

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO – RySG Membership Meeting
Tuesday 23 October 2018 at 1515 CEST**

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

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

Paul Diaz: Okay. Kristina, are you ready?

Okay. Folks, so we're going to have to get started because we have a hard stop at 4:45. They're going to kick us out.

So with that, thank you for deferring, Kristina and team. But this is such an importance, so we'll leave it with you and give you the time you need. Please, take it away.

Kristina Rosette: Excellent. So I'm sure that you're all surprised to learn that the fun and excitement has continued in the EPDP Working Group. What I'm going to do, and Alan and Marc should feel free to jump in at any point, is provide an update as to where we are in particular based on some of the activity over the weekend. We're going to identify some particular issues for which we need Registries Stakeholder Group input, identify some additional asks that we anticipate having over the next few weeks and then take any questions.

So what Sue is showing right now on the screen is the Purpose A worksheet. And I should note that what we've done is we've identified all -we've identified several purposes for which ICANN processes data. And for each of them - and I should say that we started from the temp spec and identified I believe it's Section 4.4 that sets out all of the various purposes. And we started from

there and try to identify which things we thought were purposes, which weren't, which could be consolidated.

And so for each - and we talked about this. This is presented during yesterday's session if you attended it. For each, we've been completing these data worksheets that set out what the purpose is, what the rationale is, is the purpose consistent with ICANN's bylaws, what the actual data processing activities are, who the actors are, what data elements are collected and the like. And of course, are there any (unintelligible) considerations.

So what we did on Saturday during the first five of our ten hours was to go through this Purpose A. And I guess, Sue, if you could scroll back up to the top because it's that purpose line which is really key. And this - the purpose - the discussion that's set out here was based on what was in 4.4.1 of the temp spec. And we think it's one of the kind of core purposes. So we spent a lot of time on this. It was - it's somewhat contentious. And we also want to get some particular input on the language that's struck.

So what we did here was the original temp spec language was something along the lines of reflect the rights of the registered name holder and its ability to maintain those rights.

So what we did was refine it to clarify exactly what we thought was meant or what we thought should be meant by reflected to change that to establish. We pulled in from the registrant response benefits and responsibilities doc the references to the registry and registrar terms, conditions and policies and ICANN policies and to also indicate that it's not only to show that the registrant - registered name holder is - has the rights that are forwarded to it on registration agreement but to also enable the allocation activation of the name.

One of the issues that came up was that we had originally proposed -- we meaning the contracted parties -- had originally proposed language that you see with a strikethrough that would indicate - would require that the registered name - well, that would allow the registered name holders be identifiable to the registrar and registry and if applicable ICANN.

The NCSG has extremely strong feelings about this. And we were intending this language to cover situation in which for whatever reason, whether it was because of a registry term, condition, policy, registrar term, condition or policy, that it was necessary for that relevant contracted party to have enough - to have information about the registered name holder that would make it identifiable in terms of not necessarily its actual identity but making it capable of being identified particularly, for example, in the case of any kind of eligibility requirement or other condition.

As I said, the NCSG really doesn't like this language. They suggested compactable which is not really the correct synonym. We've kind of batted around a couple other synonyms and didn't really come up with anything.

So I think one objective that we need to have is that we need to report back to the working group by tomorrow whether this language - whether we agree to the proposed strikeout or if not, if we can come up with alternative word for "identifiable."

And, Marc and Alan, you guys should just jump in at any point.

Marc Anderson: Thanks. Marc Anderson. I'll go first here.

Thanks, Kristina, for the summary. I think, you know, as she said, you know, there's concern from the NCSG and, you know, identifiable to them sort of triggers concerns about surveillance where they're used. They had concerns there.

You know, quick conference between, you know, the three of us, as well as our registrar colleagues, we felt that probably the fact that all of this is subject to registry and registrar terms, conditions and policies meant that this language was probably okay but, you know, we felt this is - was important enough issue that we want to take it back to the stakeholder group and make sure there weren't scenarios that we - you know, there weren't scenarios out there that we weren't considering and make sure we had support of the full stakeholder group for this language. So I think that's basically where we are.

