

**ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO- Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) Membership Meeting Part 2
Tuesday, 31 October 2017 10:30 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>

Paul Diaz: All right. Thank you everyone. (Unintelligible). There's a recording underway. Thank you.

Okay. Welcome back to Part 2 of Registry Stakeholder Constituency Day. This is Paul Diaz. We're entering the 10:30 slot, which is our time with the Compliance staff. I guess I should turn it immediately over to Maguy and her team. They've got some presentations, and we'll do Q&A as we work through the segment. Maguy?

Bryan Schilling: Thank you. This is Bryan Schilling, the Consumer Safeguards Director for ICANN.

One thing I'll - Just to give a summary of what I've been doing since joining ICANN in June and I do want to start off by clarifying for this group that it is a new department in ICANN. And while Maguy and I both report in to Jamie Hedlund, the Senior Vice President for Contractual Compliance and Consumer Safeguards, it's a separate department and roll from Compliance.

So this isn't a enforcement roll. For those of you who don't know my background, I had about eight and half years as a lawyer for the FBI. I didn't get a badge in that job, and I didn't get a badge, you know, ICANN - although Jamie did offer me a Junior Agent badge to go with my wings that I get from the Captains.

So that being said, what we did do in the past four months was compile and publish a list of what we thought our current ICANN safeguards. And we did that going into a communitywide webinar because this role is really to facilitate -- within the community -- a discussion about those current safeguards. Are those safeguards effective for what this role is focusing on, which is end users and registrants and the issues that may arise for that impacted group out of abuse and other related areas of the DNS and unique identifier system.

So we had a webinar. We had quite a bit of participation. But in that webinar we were asking for community input. I know there were folks from this group that participated. And where we would like input from that group -- and one of the things we thought about and don't want to push anyone out there -- but one of the things we think the Registry Stakeholder Group could add to this discussion is to have a conversation about our work with the things that you do already within your various companies to protect safeguards, to address areas of abuse. And I think adding to educating end user consumers, the rest of the community, about the efforts that you undertake could be very fruitful in that.

And so we did ask for comment and input on the safeguards. Are there areas that this role should focus on? But that is one potential area that we would like to help further in terms of the efforts that you all take to address -- abuse and protect end users and your registrants.

So that'll open it up to any questions or comments about the role and kind of what we've been doing.

Samantha Demetriou: Any questions?

Craig, go ahead.

Craig Schwartz: Hi. Craig Schwartz for the record.

I don't have a question about what Bryan just introduced, but I request that we could consider flipping some of the agenda items for this session this morning. I think the GDPR's listed last, and the (Gackers) talking about GDPR at 11 that I think some of us would like to attend. So if we could perhaps cover that sooner here, then it'd give us a chance to shift over to that other session.

And I'm willing to be practical, but GDPR always turns into an enormous time suck. And if folks are going to start leaving at 11 or listening-in for the other one, I just want to make sure we do touch on other issues. I could see that easily consuming all of our time. That's why we put it last so that we could at least get through some of the things, not just be talking about the (unintelligible).

Bryan Schilling: Got it. Fair enough.

Craig Schwartz: Okay.

Samantha Demetriou: (Unintelligible) 11 to 11:30.

Bryan Schilling: We could push. Okay.

What I want to say – we will get to it, but let's just do our best to get through the other items as quickly as possible.

So with that, Jamie.

Jamie Hedlund: So on voluntary efforts to address abuse within the DNS, if that's the next item. If there are any background or contexts you can provide it because there's a lot of different ways that discussion can go.

Thanks.

Bryan Schilling: Okay. So look to the group for this one. Remember, we weren't having – we could not schedule a closed session. But previously on the list there was plenty of angst expressed about the data that's being collected and then published by the Office of CTO and their (DAR) initiative and how that might be used by Compliance or Compliance's part in that initiative.

I'm hoping I am shaking people or remembering, you know, or helping them remember what we were talking about.

So that's the focus here. I know it's an opportunity to dig a little deeper on what is going on expressing some of the concerns.

(Liz), go ahead.

(Liz): Hi. (Liz), the CDPIF for the record.

I think I just have a general question about the (DAR) tool -- (DAR) system -- and whether or not it is or presently or is there any plans to use it as a feed into Compliance. In other words, how do you guys use it and where do you see its value? Where do you see its weaknesses?

Thanks.

Jamie Hedlund: I should say – somebody I'm sure were at the DNS Abuse Panel yesterday where a lot of these issues were discussed. We'll recap some of that here. And not pretending to speak on behalf of (Octo) or (David Conrad), but I can tell you that we know that there are questions about the use of abuse feeds and how not just publishing but also how Contractual Compliance - we use them.

So first, on DAR itself, is I think they did share -- enlighten us -- on the concerns that had been raised there. There's going to be a opportunity for a lot more community input into this before it's, you know, officially published and posted. It's going to include asking (SSAC) for criteria on judging the validity and legitimacy of some of these RBLs. And then also going to two independent experts outside of ICANN to test the, you know, the validity of the methodology of DAR and whether it puts-out valid data.

So that's sort of one part.

The other is the actual use of the data itself. So in the end, you know, the current vision is that it would put-out summary specifics, putting about abuse levels for registries and registrars without any, you know, calculated by this aggregated method. When that comes-up, there's nothing that Contractual Compliance can do with that. We can't say, you know, "PIR, you're number 14. You're really bad. So, you know, do something." That's not actual evidence.

And obviously I'm making-up these numbers.

But there is underlying data, you know, underlying those feeds which we're looking to see if we can access -- which we could potentially use in compliance matters. So there will be...

For example, a domain name that's got a phish URL, we get a screenshot of that. We send that along. We ask about it.

So, you know, there's... So that's the current vision. I'm sure we'll be -- as (Zach) provides comments and then put that out for public comment, we'll refine it more generally.

The last thing that I'll say is that as I said yesterday, you know, if I were, you know -- completely understandable why registries and registrars would be

concerned. You know, the initial data does suit us, but none of the registries or registrars who participate actively in ICANN are anywhere near the top of the, you know, the top 25 that is this list I've seen, which is imperfect in not being used for anything. But, you know, they count for 80,90% of abuse that's out there and really a hope that -- and this may be naive -- but let's hope that the contracted parties would actually see this effort as in their interest in promoting the industry and promoting confidence, particularly among UGLDs, where a lot of the high numbers of abuse are.

So with that I'll open to any questions.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks so much, Jamie. We've got a queue. So we have Maxim, Christine, Allen, Kristina and then Edmon. And I'm going to write that down so I don't forget that order.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record.

Actually, we tried to approach (Dave) from Secure Office and Registry and in (unintelligible) these registrars with suggestions that the Secure Office asks constituencies, constituencies like (unintelligible) and registrars about potential input because what they provide us, for example, as explanation how a system worked in Madrid (JB Hammid) was like mix of information stripped-out of proofs of any kind and as (unintelligible) practice to have to (unintelligible) this we actually liable for most providing service without any reason. Because saying the (unintelligible) that which contains something and you have to cancel (concert) with your customers with no legal explanation. It's something can do. And unfortunately, they were not eager to talk to us. If possible to associate them to contact us somehow (unintelligible) because individual contacts they do not count. It's a good idea to have some use of the tool, which actually funds. It's not for free. And either it's going to be a good contact or it could be reviewed in financial section of plans.

Jamie Hedlund: So again, you know, people like you have raised concerns about the use of feeds and the raw ability of those. And as a result of that we're going to have (Zach) and (Ulna) get their criteria and we're going to put that out for public comment. So with strong energies that are out to participate there.

Samantha Demetriou: Christine, go ahead.

Christine Dorrain: Thanks. Christine Dorrain, for the record. My question is even more basic. So I've seen several different presentations now about (DAR) and it seems to me that it is a solution in search of a problem. There's a whole lot of data that somebody somewhere decided needed to be collected. I've seen the slides that said, "Oh, I see people in the community ask for it." I don't think it was anyone in this room.

And then there's other slides that say, "What should we do with this information now that we have it?" So why are we collecting it? There are these third-parties that are out there providing it. If we want it, we can go get it. But what's the situation.

Bryan Schilling: Sure, so there are third parties and we did it and (DARs) consist of all third-party data that is publicly available. The reason I said – and one of the reasons that we're doing this is because thousands and thousands of entities of out there are using these lists to block domain names, to block email services, to block entire TLDs, and that's not good for the DNS. It's not good for the new GTLD program in particular.

So this information is out there. I think it is tied to our security and stability mandate. What happens with it is an issue, you know, for the community to consider, but I don't think it helps ICANN or, you know, tri-parties for that matter for, you know, to pretend that this data which does question security and stability of a number of TLDs and registrars to, you know, to suppress it or ignore it.

Man: I'm (unintelligible), for the record.

So I have the pleasure of being on that panel for DNS DCS yesterday. So the only thing I want to say is to thank yourself as well that, you know, there's been an awful lot of discussion about, you know, (DAR) being used as a stick to beat people, but I think you've been clear in stating now that DAR there's a huge gap between what is DAR is presenting and what a registry or a registrar can actually do with the data being presented in there.

So from that point of view, I think the session yesterday we had some very good statements that went out there and went to fixing that misconception that, you know, just because it's on DAR it means that the registries can turn around and use that to fix things.

So that was the first thing.

The second thing then is just you were talking there about -- and it was mentioned as well in the session yesterday, but -- unfortunately -- there's just so much information that needed to be gotten through yesterday. But the fact that these block lists and, like, (Servile) and (FAMAS) are being used in so many different ways by the internet as we speak. We don't see it happening, but there's a huge difference as well between me as a company possibly blocking things coming in to me because of those blocks. I'm relying on the DAR that is coming through those blocks as a result of that, and me as a company who's actually affecting stopping a registrant on the basis of the (DARs) do not block this.

In Scenario 1, the only person I'm affecting is myself. In Scenario 2, I'm affecting one of my registrants. That is a very sure thing that happens as well. That's the next stage of the conversation as far as I can see it. That just because it's used widespread does not mean that, again, it's still something we can use.

So I'm, again, very thankful that we're going to that next step. But, again, we need... Even looking at the ASI, you know, review of (unintelligible), we still need a very high level of belief and trust in these parties and I hope we can achieve that. But if we don't meet mass level – even in this review -- then we're still going to have some issues.

Bryan Schilling: Thanks, Alan.

And you're absolutely right. We not only need high trust in the feeds themselves, but the feeds themselves, you know, if it's just a domain name, that's not actionable evidence and we would not expect a registered registrar then to act on simply a listing somewhere of that.

But having said that, if there is, you know, one the things that these spit out is that a domain -- a GLD, for example -- could have, you know, 90% of the domain names are abusive. I think that, you know, that we would be interested in sharing that information even if it doesn't have actually evidence. But to share it and say, "You know, maybe there's a systemic issue that you should look at." And what action we can take under the contract under that is a separate question.

Samantha Demetriou: I had Kristina and Edmon next.

Kristina Rosette: Yes. Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry.

I asked this question yesterday. Didn't get an answer, so I'm going to ask it again in hopes that you all might be able to answer it.

