've kind of rebuilt some momentum in this initiative.

As noted, we have effectively till mid-December, end of the year mid-December, to gather inputs if it's going to be impactful for the Subsequent Procedures Workgroup. So the work is still cut out for us. That's going to come up a lot sooner than it may seem. But if we don't have any more right now, let's just continue to work in those various work tracks and we'll look forward to some output that we can review fairly soon.

All right. Cognizant of the time, we have a hard stop so can't go over. Just a quick update on RDAP pilot. My understanding is that we have at least three registries have pilots underway, Afiliias, Google and Verisign.

Francisco Arias: We have four registries and one registrar for pilot 50 TLDs and covering the pilot.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Francisco. So you have 50 TLDs, and that's the whole point of the exercise, to get as much operational experience, data points. This pilot program will run through until July 2018, at which point we'll take those learnings to start crafting RDAP profiles.

And obviously any other registry operators that want to begin a pilot of their own please do. And there is some very basic paperwork to notify ICANN that the pilot is underway so it can be tracked and later on we can make sure that those learnings are incorporated in the assessment.

Okay. I'm not seeing any questions and AOB and - oh, Francisco.

Francisco Arias: Just quick thing. Tomorrow at 1:30 we have a session on this topic to work on the next steps and the discussion group of the contract parties working on developing the profile or profiles and the timeline for moving to production this work that gather proposals, submit it to ICANN. It needs to be done by July next year. So thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Francisco. I forgot it was tomorrow. So tomorrow 1:30 and check the schedule. I don't know the room. Okay. It's on the schedule and we can post it on the Adobe chat later. So far AOB, Russ, anything more?

Russ Weinstein: Nothing more for me. I'm looking around at my colleagues. Anything else we need to hit on? Okay.

Paul Diaz: Good.

Russ Weinstein: Thank you for having us.

Paul Diaz: Anybody, registry, any ideas that popped up? All right. So with that thank you always for your time and good morning session. We'll take a 15 minute break.

END