Alan Woods: Alan Woods for the record.

I'm not actually going to add anything very much. I think that was I was going to say, Marc. But I would also say as well that this is one of the basic purposes and it was - it came from a place where it was aimed specifically only at the registrar name holder and was framed in a way that would have prevented it very difficult for us to justify the use of data for AEP, the enforcements of AEP at a registry level.

So it was - I mean, this was - this took a long time because we needed to make sure that we were marking a very specific purpose for us to be able to use the data out of registry level if necessary and limited to the enforcement of our AEP where we deem necessary. So I just want to add that and that, you know, it was an important thing for us because this is really the bread and butter of the domain name registration and we just want to make sure that we covered all bases.

Paul Diaz: Let me ask just for clarity for folks. So the recommendation from you three is that with the existing language at the very top, we can keep, we would not strike through or we will strike through?

Elizabeth Bacon: We tried to work through the scenarios to identify any that would not be covered by - subject to registry terms, conditions and policies and ICANN consensus policies and we couldn't come up with any. But because it was

just the three of us, we wanted to make sure that we came back to the full stakeholder group to see if there is any scenario in which a registry operator would believe that it would need to have the registered name holder identifiable to it that wouldn't otherwise already be covered by whatever kind of policies or terms and conditions flowed through the registration agreement.

Paul Diaz: Liz?

Liz Behsudi: Off the top of my head, I don't know that it's necessarily a registry issue. It might be more of a registrar issue but what about subpoenas, you know, law enforcement comes to us and says, you know, "We need to know," you know, "who the registrant is for this domain name," that's not necessarily covered in our terms, conditions, policies other than the fact that we, you know, we're subject to the laws of the jurisdiction we reside in but...

Elizabeth Bacon: Hey, Liz, this is Beth again. I was in the room when these guys were drafting and they were just hammering really hard. So thank you guys for doing the drafting on the fly with the group for three hours. And I had this thought as well but it is, in my view, covered under our privacy policy and right now we're just having a little PIR chat with the whole room. But yes, it's - we do cover disclosures to law enforcement and other bodies in our privacy policy. So I would think that that's included here in this language in my view.

Alan Woods: And just to add what - to what Beth had said there, it's Alan Woods, sorry, for the record, of course, we don't need to have a purpose, per se, for the disclosure to law enforcement because that's covered under a separate legal basis on purpose. On purpose, I said it again. But it's covered under a separate legal basis, so we don't actually need to worry about a purpose for that one specifically.

Marc Anderson: This is Marc Anderson again for the record. I'll just - you know, I think our task has been to bring this back to the EPDP group for tomorrow's meeting. So I realized this is, you know, you may not be able to definitively answer

right now. So maybe I'll say by tomorrow morning if there are any concerns with Kristina, Alan and I accepting this language with the strikethrough, please get back to us by tomorrow morning. Otherwise, I think this is the language that'll be going into the temporary specification - or the interim report.

Kristina Rosette: And just to follow on by that, I think actually he just put it on the registry list and provided a one or two sense rationale because if we are going to keep it, we're going to need to have to provide a really good explanation for it. And then it - I'm sure there's a good one that we haven't thought of but it's going to make our job a lot easier if you go ahead and do that for us.

And I guess then moving on, and I should say that for those of you who haven't seen it yet, I did send these both A and B to the registry mailing list so that you should have copies of them.

Sue, do you want to bring up B? And, Alan or Marc, if you want to (unintelligible).

Alan Woods: Take a breath. So Purpose Number B or Letter B, shall we say, because I have to refuse to call it a purpose, unfortunately, so B is a bit contentious in the sense of this is the one (unintelligible). Thank you. So you can see there on Purpose B, maintaining the securities supposing resiliency of the domain name system in accordance of ICANN's mission to the enabling of lawful access for legitimate third party interest to data elements collected for other purposes identified herein.

This is, by far, one of the purposes, with a small "P," slash-objective has been - it is a stumbling block because we can't get past it and we do need to get past it.

So as a purpose, the suggestion of this is that we - that ICANN's purpose is to collect data to disclose that data. And that is not a purpose. That is a disclosure.