What prophecies and mechanisms does ICANN intend to implement to detect and eliminate false positives before publishing the data feeds that they're intended to collect from DAR?

Jamie Hedlund: So all the data feeds themselves have their own processes. All of the data feeds that we use -- that DAR uses -- has their own processes for dealing with false positives and false negatives. And I think one of the things that we said in the session yesterday but someone a lot more knowledgeable about these things than I was that it's (unintelligible) (Rod Rasmussen) which was that the issue of false positives and false negatives now is extremely low and if you disagree, you know, please participate in the thing where you can show that it's now true.

But ICANN does not manipulate the data. ICANN does not manipulate the data underlying the, you know, DAR will put forth data based on those feeds themselves and the providers of those feeds have their own policies in that (unintelligible) and we would require them to have their own message for getting things removed or corrected.

Kristina Rosette: So just so that I'm clear because I want to make sure that the answer I heard was the answer you intended to give me. And that is we don't believe there's a problem with false positives and we intend to do nothing.

Jamie Hedlund: That's not what I said. What I said was that someone who was on the panel yesterday, (Rod Rasmussen), whose career is based on security, said that it was not an issue. I also said that it can be put out for public comment and I hope you will participate. And I also said that we won't use any feed that does not allow individuals to have their information corrected or removed.

Samantha Demetriou: Edmon, go ahead. And then Maxim after you now.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Edmon (unintelligible).

So there's was a little bit on that -- and (Will) said before -- we want to ask kind of where the line is drawn between compliance, between (PIC DRP) and between 80 something more cooperative engagement. So the feeds or DAR or even the CTO Office of some kind of abuse team can work more

collaboratively with registries to address these issues on one level And then moves to I don't know which line it should be drawn where it goes into (PIC DRP) or versus the compliance issue.

How do you see those? I see three compartments that are very distinct. One is cooperatively working potentially with the CTO Office and whatever DAR and other teams at ICANN. That's one compartment. And then there's a compartment that should be kicked to (PIC DRP). And then there's a compartment that then Compliance comes in, and that is – when Compliance comes in that's very different from and more cooperative engagement with the CTO Office of some DNS abuse team a ICANN.

So I'm wondering how you see those lines.

Jamie Hedlund: So thanks, Edmon. And could not agree with you more about the importance of using data like this -- first and foremost -- for collaboration and working with... Because not all of the... I'm sure it's not the case that all the top 25 registries are in the position that they're in because they are a, you know, because they're potentially doing bad things.

There are -- we know of and we've worked with -- registries that... And then somewhat successfully in helping them. (DACO) has in helping them with, you know, dealing with security issues in their zone. And that is completely different and ultimately likely to be more successful than compliance action.

Compliance action is sort of the last resort. I mean, even once -- and Maguy can speak to this -- but even during the course of a regular compliance matter, the hope is that before it gets to a breach that there's cooperation and, you know, and that that results in, you know, resolution of whatever the issue is -- whether it's a misunderstanding on our part or something that needs to be addressed by a contracted party.

And then as far as the tech scale is, you know, (PICS) can either be enforced or either dealt with by contractual compliance or a (DRP). And so, you know, (unintelligible) impacts and go to an outside provider. So with - again, that would be way down the line after, you know, some attempts. We hope for cooperation and figuring-out an issue rather than trying to throw people in ICANN jail. Too, that's a very scary place.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, for the record.

I have a suggestion.

(Unintelligible) he told us that you're going to accept only those (unintelligible) sources of information which allow users to get out of the lease if they prove that something is okay. And given the sensitive timing, I suggest you check the practices, those practice use.

For example, one of the parties (Sven House) include DNS servers that registers to us, which do not have transparent. And what do we do if they include DNS servers that registry. We have only four hours to figure that before we get out of the business, to have no liability. Yes. But they have no transparent procedure, no accountability. They do not belong to the community properly. They use closed use practices and they're questionable. So I suggest you check the way they include ICANN and exclude and those that you check the practices they use because some companies we should more suspicious practices, I'm not sure if very good idea.

Thank you.

Jamie Hedlund: Thanks. And I suspect that's going to be a big part of (SSAC's) review.

Samantha Demetriou: Okay. Any other questions on this topic?

Okay. You have about 30 minutes left. So we're going to move on to Number C, or Letter C.

Thanks, Maguy.

Maguy Serad: Good morning, everyone. This is Maguy Serad with Contractual Compliance.

Before I jump into the Topic C, I would like to recognize three team members from the ICANN team. It's their first ICANN meeting, and they're sitting over there. If you can raise your hand, I have (May), (Amanda), and (Yen Chen). While they've been on our team for a few months -- almost a year -- this their first ICANN meeting, so just wanted to make sure I recognize that.

I also want have (Jennifer) in the audience with you.

So to address the Question C: How does compliance define its goals and performance indicator?

So as you know, at the ICANN planning process is a continuous process. It starts with a strategic goals, the five-year plan, and the annual operating plan. Once that has been set from a strategic goal perspective, I think you also heard (Yuron) talk at the opening ceremony about the accountability -- what's it called -- the accountability indicators. So if you have heard of the accountability indicators, it speaks to ICANN's goals. Contractual Compliance has been determined to be in Goal Number 4, which is promote ICANN's role and multi-stakeholder approach. That goal in itself consists of multiple objectives. We are under 4.4, which is promote role clarity and establish mechanism to increase trust within the ecosystem.

As you all know... Also part of that role is multiple portfolios of projects. How many of you have seen the accountability indicators? Have you seen it online, on the ICANN.org? Did you go to it? Okay. It's on the landing page of ICANN.org.

In addition to ICANN.org accountability indicators, under the transparency page, ICANN also publishes how we achieve and the progress on those activities. It's a monthly publication that takes down that Objective 4.4 and it identifies it by two portfolios.

For compliance, we have defined two portfolios -- one that we call Contractual Compliance Function, and one Contractual Compliance Initiatives and Improvements. We wanted to establish a structure that recognizes the effect of we do have a regular enforcement duty and collaboration and monitoring and audits and reporting that we need to work within that framework.

So these what we call our Regular Compliance Activities. The initiatives and improvements relate to improvement to the system, the templates, to the -- if there are working groups, new policies being initiated or, you know, agreements. They'll all fall under the bucket of Initiatives and Improvements.

For example, one of the improvements we're focusing on for this fiscal year are the metrics, which is this Topic D. We continue to enhance our metric, and one of the biggest item which is aligned with the trust matter here. You earn trust by being transparent. Transparency has to be (unintelligible) base, and it's all the time on the (unintelligible) that we have. While we are being mindful of the confidentiality practice of the process in the informal resolution, we are opening up the reinforcing that ties to the informal resolution and that's up to that (unintelligible) in D.

So now that I talked about the goals and how they are published and they're on the ICANN website, I can provide the links later if you need me to do that. Based on this portfolios and projects, we take a step back and we say, "Okay now. What are the performance indicators for those? How do we measure those?" You've got the basic operational metrics that roll out to the KIP, which is like any operations that assist complaints. You have to measure the

different effects of managing and addressing and responding. And you also have the metrics that relate to our initiatives and improvements.

I have – this is a summary of how we go about it. So I would take any questions you may have. But I also -- as I always say in every session at every ICANN meeting since 2011 -- we do our best when we are defining those based on our knowledge, our expertise, and also based on our appreciation of what we hear in the community. So I welcome your input if you have any specific needs or requests for performance metrics or indicators that you share that with us and we can open that dialogue in defining one.

Any questions on Topic C?

Thank you, Samantha.

Topic D is the compliance and has supporting. So that is an initiative that's been in the planning -- in the work -- for few months. It starts with -- as you all know, everyone in the community's interested in compliance metrics in (DAFA). We started publishing data in late-2011/early-2012, and we continue our journey in improving those metrics.

The latest efforts we've launched -- if you've seen my blog, that was my first time ever blogging, by request from Jamie. So in the blog I state what led to the initiation of some of the granularity of the data being requested. The enhanced supporting consists of three elements.

The first one, enhancing the granularity of the data being reported in our monthly dashboard. We receive... You know, there are multiple working groups and policy discussions underway. Compliance receives -- all the time -- requests for data. Our goal is to always point them to data that is published. If the data is not published, we don't cater and we don't customize our reports. We understand the requirement of the data, and we go and

implement whatever is need in our systems to collect the data. And our goal is to publish and make that data available to all, not just send a set of data to one group that's not being published.

So working with the CCC Review Team for the past year or so and the Public Safety Working Group, we have learned that they have a need to define the granularity of who is in accuracy. And in the CCC Review Team, they told us what level of granularity is needed and it is aligned with WHOIS accuracy reporting system also provides. So we went in and we had to take our level of complaints we receive and break them into those categories and report on them.

Another area of interest for reporting is on the abuse -- DNS abuse -- and specifically the complaints that Contractual Compliance receives. The definition of the abuse we used is all extracted from the contract. It's exactly what's listed in Specification 11-3B.

We added pharmaceutical because that's an element we receive a lot issues and complaints about. We wanted to distinguish that, and it's not listed in the contract.

That's one element.

Then another thing that we refer to in many discussions is the need to distinguish the data between legacy and UGTLD. What we've done with that is we took a step back and also different interest in different types of data. So for the multi-granularity, we stopped under reporting at that level of a complaint type.

Then we took a step back and said, "Okay. What kind of information can we provide the community on a consistent and reliable stages?" So we have created what we call quarterly reports. We used to come to the ICANN meetings and provide you with slide deck that had some data at the end of it.

We have extracted that data and now we will be publishing it quarterly because the ICANN meetings are not structured the same anymore, and there was a six-month gap in reporting, so we were not able to truly give you an apples-to-apples comparison from quarterly consistencies.

So the deck still remains and now is sitting in the quarterly report.

So we've done new is new quarterly reports and annual reports that are the same, and what they consist of is taking the entire compliance process for both registrars and registries and showing aggregate numbers across the process phases and it evolves -- how it goes from first, second, third into enforcement.

We also have provided different types of reports. Think of it like a Rubik's cube. How can we report on the type of enforcement and their occurrences in a calendar year or in a quarterly reporting? We also provided a breakdown on reporters.

So we're trying to listen. What are the questions and the interests from the community on the data needed? And we bring it to the community by publishing it and making it publicly available to all.

The next phase of the enhanced reporting – and I think I said that also in the joint meeting call that we had for registrars and registries about a month ago. The next step of the enhanced reporting is to bring enhanced granularity and the complaints that we receive and deal with as it relates to (PICS) and the safeguards. So that – we're working towards that for the end of the calendar year or early first of 2018.

I say it again, I stress the importance of that and the website. Also we added Learn More toward the metrics because we don't want to assume everybody understands the compliance language and the language we speak directly

with the contracted party. We've added a lot of Learn More to explain the different topics and the different sources of information.

We also -- on that page -- are asking for feedback on the compliance metrics. Please send any comments and feedback to Compliance@ICANN.org. That email is a distribution list for our Compliance Team. It's manned globally and would get to the right subject matter expert based on the topic.

We welcome your feedback, not about, "Hey, I like it or I don't like it." It's nice to hear those, but we want if there are specific improvements or ideas you have, please share them with us.