Now, the other aspect that, you know, we have relentlessly brought up is the fact that we, as, you know, a company or as a - as a company, we would be obliged under the GDPR's Article 6(1)(f) to disclose data where there are legitimate purposes of third parties. It does not need to be a purpose of ICANN in order to be released. And it is a legal process between ourselves.

Liz?

Liz Behsudi: Liz Behsudi for the record. Alan and others, is there any consensus or common understanding of security stability and resiliency? What those terms mean?

Marc Anderson: So that was subject to some - sorry, Marc Anderson for the transcript. That was subject to some discussion during our Saturday meeting. And, you know, I'd say probably not but sort of - certainly, our position and the SSAC's position is that SSR -- stability, security, resiliency -- should be limited to the very narrow and specific technical definition of that and should not be expanded to include, you know, any number of laundry list concerns.

Common understanding, though, my guess is no. We certainly discussed it in its narrow technical remit but people are certainly free to interpret that however they want.

Kristina Rosette: And, Liz, this is kind of an indirect answer to your question but the one thing that was made clear during our discussion on Saturday, because this is what we spent our other five hours on, is that it doesn't encompass intellectual property violations. It was very clearly stated the IPC and BC folks weren't happy with it. But it pretty much was a consensus position.

Liz Behsudi: Can I ask security researchers?

Kristina Rosette: Yes.

Liz Behsudi: Would security researchers fall within that?

Kristina Rosette: Not necessarily. And one of the things we're going to talk about is the meeting we had with the SSAC to talk about their cybersecurity research concerns.

Keith Drazek: Go ahead, Beth.

Elizabeth Bacon: It's Beth Bacon. So I think that I agree fully this is not a purpose and objective but for the point of agreeing to get a - just to get to the initial report, it doesn't really matter because at that point, the public, including us - the public, the multistakeholder community, including the registries and the registrars and actually the NCSG and I think probably a little bit of the SSAC, are then free to say "Hey, you know, that group of folks mentioned in the report that don't agree this is a purpose, that's us and here's why." So - or, you know, however we decide to go about that. And I will say I think the effect - we had a nice exchange with them the other day. And we're talking about exactly how to take care of them and define that who falls into what bucket as a security researcher and what that really means and we're going to work together on that to make sure that they're supported but perhaps others who (unintelligible) or not.

Alan Woods: So Alan Woods again for transcript. This highlights one thing that is very clear and that the reason why we have had to take so long on wordsmithing something around this is because it is, in its own right, not actually a purpose and we're trying to create something that's already taken care of in law because it is very specifically a part of the law and we're trying to craft a purpose which doesn't clash with the legal obligation and it's really crazy. But that is 100% correct.

For the purposes of - god, for the effect of going forward to the interim report, I do personally think that, you know, if this went through any sort of a data protection impact assessment, ultimately, I still think that it would not gain any traction or muster with (GBA). However, for the - for all intents and purposes at the moment, I don't think it should hold us back from moving forward past this and have it in there and let the public comment and let's see where it goes. It doesn't - you know, I just don't think it's going to probably end up being (unintelligible) anyway but again, this could be one of those areas of compromise that it doesn't necessarily affect us badly at the moment.

Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Just two questions. Seems like purposes, they go in the end into consent which is for registrars, not for registries. No? So because, effectively, it's open-ended list of third parties.

Alan Woods: Just Alan Woods here again. So no, consensus is actually the one thing that we've all agreed on that we're avoiding. We'd go for a registrar and we go under 6(1)(b) which is subject to - as required by a contract and that it's separate and different to that of consent because it doesn't have the same connotation attached to it. Is it necessary to process data for the carrying out of the contract, i.e. the registration of the domain? For the registrar, that would be 6(1)(b). For us as a registry, we would have to then rely upon 6(1)(f) which is legitimate business interest because we, ourselves, don't have a contract with the registrant directly. But in order to give rise into - not give rise, to give effect to the undertakings of the registrar in that contract, we must process the data on their behalf to carry that out. So we're 6(1)(f).

Consent is a whole different kettle of fish that we are not in the position to go through and it would be the least benefit for us to do that and I think everybody has agreed to that, thankfully. It's not a fight that we've had to have yet or at all.

Marc Anderson: This is Marc Anderson. If I can, you know, maybe try and wrap this one up and I think what you're hearing from your EPP/EPDP representatives is that, you know, we recognize that there are some problems with this language but, you know, our, you know, our recommendation is that it's - you know, that we go ahead and let this language go into the initial report and give, like, a chance to comment on it.

You know, because access is such a - an important issue for so many people and a major focus of the working group that there's some importance and some value in having a placeholder here that recognizes the interest of third parties in accessing the data.

And so, you know, yes, we realize there are some problems with it. As Alan said, you know, it may not, you know, pass muster with data privacy impact assessment. But our recommendation is that, you know, this language go as is into that interim report.

Go ahead, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much. It's Keith Drazek. I think what you all have recommended makes a lot of sense. I think this is not nearly the only thing that is going to be sort of up for discussion and debate going into the initial report and the subject of public comments. And I think the arguments that you've made are sound. So I support your recommendation to let this go forward. Thanks.

Alan Woods: Again, Alan Woods here. Yes. I'm (unintelligible) forming in my brain and I jumped in ahead of her but this - by getting past this, we can get into those elements and those purposes which are so vitally important for us to continue processing data for our basic purpose which is the registration and the maintenance of domain names and that is the piece of work that we need to get at. So I think those serve our purposes to just move forward.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Thanks. So moving on or away from the worksheets, I think for everyone who was here this morning, we are shooting for a November 5 delivery date of the initial report to start the public comment period. (Kurt) indicated yesterday in the high interest session that that date was probably going to slip. However, we don't really have any clear sense as to what's the most likely alternative date would be.

Also, for those of you who are here this morning, you know that there actually is not as of this moment a complete draft initial report. There is kind of the shell to it and policy recommendations are being drafted and circulated to various teams. It's going to be extraordinarily important because - it's going to be extraordinarily important that the members in alternate support team when that initial report is the first draft that is made available to the working group that we all really take a very, very close look at it to - word choice and characterization is going to be extraordinarily important. And we will definitely keep everyone posted for - if there's anyone else that wants to join the support team, that would be fantastic.

There is some chance that we may end up requesting that the public comment period be shortened from 40 to 21 days because as I think everyone knows, we have a definitive date by which we need to finish our work and presented to the GNSO council. And if as it's likely to be the case, the recommendations in the final report are going to be materially different from what's in the initial report. We then have an obligation to have another public comment period and we're going to have to find those days from somewhere and shortening the public comment period, you know, gives us 19 of them. So just a heads up on that.

Sam?

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Kristina. This is Sam Demetriou.

To the question about - or to the point about shortened public comment, I know I've seen this quickly through e-mails that some draft language is starting to be circulated and I don't assume that that's what's going to end up in the initial report but do you think it's possible that staff would be able to release maybe sections of the initial report to you guys so that the support team can maybe help like get a jump on that before the initial report in its entirety gets put out there? Do you think that would be helpful in you guys to, you know, organize everything and prepare those comments?

Kristina Rosette: I think it certainly would be helpful for us. I just don't know whether that might actually make it all that much more difficult for staff. But I see (Barry) in the back of the room. So maybe he can answer it.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. Berry Cobb for the record. Where the draft initial report is that now, pardon me, is on a Google Doc. I believe it's wide open although if other members outside of the EPDP want to view it, you can't edit it, of course, maybe what we'll do is create two, one for the EPDP and then the second for kind of just read-only, so you can start to see that and/or we can just create a Word doc and you can distribute it through your mailing list.

Samantha Demetriou: Awesome. Thanks, Berry. That's very helpful. This is Sam again.

So yes. So to the extent - and, you know, fully taking the cue from you guys, to the extent that you think it's helpful if you have this, we can start getting maybe a jump on the sections that maybe a little closer to what they're going to look like in the initial report, just let us know how we can be helpful. Let us know if you need assistance in getting, you know, the team organized. I'm happy to assign out tasks as I get up for a comment. So just keep us posted, however we can help.