With this I close Topic D and take any questions.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Maguy, for it to digest. So thanks for that presentation and thanks for the work that's gone into it.

Do folks around the room have questions for Maguy? Comments?

Good. Oh, Jon in the back.

Jon Nevett: Jon. Quick question.

Do you guys deal with ICANN's compliance with contracts or just contracted parties' compliance with the contracts?

Maguy Serad: Thank god it's the last one. There's plenty of work.

It's the contractual compliance with registrars and registries.

Jon Nevett: So where would we go if we had an issue with ICANN's compliance with our contracts?

Maguy Serad: Thank you. I'm looking at (unintelligible).

So, as you know and you've probably heard, there are different forms of our engaging for escalation. We've got the Complaints Officer with (Krista) or the Ombudsman.

Jon Nevett: Thank you.

Samantha Demetriou: Next? Maxim, I have you next.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba.

I have a question about three parties who complained and the reflection in the reports.

Do you have same plans to work in Compliance from actual businesses separated from nature of business? Because what we see now is the party. They have, for example, ten employees. They use Gmail or other free mail services to send complaints. And since you're threatened by email, and either checks – they clearly use information -- the company information -- which can be upset natural persons. And you see that you have ten guys who report maybe, like, half and half (unintelligible) and false positives and (unintelligible). The company, which has 50 person of false reporting and using that track in the current system (unintelligible). And they have plans of, like, somehow served out in the future. So we see that, yes, natural persons they make, like, 50,000 complaints to him because they don't understand something, like, terminology. They don't make difference between registry/registrars. That's all they just – people from the street, yes. And some companies who, for example, occupy (unintelligible) will be, like, this minds of (unintelligible).

Thank you.

Maguy Serad: Thank you, Maxim, for your question.

So to answer your question, do we have plan – and I'm going to restate your question. Please correct me if I misunderstood it. Do we have plans to take the reporter information and aggregate it to the next level or dictate it to the next level by companies or individuals?

So I'm going to be – because I've been always for this constituency and your counterparts, which are very direct. I do not have plan to do that now. I think it requires access and a sophistication of different information that's not readily available.

But what I would like to put at the table, if you have a concern about a reporter, as you know, ICANN Contractual Compliance has the ability to review your concern about the reporter. If it's a reporter we apply the same process. If we have what I call a reporter that's abusing of this system or of the tool available to report compliance-related matters, share that with us and we'll work with you to understand what the issue is.

We have, in the past, worked and informed the reporters that this out of scope or it's a repeat or there's just doing activities that's not acceptable within this form. And we have also suspended reporters from submitting complaints and going your way.

So if you have specific concerns on reporters, let us know and give us some information to help us address it. And we can work with you on that.

Samantha Demetriou: Okay. Thanks, Maguy.

Looks like there are no other questions on that topic, so we'll move on to the favorite -- GDPR.

Jamie Hedlund: So there's obviously been a lot of discussion already in multiple sessions. I'm not going to say anything different than what (Yuron) has already said because I have kids.

But basically, you know, we know -- at a high level -- we know that the (Hulu's) obligations are going to be impacted by GDPR. How exactly that happens is still under discussion and under review, and there are going to be lots of opportunities for community engagement so that we get to the right place.

But right now we're still, you know, you've seen the Hamilton memo. I'm sure you've seen the memo from (Wilson Sincinni) that, you know, (unintelligible) commission. IDC has just come out with one. And all of these are fodder for further analysis and review. Trying to figure out what the future for WHOIS looks like.

Jamie Hedlund: Other thoughts? Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: The question is these (unintelligible) actual it could cause Compliance to be (unintelligible). They expect it to be single find for ICANN or multiple finds since it's common irregulator (sic) who's been most probably. Common that controller.

And for example, two PODs are fine and your common controller. They think it's going to be one find, where 20 million euros all (unintelligible) to times. Thanks.

Jamie Hedlund: So I can't speak for DPAs. I can say that ICANN Contractual Compliance doesn't have any plans to assess fines at this point. But, you know, how we, again, how we enforce what WHOIS looks like, what Compliance, what those obligations looks like. Post May 25 is still very much up for discussion.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, for the record.

Actually, it's not just WHOIS. It's also (ESCROL) and the concerns which we actually don't have the gist of. Because in current (unintelligible), (ESCROL) it's not meant to allow the change in the data uploaded. Yesterday, today is a go, and things like that. It just (unintelligible) your files and without sorting these files, we're going to be in trouble.

And also the system in which currently in place for the delete the names. When we delete the names, we officially not allowed to change the information fields. For example, if a person withdraws consent, formally we should replace his name with protected by this bureau. Something. And we are not allowed to.

And, yes. So I suggest you check other duration of ICANN's registries and registrars parts in their life.

Jamie Hedlund: Maxim, you're absolutely right. I was using WHOIS for just short of shorthand, but it in fact transferred it affects (EBRO), it affects lots of different operations with domain names.

Samantha Demetriou: Okay.

Sebastien Ducos: Sebastien Ducos, GDPRB Group speaking on behalf of FRL and (M Standard) with their consent.

A month ago, they received -- yet again -- a letter from you guys -- a compliance letter. I know that you know that they're working on a solution -- have put a solution on the table.

For all intents and purposes, a year and a half ago they blew the whistle on this particular problem for us and raised (unintelligible) for the whole community. They're ahead of all of us in terms of problem. And so first of all -- and I've already sent you an email in their direction -- can we please list the

foot on this and make sure that we use their example. And I'm not sure the way everybody wants to go, that we use this example to lead us or to guide us in this process, rather than trying to strangle them into getting back into the fold of ICANN compliance.

I understand that is part of your job. We all understand also that this is a difficult situation that we're all trying to deal with, and everybody's working on it. So let's do that.

The second point I wanted to make is that in this particular notice, there was reference to (RSEP). Now I'm an (RSEP) expert. There's other people in this room that they'll have more to say about it, but I think that there wasn't even (fallacy) between them, us, you guys. I don't know exactly what the situation was with regards to (Adonis), but if there was indeed one that was required -- in your view, which happens not to be ours -- but again, I'm not going to debate that. Other people will do that better. But I'd like to understand exactly what the position was.

And then just in general, begin on this side of the room -- on the registrar side of the room -- or the others, let's at least until May make sure that we discuss and we try to find solutions rather than try to enforce things that we all know are currently -- at least in Holland and very soon for the rest of Europe -- not enforceable.

Thank you.

Jamie Hedlund: So two quick things. One is that, you know, if a matter is under Compliance and so we're not able to say anything about it except with them because it's in the confidential phase of the proceeding. They did also separately write the CO and general council. So that's on one.

On the second, I think one of the things that (Yuron) and others have talked about is trying to figure-out what we're going to do in the meantime before,

you know, this interim period between now and when there is, you know, the revised policy if that's what it is. And so would urge you and (Defarela) and (Sam) and whoever to participate in that.

Sebastien Ducos: So that's it? Because, again, (unintelligible) was hoping that somebody could share thoughts on our steps for maybe (unintelligible). And again, I'm not in the (unintelligible). I might not want it, but I know that we should use it internally on the topic.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, for the record.

Given the current financial with GDPR and actually base of purposes with the ICANN community and ICANN, I have a question. What has should we as registries undertake to start the procedure of -- how to say -- how to receive first track (weavers) of some sort in case we, for example, don't have solutions by the beginning of May, where (unintelligible) go that because, like, no registry is already (unintelligible) because we are barely a few companies in this industry can withstand the single find of 20 million viewers. So it could be something while we're not so temporarily withhold, like, execution of some parts of the agreement and policies until it's resolved because usual resolution of -- fast resolution of -- six months. And we don't have that time now.

Thanks.

Jamie Hedlund: Contractual Compliance I don't think has an answer to your question other than there are multiple efforts underway within the community to figure-out what both with registries and registrars in ICANN need to do both as an interim measure as well as, you know, on a more permanent basis once there's a revision to the same policy.

Samantha Demetriou: It's (Rubens) and (Keith) in the queue and then let's say about three minutes left to just time check for everyone.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) of compliance (unintelligible) specifications. We use specifications in contracts because they don't actually require a registry to publish data. They always have the one example. So we could for all (unintelligible) publish in-house (unintelligible) example registrant can be confined to contracts. So that's a (unintelligible) compliance (unintelligible).

Jamie Hedlund: That is an interesting question.

When I, you know, being new in this job I hadn't really thought much about it before but I guess that is a way to interpret the contract. It's not necessarily the way that we would condone, but we think we can come back with a more fulsome response.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks.

Keith Drazek for the transcript.

I do want to go back to the question that was raised about the (RSEP). And I'm just really looking for a little clarification with regard to that answer down about FRL. I know you can't speak, Jamie, to the specifics of your ongoing communication with them as a contracted party, but just generally, was the compliance notice issue because of the, you know, their treatment of the WHOIS data or was it because there was not an (RSEP) filed? I heard different views on that, and I don't know if it's one or the other or both, but I'm just curious if you can elaborate a little.

Thanks.

Jennifer Scott: This is Jennifer Scott from Contractual Compliance.

So currently -- I think Jamie already said it -- the information regarding the compliance ticket that was referenced in the letter to the CEO is in fact in the informal resolution process. So additional details can't be discussed, except with those parties.

Jamie Hedlund: So I understand your frustration because they have shared some information in their letter. They can do that as, you know, being on the other end of the complaint. But we, unfortunately, can't.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks.

This is Keith, again.

And again, I wasn't seeking any sort of details about the exchange, more about the reasoning behind the initial compliance notice. But that's fine. We can take it offline.

Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Any other questions on this?

(Woman): This is (woman [can't identify name]), by the way. I keep forgetting to announce myself.

I'm going to ask a question just because I feel like we've kind of circled around it a little bit. I'm going to try to reframe it in a way that you guys can answer.

What is -- or is there any relationship between the (RSEP) process and compliance, as you guys see it? Do they overlap at all within ICANN?

Jamie Hedlund: So this is Jamie and I've never announced myself and I apologize for that.

But – want me to start and then you guys add-in.

There is – it is possible if a registry is offering a new service and it's a registry service and it hasn't gone through the (RSEP) process then there could be compliance action against them for not filing, for not submitting and (RSEP) and really for providing an unauthorized registry service. And the main reason for that is the community has a policy on the introduction of registry services that, you know, have main priority or objective is to, you know, support the security and stability of the DNS and make sure that there aren't any competition issues like we've seen in the past, raised by new services.

Samantha Demetriou: (Unintelligible).

Man 2: So Compliance Team, what are you hoping for? What will happen with GDPR in the next couple of months if more registries follow the example of Amsterdam and everywhere else? So what do you think will happen?

Jamie Hedlund: So as Contractual Compliance, I don't think we're supposed to have an opinion on what's going to happen in what, you know, going forward. There have been Board members and others who have said that they expect that, you know, some contracted parties are going to decide, you know, between (Huge Finds) and (ICANN GL) that they'll take (ICANN GL) because it's really not that uncomfortable.

And that can be helpful in getting the community really, you know, focused on this and quickly find a solution.