Kristina Rosette: Absolutely. Thank you. And I think we should have a much better sense of kind of timing and what the expectations are as I think everyone has picked up on from the fact that, you know, we talked about these on Saturday and we have to have your comments by tomorrow morning. We're going to - as we move forward, I expect that we're going to continue to have increasingly short turnaround. So we apologize in advance but there's really nothing we can do about that.

The next thing that I - I don't know, Alan or Marc, do you want to jump in? I was going to move on to the meetings we had yesterday. Okay.

We had several meetings yesterday. One was a CPH coordination meeting. We've been working fairly closely with our registrar stakeholder group counterparts. So in addition to all the other calls, we also have a one-hour call with them every week and a very active Skype channel. So we were talking about issues that we have identified and how we need to identify ways to work faster and smarter going forward. So we are going to be working - trying to flush those out.

We did have a meeting in the afternoon with SSAC that James Galvin was great about facilitating. And that was to discuss the SSAC's very high interest in access for cybersecurity researchers. And after that discussion where we left it was that we asked them to basically complete one of these worksheets for the purpose of access to cybersecurity researchers, identify name in particular, and who the categories of users would be, whether there will be any differentiation and the like so that we would have something to work from once we get to that point in the discussion. And it was my understanding at least that they do, in fact, plan to do that.

I had to leave that and I was unable to attend the meeting with the NCSG that followed. I don't know if either Marc or Alan can speak to that.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Kristina. This is Marc Anderson for the transcript. Yes, as Kristina said, after our coordination meeting with SSAC, we also had a coordination meeting with the NCSG. In general, we've been able to work pretty closely with them throughout the EPDP process. This meeting occurred after they had seen the letter from contracted parties to ICANN on the UAM.

And so they had some concerns about that. They maybe hadn't had a chance to fully digest and read the letter. And so they had - you know, there's a little bit of contention there over the contents of the letter and why we submitted the letter when we did. We discussed that and eventually agreed to move on and get back to the, you know, sort of the task of coordinating on the EPDP.

And I think, you know, as I said, overall, that's been a good collaboration for us. We've been able to support each other on a number of issues, you know, recognizing that, you know, the contracted party house issues are not the same as the NCSG's issues but where there's overlap, they've been, you know, really good at supporting us.

You know, we all - I don't know, is there any - looking at Alan, is there anything I missed there?

Alan Woods: It was very (unintelligible).

Kristina Rosette: Thank you. There were - there is one other topic that we need input on and this is that Purpose N which is really relevant only to those registry operators that validate registration and policy eligibility. So in the interest of saving the time, I'll move that to the list. So if you are one of those registry operators, keep an eye out for that. Before I close, although of course if there are any questions, please feel free, on behalf of Marc and Alan and I, I just really want to extend a huge thanks to the alternates and the support team who have been phenomenal in helping us kind of stay on top of everything,

drafting, providing information, really making sure that we're able to keep up our end of the working group bargain. So thank you very much.

Marc Anderson: I just like to, you know, add my thanks to what Kristina said and also thank Kristina and Alan. You know, Kristina, Alan and I all recognize that, you know, we're in a different situation where, you know, we're here as representatives of the Registries Stakeholder Group and that's an obligation the three of us take very seriously. We're very mindful of that. We coordinate with each other to make sure we're representing the views of the full stakeholder group. And so, you know, first, you know, thank you to, you know, I don't know. I can't imagine doing this without, you know, the support and help of the two of you. So thank you. But also, you know, just, you know, just wanted to - you know, we take our obligations, you know, very seriously and appreciate the trust that the Registries Stakeholder Group has in the three of us. So thank you.

Alan Woods: So just one last thing. Obviously, thank you as well. And again, thank you to Beth and the alternates for, like, you know, helping us. The entire team had just been fabulous.

But what I do want to say is that high in the list of topics that we're now going to be going forward and looking out as well are the geographic application, the legal natural and also the access one which just a word of not warning, of surprise is that we had a very amicable agreement on the asset issue that's limited to functional access and reasonable access as opposed to legal considerations of what that access should be. So it was a very positive starting point that it was about, you know, things such as, you know, having clear ways to request that acknowledgements of request that if we were to deny that such request would - we provide reasoning for such denial, not just say no.

But it did not stray and it was agreed by many parties in a small team, not by the full team, but that it was not about whether or not the legal request was to

be dictated to us which I felt was a very positive and a bit of an eye-opening moment. So hopefully, that might actually - once it gets back to the full team, that might change, absolutely. But I thought it was a very positive, interesting development as well. So we'll keep you posted.

Paul Diaz: Great. Okay. Thank you, everyone, and echo everything that's said. Fantastic teamwork and keep going. It's only a couple of more months that you have to do this, right?

All right. Let's see. Going back to our agenda, Jon, I know you had a click AOB. Do you want to jump in?

Jon Nevett: And we'll probably – Jon Nevett from Donuts. We'll probably talk about this when Wen talks about the public comment process in the open public comments. But there's a comment that was just published. It's due on November 27, related to the auction proceeds. And there was a session on auction proceeds earlier in the week. There are questions out there that we'll need to hopefully get aligned behind allocation methods, safeguards, conflicts of interest issues, can an ICANN organization get any of - apply for any of these funds and probably the most important thing is the mechanism for distribution, is it inside ICANN, outside ICANN, you know, in conjunction with a charitable organization that already exists or not. So those are the kinds of issues I wanted highlighted, make sure everyone knows.

I'll send around the slide presentation from that session. I guess it was yesterday. And then, hopefully, there'll be a group together working on that for getting our comments together. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Jon. And we'll come back to Wim.

Before we get there, okay, we had a very substantive discussion about GNSO Council, the update in the agenda but, Keith, however you want to take this, follow-ups or...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: ...you want to drill that on?

Keith Drazek: Sure. Thanks, Paul. Keith Drazek.

I think the one topic that we discussed of significant substance and process earlier was the IGO-INGO Curative Rights Protection PDP final report. And for those who were not in the morning session with the registrars, just very briefly, we have a final report that is for council. The question is, how do we handle it? There are some concerns and questions that have been raised about one of the recommendations. It's possible that all five of the recommendations are not consistent with GAC advice which isn't necessarily a reason to not forward it. But there is significant concern about the Recommendation Number 5 as it relates to possible changes to the UDRP that would be out of scope potentially for the actual curative rights protection PDP.

So we talked about that quite extensively this morning. I'm not going to go over it all again here. But I think the marching orders that we took, Donna, Rubens and I took, from the conversation this morning was that the most appropriate path forward now is likely to recommend withdrawing the motion than engaging with the GAC in some manner or capacity, consultation or conversation, whatever we want to call it, as they requested in a letter that we received at council earlier this week.

And then further discussion about how to advance the work or to terminate the PDP. And whether that's a forwarding of a subset of the Recommendations 1 through 4 potentially and not Number 5 or possibly some recommended or suggested terminating the PDP outright. So there's additional conversation that the council needs to have about this, we believe, and that we will be sure to engage all of you, Registries Stakeholder Group,

working with our registrar colleagues to ensure that we're keeping you advised and taking your input as to next steps. But at a minimum, tomorrow. And this will be discussed later tonight in the GNSO Council working session. But at a minimum, our recommendation on your orders or recommendation is to suggest a withdrawal of the proposed motion at this time.

Donna or Rubens, do you want to add anything to that?

Okay, Paul. That's all I've got, I think, for the council update. But as we discussed, most of it was discussed quite extensively this morning.

Paul Diaz: Great. Thank you, Keith.

Marc?