Samantha Demetriou: Go ahead. And then we probably have to wrap it up because we're running a little bit over.

Crystal Ondo: You guys keep talking about the community and what GDPR or a lot of people -- myself included -- think this is more of a contractual compliance matter between the two parties -- ICANN and the registries. And given the

timeline, is there a process -- and I know this is asked, but I'm not sure it was adequately answered -- by which we can come to you with our solution and you can say "yes" or "no" so that between the two of us, we don't get into a position that FRL and Amsterdam have found themselves in?

Jamie Hedlund: So, you know, obviously the... So a couple of things. One is WHOIS is a community policy. It's also in the contract, so it's not just a contractual matter. At least, that is our view. And then, I mean, that's the ICANN-at-large view.

Secondly, we very much -- I think -- want contracted parties' input on what the GDPR -- what you think the GDPR -- requires in terms of modifications to WHOIS and how you would, you know, comply with the GDPR and maintain to the greatest extent possible fidelity with the community policy.

So the ICANN meeting, if you came to us, if you came to (Yuron) and the Board with a solution, I can't say what they would say or how they would treat it. But, you know, I do know that there's a need for input on what the view is on what the law requires and what it, you know, what has to change post-GDPR enforcement.

Crystal Ondo: Hi. Crystal Ondo again.

Does that mean that you're taking the position that you guys are not able to wave part of our contract in this instance because there's community involvement?

Jamie Hedlund: So, you didn't ask a question about waivers so I didn't answer it, but the -- and I think that's a completely separate issue. But, I mean, there is clearly, I mean, you know, there is clearly set-out two different phases. One is, you know, the interim phase and what's going to happen, what ICANN's going to do -- both in enforcement of contracts, but as well as for our own compliance with GDPR. And then post-policy development with, you know, and what that looks like.

Samantha Demetriou: All right. I think with that we're at time. So thank you guys for joining us and for answering our questions.

Jamie Hedlund: Thank you.

Okay. And then we're going to go right into the INS briefing (unintelligible).

Kim Davies: Hi, everyone. I'm Kim Davieses), instructor at (Pinnacle Services) of the INS services.

We've got the time to speak with you today because we have a fairly large project beginning up within our team to develop a next generation roots and management system. One of the fundamental parts of this is redesigning some of the ways we interact with you, and it's important to us that we get feedback from GTLD registry operators as we go through this process. So we capture your concerns and requirements and build a system that supports the work and interaction that you do with us.

Next slide, please.

So Next Generation Roots and Management System is essentially a comprehensive rewrite of a tool that we provide today to TLD managers, and allow TLD managers interact with us, to make change requests, and perform a variety of functions. And the functionality change that I was alluding to is what we calling for now a new authorization model. This is how we get consent from TLD managers to perform changes on behalf of the TLD manager in our database.

And as I mentioned, we're seeking feedback now because we're in pre-(unintelligible) design phase. We've started engineering work on some aspects of this and still being designed out at the moment.

Next slide, please.

Why are we doing a fundamental rewrite of our system? Essentially, the system that we're using today has its origins in the early-2000s. It was a prototype and originally it was (dissolved) by the community. ICANN then took on that prototype and expanded and evolved it. However, a lot of the design decisions and the technology that's used were based on pre-new GTLD assumptions -- the assumption that there's basically only 300 TLDs, the change rate was relatively low.

And informally, as technology evolves irrespective of the number of TLDs, we're running into internal technical limits on how we might want to add new functionality. And the toolkits that were common 15, 20 years ago in software engineering are struggling with adding modern contemporary functionality. So our engineering team feel that having a modern basis for future evolution would be desirable.

So given that we both have this rewrite on the books for other reasons and given that we are now close to transition of INR, it presents a good opportunity for us to rethink some of the fundamental assumption on how the systems worked.

The current model of authorization involves the concept of an administrative contact and a technical contact. This is a model that's common to many. It's existed in our industry for decades, something that we've inherited.

Another thing that we're at changing, which is on the subject of today's talk, is how we do technical checks and how we evaluate technical compliance of TLD registries, report errors, and remediate problems in the process.

Next slide.

So I appreciate, you know, everyone here uses this system directly so just for familiarity this is a snapshot of the current system. So all TLD managers get log-in rights to this to administer their domains. They log-in, they can see their portfolio of domains, they can look at all the current settings, they can modify the settings, look at the (unintelligible) change requests, and perform a variety of actions that translate into change requests that are processed by the (IANA) Team.

Next slide, please.

Next slide, please. Thank you.

This is fundamentally what the (Rootzone) Database Record looks like today. We essentially capture three contacts on behalf of every TLD. The first is what we've historically called this functioning organization. In G30 pounds, this would be the register operator. In signatory pounds, it would be the signatory manager. In both cases, it's essentially the legal entity responsible for managing the TLD.

In the case of GTLDs, it's the contractor's party with ICANN. And from an (IANA) perspective, this is the party that is in power to nominate and replace the administrative and technical contacts.

We then have two contacts -- one administrative, one technical. But despite their names from a policy and operational perspective, for (IANA), there's no distinction. They're just simply two contacts. Both are listed in the WHOIS. Both are required to cross-authorize changes to the TLD irrespective of the type of change. So even if it is, like, a purely technical change by updating an end server record, both need to validate that change request that's not directly purely at the technical contact.

So that's the current model that we have today.

Next slide, please.

So I pitched and created a new authorization model is to develop something that addresses a number of pain points and our customers see with a method of both submitting and approving change requests. In that sense it's adding flexibility to allow you as a (unintelligible) manager to configure things in a less strict way than having purely one admin and one tech contact. And I'll go the details in moment, but essentially, we're taking feedback, so keep in the back of your mind as I walk through this. If it would work for you, what parts need refinement or improvement?

We've had a lot of discussion with signatory managers that has helped improve this approach, but we've had little in the way of GTLD feedback. Particularly given the different nature of GTLD operators, registry services providers and their portfolio size, it's critical to us to get feedback from you, even if it's just to say, "Look, this looks pretty good for our requirements."

Accordingly you can accommodate your current arrangement if you like. If the way you interact with (IANA) is perfect for you, having those two contacts, you don't need to change it.

So in theory, if we've done everything right, this is all benefits and no down sides.

Next slide, please.

So this is the current model. We have an administrative contact and a technical contact. Both are listed in the public WHOIS. Both approve change requests. And the (unintelligible) admin contact must be in the country for that CCTLD. That obviously is not applicable in the GTLD case.

Now you can see where the conflict lies here -- and I'm sure many of you are familiar with it -- which is that the party that you want to list in the WHOIS is

probably quite different from the party you want to approve change requests. Change requests can ultimately result in a transfer of your TLD to another party.

The public WHOIS is where people go to send operational questions, complaints, inquiries and so forth. So I think you would want your helpdesk or frontline customer support to be listed in the WHOIS and have those contacts (unintelligible) there. But in terms of approving change request, you might want someone relatively senior. So and this is the feedback we've gotten over many years is that, you know, "I want someone senior to approve these change requests, but they need to be listed in the WHOIS today. So I get a lot of SPAM, I get a lot of inquiries. I need to redirect that."

So this is as conflict that we see that we're trying to evolve on.

Next slide, please.

So this is (fundament) for the new model. The new model is removing the approval concept from the admin and tech contact. We keep them, but they're purely for public information only. So therefore, if you miss appropriate contacts for your TLD in the WHOIS that are responsive to administrative type queries and technical type queries on behalf of the TLD operator.

And then we introduced a new concept called an authorizing contact. This is a contact that essentially approves change requests and nothing else. They're not published, they're not in the WHOIS. You manage them yourself through a front service interface. It can be one, it can be more. There can be 10, there can be 100. It's up to you to configure as many authorizing contacts as you like.

They're lovely people. They don't (unintelligible). We have stronger identity controls than we have today. We have flexible and traditional approval options. And that last point we can avoid. That's the question for the CCNSI.

But that's the gist of it. And I'll get into details in a moment. I see a hand up so I'm going to pause.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record.

The question is from legal perspective there's the (unintelligible) is primary contact. One of them is liable for what's going on, yes. And we saw it in the past where I'd say one of (unintelligible) administrative contacts was fired was trying to do some very extensive aid to the room, which he was not allowed to. That was the case.

So I suggest you do not remove completely authorization of the primary contact because the only contact and the contact with ICANN can ask formally on behalf of the company. So it needs to be in the upright in contacts by definition, then each cannot be empty to avoid legal issues. Because in case with authorizing contacts, I (unintelligible). For people different (unintelligible) and none of them is primary, and something happens, who will be language of (unintelligible). It could be fishy, from the legal perspective.

So please make sure that the person who signs the contracts from the registry has the right to act and she asks for every (unintelligible).

Thanks.

Kim Davies: Thanks for the feedback.

I think I need to talk to you in a little more detail (unintelligible). From an INR operational perspective, the administrative contact doesn't have any particular legal responsibility. In my view, you know, in a contractual unrelated (IANA) aspect, but we'll talk and find-out more.

Next slide, please.

Okay. Let me see all the text.

So there are certain key concepts I wanted to talk about as approval for threshold. So today we have no such concept. We have two contacts and both must authorize in every scenario.

Here, this new model, you can define it. So you can any number of authorizing contacts, but you can also define what the threshold for approval is. Maybe it is just one of the (unintelligible) need to approve -- two, three, the whole set. That's configurable enough to use. So you can define it in a way that meets your risk profile and what you think it appropriate.

For now (unintelligible) that this is actually going to need cross approval. For example, maybe you have your RSP as a technical contact today and you make a change that is unrelated to technical operations. Why do I need my RSP to cross authorize that change?

Another scenario that we've heard is it's one security manager said, "I want my whole Board of Directors to be listed as authorizing contacts whenever there's a fundamental change because, you know, I don't want that to change, to go ahead with that. Then we'll all approve things." But the idea is you can configure a scenario like that as well.

All the approvals will have a dedicated management interface into the RVMS, so not just the contacts we have today. And then anytime you change the set of approvers they get approved by the prior set. So today, if you were to move to the (unintelligible) model, the existing ANTC would approve that beyond that point that you said would approve any subsequent changes. So that's the idea.

Next slide.

Another key concept is granular access, the idea that authorizes and has to approve all types of change requests. So you can set-up authorizers. The IRC scenario. Maybe they can only modify the technical aspects of the record, not the content. Exact granularity is something that we haven't decided and based on your feedback, we will help define

Obviously there's a trade-off there between power and complexity. So we can make it incidentally configurable, but that makes the system probably more complex than it needs to be. So we're really looking at common use cases and how we can capture those in a flexible way without giving 1 million different knobs (filtrating) how to setup and then we'll provide those mechanisms to you and again it's all self-service.

You can go-in and make those modifications yourself. Next slide, please. Out of this, this is not directly related to the authorization model per se but we'll roll it out in tandem with that as adding pro security options to our account model, adding two types of authentication so the two methods we're planning to support is what's called TRTP.

These are the apps on your phone with the rolling code, already doing this for us is (future code) is east-west which is hardware spoken, they're a lot more secure than the apps.

Part of this is migrating from roll accounts, the person-based accounts, the idea here is if you have a roll account today that goes to a team, each of those team would individually have their own account and this is so each team member would have their own tokens and so forth, their own passwords so you wouldn't have shared credentials.

It's also important for us that it allows us to do much better account recovery procedures. Today we run into obstacles that we just have a roll name. We don't know who's behind it, it's based mostly in password.

If we can't establish who they are, we don't have a good mechanism to restore trust so having individuals rather than roll accounts here benefits the process, it improves security.

And do bear in mind, this is not in the (hooey) so the primary motivator for a roll account is not publishing individuals in their (hooeys) and this is not applicable here. Eliminating e-mail-based submissions is another security request we're received so you must walk-in with your token in order to make the submission and a comprehensive order trail.

So you can login and make changes and it's a complete log of everything that is done. You can go-in and review who's logged-in when, who's made what changes which is substantially more than what we offer today. We have another question?

Kristina Rosette: Yes, Kristina with Amazon registry. I would suggest in light of the experience that some of the registry operators are having in connection with the new naming services portal terms of use that you all give us plenty of advance notice for any new terms of use.

Some of us that have fairly robust infotech departments and requirements are going to need two to three weeks to get whatever authentication methods you're going to want us to use reviewed and approved so I would just really emphasize that as soon as you all are fairly certain about how you're going to configure everything that you give us enough information so that we can start our internal review and approval processes.

Finally it doesn't sound like that you've done it but I want to make sure, I think for those of us that have multiple TLDs ensuring that there's no requirement that the contact be the same person across TLDs is going to be really important.

Kim Davies: Sure, so there is no such requirement and I think importantly just so that at this point yes, we will provide as much advance notice as we can but this is all opted so if you don't want to make these changes, you don't want to use improved factors, we're not going to force you so please continue operating the way you have been.

((Crosstalk))

Man: So that says you've got new stock for ones not like we're (unintelligible) for this particular question. You mentioned the case of wanting to make a change that may not concern your ISV and deciding that you can make the change as the registry operator.

I also obviously have the adverticos, the registry operators that have very little interaction with this community have entrusted their RSP to do, will you authorize all levels of authorization all the way down to the RSP for those registry operators that decide to completely delegate those tasks? I was thinking because in the recent months we have had to upgrade a number of TLDs and went through this 250-plus times.

Man: Right, I think that will be possible but it's not something that we're empowered to make a decision on. That will be up to the registry operator, the contracted party to make the decision.

But we certainly it's a use case that we want to support which is that the registry operator/contract party wishes to empower their RSP in a significant way to submit changes, approve them directly when it comes to the (tentacle) factor then they can configure it in such a way.

(David): Hi, (David) from (DH Africa). In the cases of an RSP that's looking after several registry operators in much the same way as on ours upper (nick handles) for IP address management where you don't have to have multiple logins to manage several resources, it would make a lot of sense from an

RSP's point of view to be able to associate your accounts with more than one registry operator at a time so thereby reducing the administrative burden of having to have extra logins for essentially the same portal.

Man: So in theory we support that today and we'll continue to do so, it's kind of cued off e-mail address or do you have a common e-mail address across multiple TLDs?

We don't it's a single account and when you login you see your portfolio but there's definitely work to be done in improving that through (and the only) choice made in some people's submissions which use a unique e-mail address in every application and that's manifested itself in us creating many different e-mail addresses and contacts.

Some of the larger RSPs consolidated that and we've done that manually with their support but we probably need to provide some additional tools to support that as well.

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davies: Any other questions?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba but for the record, how do you see the shift from the old system to new system? Do you plan to have some overlap or like you have pilot (samples) so we can linger (a little bit) without dangers of getting TLD and/or like crazy sense but sometimes because the question about the current (JD) portal was that it's actually some registry.

Scanners do use it because of legal systems and e-mail is the only way they can actually change something and request something. It happened to be and we would like to avoid the same statement. For example you add some text which actually says something - we try not to use it - and since you

reward using e-mails so what's left? Visit to your office or something?

Thanks.

Kim Davies: So in the past because we considered the red zone to be particularly critical, we've had extended periods of parallel operations where the new system and the old system have run in parallel for many months. Now what we haven't done is provided access to the future system to customers directly.

We've start some things through manually on behalf of you so you don't have to do double entry. We do have an (OC&E) environment. We can look at providing that as kind of a sandbox so we'll take that feedback onboard and see if we can find something and that will be a good way to sound out feedback before things are locked-down.

Maxim Alzoba: Last suggestion, if you go to sandbox thing, please use different phones and different backgrounds so we can see that we are not like mingling with the real (pure deal).

Kim Davies: Sure, okay. (Tarak)?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Kim, it's Jonathan Robinson for the record. Just a follow-on question I think from (Maxim) I guess it's about transitioning and moving and how in terms of in the new system regardless of the tweaks you make based on feedback, it's likely to be it's probably more comprehensive data and to what extent are you going to presumably you're poured over the old data and then leave us optional as to whether or not to what extent that new data is populated.

So in principle someone could be on the new system with the old data or what's the mandatory changes that are likely to be made?

Kim Davies: So the only mandatory change that we're envisaging is this move from basically eliminating roll accounts from authorizers. The exact mechanism

which is one of the design things we're still grappling with, it could (rock lead) we just have sort of a Legacy flag and if you're a TLD hasn't migrated to the new model.

It just works exactly the same, no in-migration whatsoever and when you decide to opt-in to the new model we migrate those roll accounts into individual accounts and we take that Legacy flag off and then the business rules shift slightly but that's still a question mark. We need to explore that. Next slide.

So another contact I wanted to bring to your attention is one of API access so everything I've spoke to that so far assumes you login at a Web interface to perform changes but again one of those key pieces of feedback we have particularly as portfolios get larger is we need something to help us with automation so our primary response to this will be adding an API interface.

So customers rather than logging-in and manually entering change requests can build simple tools to submit change requests en masse so you know, today informally if a registry service provider for example has a large portfolio and wants to do a bulk change across dozens of domains.

They can reach-out to us at a band and just we have ways of automating that internally and we kind of facilitate that by giving the tools directly to you so you can build tools and programs to interact with us. It makes it less error-prone, makes it quick and makes it fast and then throughout the life of a request, she can build tools to probe status as requests go through. Next slide.

So those are the considerations, the question marks, we talked about one already which is the migration of existing contacts, the roll accounts being replaced with people and it's one of those things we're still designing-out.

Initially (Greg) lighted control by context how much granularity is needed, is it just a technical/non-technical split or is it on a per field basis and that (basically) worked out and if you have any thoughts on that, I'm happy to hear them this week.

Eventually we're trying to balance complexity against meeting most if not all of the needs. Another question that was posed, to (allow for this year) we have this idea of API-only accounts so maybe you want to give your technical service provider just API access and not access to login and perform actions and they have a very limited highly-specified interface that aren't going to let them do just the minimum required for their function.

We have to work-out with the GNSO about new country requirements and then protocols for adding any special processing or handling that we might have on file which is not typical at all for GTRBs. Next slide, please, so what are the next steps? Well, I'm here to obtain your feedback.

Our goal is as (an example) solely to capture additional requirements through (unintelligible) and so forth and really (rets) the over-action design phase so if we should want to do a large course correction, now's the time because as we get further down engineering and which way it's harder to back-out of the approach.

The next step (asberg) getting feedback during the ICANN meeting this week is to develop a detailed implementation paper that nearly spells-out the details of this at a level where you can critique it and provide fine feedback on the model and say well here's a gap of this narrative that's not covered and we'll share that with the community to sort of pour over and provide detailed feedback.

And then over the course of the next year we plan to implement this now next-generation system. That's our 2018 project and while feedback on the authorization model that I've given an overview on today is most critical, any

aspect of red zone management system that you might have feedback on whether it's the API I mentioned or other aspects that might improve the customer experience, all that kind of feedback is very welcome. Yes?

Man: A small clarification. I hope you meant November, not this month because it's only half a day left in this month.

Kim Davies: I didn't mean this calendar month, I meant in the next few weeks. Next slide and question?

Man: So a question because (unintelligible) of the group essentially you're running in a registry and a registrant together. Have you looked at the GDPR implications of your (offer)? Do you need any help to look at it from my experience?

Kim Davies: So we're part of the ICANN-wide initiative to review all that internal systems for GDPR compliance. I'll take your invitation but I care more broadly as I think you had in the previous session, you were looking at all these implications and we're part of them.

Cool, okay, thank you (Ken). No further questions? Great timing too because we started this session five minutes late. All right, everybody, we thank you very much for your time and we will get back to you. I should also note we have a tech-ops group within the stakeholder group.

It includes not just the people in the room but a lot of our more technically-oriented colleagues back home and we'll put this - share the slides with us - we will put this to them. They're the ones that can provide some I'm sure really insightful inputs. We'll get back to you with those suggestions.

For everybody else, we're going to head into our lunch break. Before we do however, we're going to do the group picture (which ought) to be somewhere.

Samantha Demetriou: Yes, nobody gets to eat until you pose for a picture so we're going to pose at this table and behind. He's going to, right here, so if we could fill-in the seats at the rest of this table and then everybody else stand behind this table and then he's going to take the photo from this direction and then ...

((Crosstalk))

Samantha Demetriou: ... yes, put your microphones down if you could, maybe laptop those that might look nicer, maybe water bottles off the table, I'm getting picky, I know, sorry, okay, and then before I get off the microphone, for lunch we asked you to RSVP for lunch so lunch was ordered based on the number of RSVPs.

If you are not on this RSVP list, we ask that you wait until the people that get RSVP get their lunch and then you may get what's left. That will take you to our CP.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Would the working lunch part of the session, this is (Stephen) by the way, do we need (Sue) do we need to (recruit), do we need this? It's on. Good, so first order of business is to turn to our GNSO counselors who have got their mouths full but that's the way it goes and ask them to give us an update on the council so on a key, (Reubens).

Donna Austin: Thanks, (Stephen), Donna Austin so I guess the exciting thing about this meeting is that we will have an election for new chairs. (James) is stepping-down he's term-limited. We only have one nominee and that's Heather Forrest so as long as none of the above gets out we should be okay. In terms of my sense I don't actually think we have any.

Man: I don't think so.

Donna Austin: No, we don't have any. One thing that is up for discussion is the community change process which (Craig) has been trying to push through this. Unfortunately this is it's a I guess (Craig) has beneficiary working diligently

with the GDD under the understanding that by developing the process that will go through public comment and then that would be the end of it but GDD got a little bit shaky about whether this was a policy issue or whether it was implementation so they asked (Craig) to bring it to the council and we've now had two discussions around it.

It's up for discussion again tomorrow and I think hopefully the path forward is that the council will support the notion that this is an implementation issue and it's not policy and the recommendation will be that it goes-out to public comment and then perhaps comes back through the council once that's finalized and then council will say that's tremendous and off you go.

So hopefully that's the path forward and I guess from a stakeholder perspective we need direction as to whether stakeholder group supports that. (Craig) did you have anything you wanted to add?

Okay, so I guess it's a question of whether we have direction from the stakeholder group to support the idea that this is an implementation issue and it should continue on the path that it's currently on.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Do we have any comments, questions, anything further from (Keith) or (Reubens)?

Man: On that topic?

Stéphane Van Gelder: On general council topics or that one?

Keith Drazek: Yes, thank you Stéphane, this is Keith Drazek for the record. Yes, I think, you know, the topic du jour is this SSR 2 review team and I think that the council will discuss that because as we discussed earlier in the session with the SSR 2 review team, the SOs and ATs have new responsibilities and I think with the announcement from the board yesterday in the public forum

that you know, they hit the pause button but the community has the opportunity and the requirement to hit the play button.

So I think that my suggestion that I'm looking for feedback here from the stakeholder group is that we tell the council that we have registries and that we would encourage others to actually go through a process of reviewing the current charter in terms of reference and scope for the SSR 2 review team to engage with anyone that we may have you know, appointed or others that we know in that group to inform ourselves about the current status.

Ultimately identify whether there are any areas of scope that are outside of the bylaws and to plan to come back to the council with our recommendations for next steps forward, whatever they may be. I think the council is going to have to make a decision at some point about the path forward and I think that we need to try to target that for the next council meeting because the longer this drags-out, the longer the SSR 2 review team is inactive, unable to advance its work.

If changes are necessary either in scope of composition, you know, that's going to take some time so I'm concerned that this is something that'll drag on indefinitely if we don't put some priority and some effort behind it so I just opened that up and asked if anybody has any further thoughts on that topic or, you know, guidance for the counselors?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Additional thing which might happen is the team is on hold for too long we might face depletion of member base and that given the current I say lack of additional candidates, it could be (dealt) into these spaces.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Maxim, I agree completely. There is a risk of, you know, already as I think the morale of this team - this review team - has been hit and you know, these are as (Denise) said earlier these are volunteers and if, you

know, if their capabilities or commitment are being impugned or, you know, whatever the case may be, it does stand to risk the group.

I should note my understanding is that review teams and this particular review team can have up to 21 members. In this case this review team only has 14 or 15 so there's an opportunity for us I think through the GNSO as a supporting organization to identify additional candidates with expertise in SSR-related issues.

And if we think that there's an opportunity to sort of jump-start or refocus this group in a positive way that we as the registries perhaps working with our registrars and contracted party house ought to identify candidates who we might suggest be added to the team.

Even if no one else comes-off the team, there's an opportunity there to appoint new blood so and I think that might be a - I think that will be - well-received by the current leadership and the current composition. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Keith. Any further questions? Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, it's Jonathan Robinson for the record. I hope this isn't repetitious Keith but I'm just trying to understand the sequence. I mean, I got it that the (ideally) for very good reasons articulated already would be good to have the council make a decision at the next meeting so what do we actually need to do apart from discussing like what's the tactical, you know, if you could just walk us through how that might work, I think that that would be very helpful.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jonathan. Great question and I'm not sure there's a clear answer because we're sort of you know, in a situation now that has no guidelines. Essentially the review team was - well, let me back-up one step - the review team members were appointed by the various SOs and ACs and in the GNSO we can speak to the fact that we have a standing selection committee that is responsible for coordinating the GNSOs recommended participants.

And you know, there's a certain process, a certain threshold, a number that the GNSO is guaranteed on a review team and then beyond that there is the possibility at once, you know, for geographic diversity, gender diversity, no expertise and all of that, there's a process where if I'm not mistaken it's the chairs of the SOs and ACs get together and sort of figure-out the proper composition.

So the GNSO would probably have to reinitiate or reengage the standing selection committee to you know, try to figure-out do we add new appointments? Do we need to change the composition in some way?

Is somebody going to resign that we have to replace so this will be a process but in terms of, you know, how, you know, how does the community hit the play button again, it's sort of unclear because hitting the pause button was never, you know, by the board was never envisioned.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Jonathan Robinson just for the follow-up if I may, (Stephen) and that's helpful and so clearly one practical point is us discussing it and understanding it and then it's obviously the as you say the one option is to inject further additional expertise and it's good to understand that that would be well-received.

I suppose the other issue is where does on try, in what forum is it likely that there's one's heard, you know, I've heard different things. I've heard that there weren't enough people at the meetings and the resource budget was going over and then this whole sort of (fed) but I'm just wondering where that sort of and I think you might have said it earlier that the council plans to do some due diligence on what's and sort of (unintelligible).

So somehow or another we have to find-out you know, in essence and try to understand it a little bit more before we decide on next steps I suppose or not. I mean, I'm just sort of grappling and clearly you don't have the answer,

I'm just throwing it out it to what the sequence and one other option is of course talking to the registrars and seeing what they intend what if anything they intend to do.

But you know, so if that's not an absolutely clear question but I'm sort of talking off the cuff a little bit as I try and think through it. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks, I'll just respond real quickly. Thank you, Jonathan. I think all good points and I think there, you know, let me backup one second so during the GNSO council session with the ICANN board two days ago, this topic was brought to the attention of the council.

Many on the council were surprised by this development. There had been like the day before a couple of days before some, you know, sort of impromptu meeting of the board's effectiveness committee and senior staff and some board members with SO AC leaders to say hey, we're planning to pause this review team, any objections? It sort of like came-out of nowhere.

The only SO or AC that raised any concerns about this review team was (assak) and that was in a letter I think that was, you know, probably several weeks old now and so this was the first that we had heard as a community that the board was intending to do this, literally on Friday this week.

So I think we're, sorry, sorry for the whistle, I think we're in uncharted territory here and so in the session with the board, we heard (Steve Cocker) say frankly refer to some sort of an incident that took place in Johannesburg. This is all in the transcript so, I mean, I'm just repeating, you know, repeating what was told to us.

That there was some incident that took place in Johannesburg between a member of the review team leadership and somebody else, I guess it was an ICANN staffer that essentially was unpleasant at a minimum and caused the

staffer to, you know, feel like she was being attacked who then went to (Yuron) and reported the incident and this sort of blew-up.

(Steve) basically referred to this and said you know, in any normal organization or private company this would have been handled within, you know, weeks or days or something like that, I'm paraphrasing and then (Renalia) who is the chair of the effectiveness committee instead focused on this issue of scope.

So there are things at play here that are not necessarily I think being discussed openly or talked about at least not in formal sessions. I think there's some rumor and innuendo and I'm not entirely sure what the facts are and I'm not sure any of us do.

So I think to your point yes, we probably need to get to the bottom of what's going-on here but procedurally this is uncharted territory and the board has effectively taken a position in terms of pausing this group that I think has a lot of people concerned about precedent in terms of have they overstepped their bounds in the new accountability mechanisms and you know, are they operating within the bylaws?

So I think there's a lot of further discussion that needs to take place to your point. Thanks, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Keith. No, I'm done and so I'll put myself in the queue.

Donna Austin: Thanks, (Stephen). The council also had a conversation with the GNSO council yesterday with you know, and we had a regular lunch meeting with them and, you know, the temperature from this meeting is always they seem to think that there is an issue when it was probably the right thing to just pause it.

We can probably also assume that (unintelligible) so the other challenge we will have is the board has pushed the pause button, what's it take to get it moving again so do we need all the SOs and ACs aligned so that's another challenge that we're going to have so I guess it's unfortunate the way this has played-out and then it hasn't been open and transparent.

There's a lot of scuttlebutt around it so I guess to the extent that we can get to the bottom of it and provide a path forward but hopefully we can get the other SOs and ACs to come along with us, that would be, you know, the objective but you know, we did the concern that this has already been it's taken too long already.

I suspect it's going to sit us back another two months at a minimum unless we can all come together and just say, you know, continue on but I don't think that's going to happen this week.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, (Donna). I think (Sam) has a follow-up.

(Sam): Thanks, (Stephen), thanks, (Donna). I'm just curious to know is there a blueprint for SO and AC leadership to issue some kind of joint statement or like do we know what the process here looks like at all?

Man: Yes, so thanks (Sam) so yes, I think (Donna) was saying I talked to Kristina and Keith about that referring back to the London meeting in 2012 where we came together as a GNSO and largely as a community to make some points that were effective eventually. I don't think there is a structure or a process outline.

As I said we have been pushed into uncharted territory here and I think we're going to have to figure this out as we go. There are regular SO AC leadership calls with ICANN senior staff and maybe that's an opportunity to you know, sort of kick-off the conversation or carry-on the conversation but I think we're going to have to try to figure this one out.

Which is one of the reasons I'm asking for guidance or any input on that because as you know, as your counselors go to the council meeting tomorrow and this is discussed and we talk about, you know, what are we going to do and how are we going to try to resolve this, what markers do we want to put down and how do we want to engage with other parts of the community you know, this is something that we don't feel like we can necessarily just do on a blind. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, (Steve) so before moving-on to I have a different matter that I want to ask you about but perhaps to answer the call that you just put out, is there anyone that wants to provide, Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon registry. I agree Keith that it is important that the council try and come together and perhaps put together even a straw man document or proposal or motion that could then be coordinated with the other SOs and ACs.

It does sound I wasn't aware of any of these other issues but it does sound as if there will have to be an intentional effort to separate those out and perhaps deal with them separately.

It may be the case without knowing anything about them that the review team would need to have some structural changes in terms of its current composition to just try and put everything behind the team so that they can move forward.

But I do agree that it's important that the GNSO at least try to take a leadership role here in putting something together that the other SOs and ACs can get behind.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes, observer here. I don't know the details, it sounds like none of us do, I don't know but a thought that's crossing my mind that you might want to consider as you're moving forward is because of the important role of the SOs and ACs, would it be better for any one of those an AC or an SO to raise issues like that among the SOs and ACs instead of going straight to the board?

The board was probably put in an awkward position there but it seems to me because of the important role in the empowered community of SOs and ACs that going forward it would be wise for any SO or AC if they have a concern to work it first through the SOs and ACs before taking it to the board. Just an idea.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you. Any further comments on this one? I hope that's sufficient for you guys so I have three questions, the first one I'm going to try and be as diplomatic as I can be and that's not my forté obviously but there is everyone in this room is probably aware of the CNSO non-comm spat when I wanted to ask you guys if there's any potential problems with non-comm appointees at GNSO levels that you want to talk to us about?

Samantha Demetriou: I heard a whisper yesterday that there may be but I don't know the detail but it is possible that there will be some concern.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Just for clarity's sake, and for those that don't know what's happening, the CCNSO basically flatly refused a NOMCOM nomination which should never -- I don't think -- happen before and there's no process for that to happen. And it's basically an SO or an AC cannot refuse a NOMCOM appointee. But because of the way they handled this, the appointee herself resigned or didn't take up the position.

So that has led to a difficult situation which I thought it, you know, was important everyone here is aware of it. And whispers - or the rumors are that there may be a similar situation with the GNSO. So I just wanted to make

sure everyone was aware of that. It may be worth attending the GNSO council meeting tomorrow if you weren't planning to just to understand that situation a bit better. Because I think it's a key - obviously, you know, the NOMCOM and the way NOMCOM appointments are structured, it's a key issue for the way that's going to work going forward. So something that Jon may have to deal with this year, but it's obviously early days for him to tackle it now because this is the last year issue. But, you know, something we should be aware of. Maxim did I see your hand?

Maxim Alzoba: I just wanted to clarify why do you expect the same level of issues on GNSO scale, because the TCLD, they have their ways on approaching via GAC, via - you know, they - somehow represent on parts of governments sometimes. And I don't see the same in GNSO. So why do you think we can have the same kind of issues?

Stéphane Van Gelder: That's all the information we have so far, but good question, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: Oh, Reubens.

Reubens Kuhl: Rubens. (Unintelligible) losing that one cooperating GNSO, it will still be a different situation because (unintelligible) GNSO there was an appointment if it was for the (unintelligible) he or she would take office. But CCNSO is opposed. In the GNSO case, the questions that the (unintelligible) was supposed to get retired from a government job and then government changed its mind and said, "Oh, not yet." So it was not something that was about the GNSO, either any SOs or ACs not wanting that appointee. That condition changed and that person might have to resign his appointment or not. We don't know that yet. But it could still be a different situation, even if NONCOM has to wait again and then find a new councilor for the (unintelligible) for the contractor (unintelligible) to - going to be seated as far as we know.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. Okay. So another question I had -- which is slightly self-serving, I suppose -- but just do you know on the ATLT3 what's supposed to happen next when the GNSO's come to - has made the selection? That's presumably been forwarded to somebody.

Samantha Demetriou: Maxim? The CSSA finalized the ATLT3 place.

Maxim Alzoba: As I understand, the recent developments - the next scene expected from the section committee is review of its charter, basically to allow interviews of those persons to better identify if they fit or not. Because (unintelligible) it's not. And if you allow me for two minutes I will open notebook and will say the answer.

Samantha Demetriou: I'm sorry, my memory (unintelligible) me, but I think you're one of the appointments in (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Maxim Alzoba: In hard book I'm (unintelligible) I'm finished.

Samantha Demetriou: Okay. So I think the process going forward is that those nominations will go forward to the SOAC leaders and they're responsible for the finalization of this plate.

Maxim Alzoba: Basically the last (unintelligible) we did was SRT2 with a (unintelligible), as I understand. And all things we haven't done yet in committee - actually, the only thing left is - yes, the shorter SR - yes three state it's not in work at the moment. Or either. Let me see.

Samantha Demetriou: Yes, okay. I just need to follow up with - I can't remember where the council has approved that site yet or not. It might be on the concern agenda for this one, so I'll just have to check. Sorry Stéphane Van Gelder.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you very much guys. Any further questions for our councilors? (Kristina)?

Kristina Rosette: I'm going to go back to the NOMCOM issue and then I do have a separate question. If it is in the fact - if it is in fact a case that the - there would be a government employee or contractor or whatever you want to call it as a NOMCOM appointee, it's not the second time that's happened. I mean, this is the second time that's happened. I don't know that there's a way to deal with it other than perhaps amending the bylaws. But I think it would be worth taking a look at it. You know, obviously I think it's worth taking a look and saying does the GNSO want the NOMCOM to be appointing government employees, GAC representatives, etcetera to the GNSO council? You know, I think that's important question for the GNSO to decide.

To the extent that it's possible to address it without having to amend the bylaws. I think that would be preferable. But it seems likely to me that it will continue to happen unless there's something - you know, if people believe that there is - this is a concern and it's not a situation that we would like, then it seems the best thing to do is to actually do something about it.

And then the question that I have for the councilors is has there - does the GNSO council intend to have any discussion tomorrow about the board member background investigation issue that was raised in the public forum yesterday?

Samantha Demetriou: I missed it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks (Kristina), a good question. As far as I know there's no - there's nothing on the agenda specific to it because the agenda was set prior to that intervention. I wouldn't be surprised if it comes up in AOB. So if there's something that we want to talk about here related to that, by all means. I think - and maybe I can just set this up for those who were not in the public forum yesterday. There was an intervention at the microphone concerning

what is a - I guess it was termed a double standard as it relates to the background checks that board members go through. If you come through the NOMCOM process you are subject to background checks. If you are appointed by the SOs, specifically the GNSO and the CCSO, you are not.

And so this was raised as a possible question - or, you know, a double standard or, you know, essentially the intervention said we should have the - all board members go through background checks. And the recommendation was that even before the new board is seated this week that those board members who have not been subject to a background check go through a background check. And so I think, you know, (Steve Crocker) essentially said, "Look, you know, the board cannot be telling SOs or ACs, you know, that we won't seat your board member until it goes through a background check, because that hasn't been provided for." So I think he pushed back on the timing question.

But there was I think a general acceptance or recognition that all board members should be treated equally in this regard. So I think that's the context. If anybody heard it differently, feel free to jump in. But let's kick it around a little bit in case this does come up in AOB.

Kristina Rosette: Well, for what its worth I do think the board members be similarly situated from that perspective. So I would recommend having the GNSO appointed - obviously at a minimum the CPH nominated board member. And obviously you would hope that that would be something that the other house could agree on as well.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Just to address the point you made about the NOMCOM, the - you are right, that it's either a bylaw change or there's nothing wrong. I mean, it's pretty actually black and white. I - or the SOs and ACs that the NOMCOM recruits to tend to send in skill sets or requests for certain profiles of applicants that they'd like to see. And that is nothing compulsory. The

NOMCOM is free to ignore it if it wants to. It makes its determinations the way it wants to according to the bylaws.

So if -- for example -- there's a bylaw stipulation that the NOMCOM cannot exceed the geographic zone limit for a board member. So it's minimum one, maximum five. So we can't - the NOMCOM -- I shouldn't say we anymore -- but the NOMCOM can't select someone that's in the same geo region as existing board members if there's already five of them. But to the matter at hand, that's no written rule yet. So the GNSO cannot refuse a NOMCOM nomination. And once the NOMCOM's made it, it can't take it back. So there is a problem. If there is a problem.

Kristina Rosette: Well, absolutely. My broader point was, you know, I'm not - I'm not giving any opinion one way or another as to whether or not government employees or contractors should be seated by the NOMCOM on the GNSO council. But my point is rather either this is something the GNSO cares about -- in which case they should take it up -- or they don't, in which case let it lie.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Sure. So thanks for that exchange. And I agree. I think though short of changing the bylaws, it'll be very, very difficult to make any sort of such sort of restriction. And I think that's what you're saying, (Stephen). I want to call out the situation with the CCNSO -- as I understand it -- in this particular instance was several years ago the CCNSO gave advice to the NOMCOM, essentially. I'm not sure exactly how that happened, but they put down a marker that said we don't want NOMCOM appointees from the same organization where we already have a councilor. And in this sense it was...

Stéphane Van Gelder: That's not correct.

Man: I'm sorry?

Stéphane Van Gelder: That's not correct. That's not specifically correct. Do you want me to...?

Man: Yes, by all means. Yes,

Stéphane Van Gelder: It's - to be specific, the - what the CCNSO - the NOMCOM -- at least at the start of every NOMCOM cycle -- the NOMCOM requests from the SOs and ACs and the board skill sets. That was apparently mishandled this year. So we - the NOMCOM did not request officially from the CCNSO and the CCNSO has stopped providing new advice since 2012, but the advice they previously gave was that they didn't want people that were linked with a CCLD. It wasn't a case of - it wasn't even as specific as having the same employer. They just didn't - they would want someone that was outside of that environment to bring -- I suppose -- a fresh outlook.

Man: Thanks Stéphane. And maybe - thank you for the clarification. I think, though at the end of the day we're saying the same thing in that in this instance one of the NOMCOM appointees was from a CCTLD operator that already had a councilor on the board. Or I'm sorry, on the council. So it was the double dipping concern at the CCNSO level that was the reason that they pushed back on this particular candidate. The only reason I raised this is that short of a bylaw change, you know, putting out a marker, giving previous advice about your preferences isn't necessarily going to hold water.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, thank you very much. Maxim, Jonathan, and Jon. And Chuck. And (unintelligible)...

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. About the progress of (unintelligible) installation committee, the information about the recommendations were sent about ATLT3 days - something like -- around ninth of September or eighth of September -- about (unintelligible) it was sent recently. And, yes, currently it's only the future charter improvement of the selection committee which

would allow - yes, interviews if we have time to best understand how information provide relates towards in reality. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Maxim. Jonathan, you're next.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I want to speak to the background checks and validation to the extent that it's a possible axiom on GNSO AOB and/or for this group, frankly. As you might have heard, I spoke in the public forum on this and I was a community appointed member - board member to the IANA - to the ICANN subsidiary or, you know, affiliate PTI and I was subjected to -- I guess on the instructions of ICANN legal or ICANN Org -- full, thorough, comprehensive background checks. And I saw it as a reasonable request and simply acceded to it. And I'm - so this is kind of a bit of a surprise to me in many ways that -- A -- it doesn't happen and -- B -- to the extent that it hasn't happened that - you know, I thought (Maron's) suggestion yesterday was very pragmatic. If the board members simply subject themselves to a voluntary similar check.

I mean, I understand that the way it's worked in NOMCOM is that the NOMCOMs put their board appointees through the check -- I think that's what I understand -- and then they go on to the board. And so the board's kind of saying, "Well, it's up to the appointing organization." And, you know, that may be a decent way to do it in the future when GNSO and CCNSO. But to the extent that we have a current sort of urgent problem that's been manifest or surfaced and in particular is probably more acute in the post transition environment where the whole organization's subject to higher levels of scrutiny and should show, you know, absolute excellence in corporate governance, I find it really hard to understand why we don't simply -- A -- take that voluntary approach which is a patchwork solution for the moment, especially with respect to voting board members, as was argued yesterday. And then the GNSO and CCNSO and other appointing organizations can take their own approach as they see fit, if that is the case.

I mean, my personal opinion from a sort of board governance point of view is I would have thought - I mean, the way the board typically says is once you cross the threshold into the board, you know, you're subject to the fiduciary duties of a director of that organization. So to me -- if this was my board -- I would be saying, "I'd like to see all my director's subject to this." So I don't quite get why it's being pushed back to the SOs. And I think it's - as a - it's polite, it's respectful to say, you know, we'd like to hear that from them, but frankly from a sort of more generic corporate governance point of view, I would have thought that it was a board matter anyway. You want your board directors to be subject to the highest levels of - high standards and across the piece. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jonathan. On the NOMCOM process, the NOMCOM makes a selection and then submits it to ICANN legal, who then carries out due diligence. And before that was then forwarded by the - once the candidate had been approved it would be forwarded directly by the NOMCOM to the board. Now it's forwarded to the empowered community.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, just a brief response to that. So to that extent, it's kind of a fudge to say it's a NOMCOM process, because again, it's ICANN Org, it's legal, it's the board making it, so I'm not quite sure why the waters are being muddied in this way. It's really seems strange. Because -- as I said -- in - from my personal experience of corporate governance, this is a matter for the board. Make sure your directors are fully scrutinized and checked before you appoint them, and if there's a retrospective to be done, do it as a matter of urgency. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I have Jon next.

Jon Nevett: Thanks. Yes, I agree with Jonathan on that. I kind of recall the - we had an election process for (Becky) that there was some background checks. Maybe it wasn't the same level of scrutiny, maybe it's not - (unintelligible) shaking his head. We should check on that. But regardless, we should make sure we do

that in the future. We all went through background checks. Anyone who went through the new TTLTD program. I was checked (unintelligible) times. You know, I still passed it. But you know what? Can we have the board do that? So that makes sense to me.

On the NOMCOM process, the process for this year might be a little bit different in timing of the background check. They might do it earlier in order not to have a delay later in getting the name announced. And then I think we should also reach out to the SOs and ACs and say what are your criteria and - so to the extent the GNSO has that, while it might not be mandatory I'm sure it'll be taken very highly, you know, into account. So I'd recommend the councilors work on that. If there's something - and then for us as a contractor party house, that's something we want to talk about. What are the criteria we would want in a NOMCOM appointee for us, whether it's this year or next year or in the future. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And this is Chuck speaking and Jon, I totally agree with you, the GNSO should take this up. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the GNSO in its process for selecting that board seat that we're involved with -- of the two board seats -- there's nothing to prevent the GNSO from building their (unintelligible) to the process. And I would just suggest -- and I - speaking to the choir here, I'm sure we all realize this -- that it's built in the process not after the decision is made but any potential candidate that that happened beforehand so you'd avoid a situation where you appoint somebody and then you have to pull them back because you did a background check later.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. Anyone else? Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: So two quick things. One in response to Chuck. I mean, I had a kind of corridor conversation with Alan Greenburg and I think I understood him say that's what the ALAC did do. I can't be sure, but I think they get a final short

list and they do that. Now again, I would say we should synchronize that. I think it's quite an expensive and complicated process, so we need to make sure that it is down to the final short list. Perhaps the final couple of candidates or whatever the case as we had in our case.

And second I suppose practically for (Keith), what are we saying to (Keith)? I think we're saying to (Keith) -- A -- you have our motivation to raise it and -- B -- to say that the registry stakeholder group would support both this as a process for the GNSO and potentially the voluntary thing right now to get things tidied up right away. I don't know if it is those three, but that's what it feels like to me. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. So we should probably move on. Any other questions for our councilors? Okay, thank you very much. So we'll move on to the working group updates. And Karen has kindly volunteered to stand in for (Jeff) on this sub-pro PDP.

Karen Day: Thanks (Stephen). This is Karen Day for the record. Subsequent procedures will conclude our Abu Dhabi activities tomorrow morning with the first meeting of the newly formed work track five. Which is specifically focusing on geographic names. So just wanted to make everybody aware that that session starts at 8:30 tomorrow morning and please encourage everyone that can to come and participate. As you know, that's a new model that we've set up. We'll need lots of participants from the GAC, the CCNSO, the ALAC, and other organizations. So please come and (unintelligible) for the GNSO. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. Any comments, questions, discussions? Okay, Christine on the RPM PDP.

Christine Dorrain: Thanks. (Unintelligible) this is Christine Dorrain. The Right Patrician Mechanisms PDP has - well has had four meetings this week. We had two sessions on Saturday, one one day and we will have our final meeting on

Thursday. The sessions on Saturday were essentially one long session, just broken up into two pieces. The first one was just sort of an update on where staff was at on the data collection. I know I've updated the group before. The first - we're working on putting together a list of questions to send to a survey provider to put out for an RFP for a survey provider to find out more information about what worked and what didn't work for Sunrise, what didn't work and what worked for claims, and then generally try to do some data gathering and how the GNCH process worked all together.

It's designed to be a pretty - I think it's supposed to be a pretty big survey. We want to survey registries, registrars, registrants, potential registrants, which is kind of tricky. We want to get information from land owners, people who participated in the claims process. So it's going to be a pretty big data collection efforts. So there's a group of people right now who are currently trying to decide what that survey should look like and what the sort of criteria are for the bid provider. In parallel with that, we have decided that some of the questions are things that we can - answers we can get from staff or other research. So Berry Cobb with staff has been doing a lot of research on URS and UDOP data, other sorts of information that ICANN has available. So we are trying to pull some of that data from ICANN's archives in order to save time and money. Because it's a possibility that this survey could just get, you know, completely out of line, both in time and in cost. That's ongoing.

So work is not done yet but we hope to finalize that in the next couple of weeks. It's a pretty small working group putting together some of those questions to be sent to the survey provider. We're not going to pretend that we're survey experts, so we're really just trying to, you know iron them out so there's no ambiguities in the questions. And we hope to have those available in a couple of weeks, probably accounting for the travel time, you know, back. So we're going to get - lost a little bit of time with that.

The second thing that we did on Saturday was we reviewed the URS as a process. So staff reviewed that with the community. Just to remind

everybody what the URS was about, our session on Thursday will focus on - and (unintelligible) that's Thursday at 13:30 Capital Suite 1. We will focus on the URS and we will start to look at how we're going to split that up or how we're going to, you know, start to attract URS. And figure out how we're going to do some review there.

The last thing that we did was we did -- and I think many of you were here -- that we actually sat down with the CCTRT on Monday and reviewed their findings and their recommendations to try to see if there was anything that came out of their work that should dovetail with what we're doing for the RPMs. So for instance, one of the recommendations of the CCTRT was to do a review of the cost benefit analysis of the trademark clearing house, which is a very, very vague recommendation because as I just mentioned there's at least the three components of the database itself, claims and (unintelligible).

So we don't really have a lot of guidance and so we have to try to figure out what that means without, you know, sort of punting I guess to other groups. So those are some of the things that we have going on right now. Really not - it's - if I had to describe it I'd say there's a little bit of a (unintelligible) in the work because some people are working in data collection sets, some people are ramping up for URS, staff is doing a bunch of data review, and now we have to think about how we can integrate with the CCTRT. So I'm anticipating that our next meeting on the phone -- our next not in person meeting -- will be highly organizational.

So if anybody is interested in the URS as a topic, I know it's the one RPM (unintelligible) registry operators and cell sector lock for domain name and they have to take the action and suspend the domain names. So if there's interest in this registry operators group, this is - now is the time to get involved. Because this is the stuff that kind of matters, you know, and that has - that we have to deal with from an implementation standpoint. Happy to take any questions. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Many thanks, Christine. Any questions or comments? Martin, I know you have a follow you want on the previous matter of subsequent procedures and then I'd like to turn to you guys for an Amsterdam RIL update if possible and then we'll go to David. Just so everyone's clear. Marin?

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Martin Sutton. For the work track five that's just been formed, I just wanted to update everybody on a meeting that's scheduled for 8:30 tomorrow. The room's changed, so just to bear that in mind to come along and join in with the - what really will be a discussion over terms of reference but more so a discussion on how the work track will follow the GNSO working group procedures to give assurance to all of the other communities that are co-leading that group that there are opportunities for input and that any output through recommendations towards the PDP working group and the -- and anything resulting after that -- has lots of opportunities for each of those communities to comment back on any of the items that do end up as recommendations from that work track.

I am pleased to say that the sign up to membership of that group is looking good. As I've just looked at it now, 64 members, a number of other observers listed here. Plenty from the GNSO and all the different parties of the GNSO. And so if you can fit it into your schedule tomorrow, I would really encourage you to come along and help those discussion formulate the terms of reference for the group. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you, Martin. Any feedback? Okay. We - this wasn't in the original plan, but we wanted to give (Sebastian) a chance to just mention what's going on with the Amsterdam FRL situation.

Sebastien Ducos: So this is Sebastien Ducos, geoTLD group. I'm sitting here with (Henry), who's actually got FRL but has asked me maybe to give the - a short brief on what happened in the last few months. So just for background, 18 months ago that FRL came to us -- the GLTLD group -- at - in Morocco explaining this

problem that they had with Dutch law, which is essentially the Dutch law is applying today what we are expecting for GDPR in May next year. And so they are not only in breach of GDPR as we all are today but they are in the situation of being fined (unintelligible) breach.

They implemented a solution 9, 10 months ago in terms of FRL. Amsterdam did the same thing about three, four months ago. A solution that is based on the current solution used by the Dutch CCTLD FIDN, which basically consists in hiding private data in Who Is. So contact details are hidden, deemed private unless proven public. So there's an opt-in system for basically registrants and admin data. Just by tradition in Holland the tech data has always been the registrar and as the registrar has been considered as being public information its company information or personal information.

This clearly is in breach of compliance with ICANN. So they were in discussions with ICANN before implementing their model for a better part of a year. Got - (unintelligible) forward ICANN kept on saying if you're in breach of law in your country, please bring us some documentation saying that you're in breach of law. And obviously there was a chicken and egg problem here. If you go and ask a cop after speeding have I sped, he will give you a fine. It's the same thing. And so they didn't want to push it too much with the GPA, even though the GPA was aware of the situation and just said, "Don't talk to me too much about this and I won't fine you."

In September -- end of September -- there was a final compliance notice -- which I mentioned earlier when compliance was here -- that referred to a - the need of an ISAP. I've tried to obtain that information from Jamie, but the answer wasn't very clear. The FRL advisors asked at some point to ICANN if an ISAP was a way to go and decided themselves -- given the ICANN response -- that it wasn't the way to go. I'm not quite sure how that came into the circle, but now when ICANN is being asked about it, indeed there is some kind of an ASAP requirement and they're saying in terms of compliance that there were not - compliance is not about the fact that you've - you're in

breach of your Who Is requirements. Compliance is here in terms of ISAP we've asked you to go through a number of steps and you're not moving forward. So that's what it's - I was trying to understand. And this is a bit of lack of clarity in that particular process.

In any case, following the compliance notice, the letter that we send, the noise that was made in this room, they backed off and understand that now indeed we need to talk about this. They haven't completely backed off; they haven't removed the compliance, but there's no longer that deadline that there was. FRL answered and answered - I think Maxim suggested that something that's roughly inspired in that saying, "Are you really asking me to break Dutch law? What you're asking me by returning in the fault of the ICANN agreement is to break Dutch law. Is this indeed what you're asking me to do?" They haven't had any answers yet.

Now, in the meantime in an interesting and very timely development that was not forced but encouraged by FRL, the DPA -- the Dutch DPA -- issued last week, 10 days ago a notice that clearly states that the solution that has been implemented by (unintelligible), by FLR, and by Amsterdam have since -- or sorry, a few months ago -- is indeed with compliance with Dutch law with the GDTR. It doesn't say specifically how it is, but it's saying whatever they're doing, they're doing it right.

We have that statement in Dutch, which is a great language. I'm happy to go through it with you if you want. We - I understand that there is a version of this in English, but it's not an official version of English - in English. FRL didn't feel it proper to translate it themselves and then thought interpreting interpreting. But I understand that the board has seen a version in English translated for (unintelligible) by one of the Dutch board members. SIDM has offered to supply an English version by a proper translator. I don't know exactly when that's going to fall. And that's basically where we're at right now.

Man: Maybe a short - the letter also says it's - what European Union asked in May next year. So the judge DPA says this is how we do it. It's good for the European Union law next year in May.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks to you both.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Right, can I call for any questions or comments? Okay, thank you very much. I'll turn to David. You wanted to give an update.

END