Marc Anderson: Thanks. Marc Anderson for the transcript. So maybe half an update, half a question for Keith. I think as everybody is aware, I've updated you previously on the next-gen RDS PDP and that we sent - you know, leadership team sent a recommendation for termination to the GNSO Council. I understand that's on the agenda for, you know, for here in Barcelona. So I don't know if I can throw it back to you for a little bit of an update on where that is, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Sure thing, Marc. Keith Drazek. Yes. I discussed this morning one of the motions before the council is to effectively terminate the RDS PDP working group and I expect that that will take place later today. It's always possible that somebody could raise, you know, a request for a deferral but I've seen no indication of that and I think there's broad recognition that due to the developments around GDPR, the ongoing work of the EPDP, resource allocation and all of that that I think there's pretty broad recognition that it's time to shut that one down and ensure that the community can focus its efforts on the EPDP at this time and parallel perhaps discussions around the UAM. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Marc. Thank you, Keith. I just thought of one little thing strategically. If we withdraw the motion to get time to engage with GAC, do we know specific GAC members who have voiced things on this that are leaders who we could talk to, begin to work with?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul. Yes, there's, I think, a small number of GAC members who are sort of leading on this and they are the representatives of the IGO's and the INGO's and, you know, the GAC's. So Brian Beckham, you know, as a representative of WIPO, is one. And he actually wrote followup communication to the GNSO Council just in the last 24 hours, you know, providing some additional explanation of their concerns about the recommendations in that final report.

So the answer is yes. It's not limited to Brian but I think there's a subset that would be, you know, sort of the key interlocutor. But I think it's also important to note that, you know, these groups, these individuals, the members of the GAC have been invited repeatedly over many months and, frankly, years now to participate directly in that group and did not and chose not to. So it's unclear that there's much room for, you know, further, you know, compromise or engagement. But I think further conversation will help us understand, you know, are there concerns about all five of the recommendations, is it primarily about the fifth and that might give us some more information in terms of next steps. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Great. Thank you. Makes perfect sense.

All right. Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes. Just to briefly add, as a former co-chair of that working group and I found an extensive minority statement, the IGO members never officially joined as members. They did comment several times to engage with us, primarily WIPO, World Bank and OECD. The UN got involved as well. So that's where the expertise lies.

I never personally supported the GAC advice which is kind of the polar opposite of Recommendation 5. The co-chairs try to forge a consensus middle ground recommendation to grease all of this clash of rights between registrants having access to (unintelligible) IGOs having a degree of judicial immunity that varies by nation but there was not a willingness within the working group to go there. So I think a constructive dialog would be useful rather than a vote now. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Phil. Okay.

All right then. Sorry, Donna?

Donna Austin: Donna Austin. I just have one other council item that I'd like to mention. So Keith is one of the candidates for the chair of the GNSO. I think the direction to our incoming councilors is to vote for Keith and vote often. I just think we should concern that in this room. So best of luck, Keith. I think the format is that there'll be a first round of voting. So vote for Keith in this first round and vote for Keith in the second round.

Woman 1: I think we can confirm that pretty comfortably.

Donna Austin: Okay. Good to know.

Keith Drazek: So Paul, if I may, I think this is an important opportunity to also recognize Donna and her service on council for the last four years, including as our vice chair of the contracted party house for the last couple of years on the leadership team and, frankly, just a note that the leadership team working, you know, with (James) and now with (Heather) I think has become a very, very important sort of, you know, it is - it's a leadership team and that's been an important component and driver of the council's work. And I just have to say that Donna has gone above and beyond in terms of being a leader, taking responsibility and really being the point person for the Registries

Stakeholder Group over the last many years. And I think we owe Donna a serious debt of gratitude and recognition. So I think we ought to give her a round of applause.

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

All right. So then let's keep rolling. We might actually get out of here a little early.

Pending public comments, Wim, do you want to take us through?

Wim Degezelle: Okay. Thank you. I will keep it short as promised.

Again, puts up the overview. I sent the overview of - I think that's the - Sue, could you put the updated - I mean, the - I set that just before.

There is basically one comment that is up for - that has that deadline between now and the next Registries Stakeholder Group call. And that's the choice to comment. It has been discussed in the group and there has been a number of conflicts with the Registries Stakeholder Group. I don't know if Marc in the room he wanted to give a short update on how we stand there.

Marc Anderson: Thanks, Wim. This is Marc Anderson. Yes. We've had a couple of meetings with our registrar colleagues on this one. I think as I've previously noted, the contents of the report are probably more impactful to registrars than registries. So at least from my perspective, I'm content to registrars take the lead and support their positions on this.

And also Volker from the Registrar Stakeholder Group was a member of the RDS 2 Review Team. And so he's been involved in that and has been able to share his thoughts, insights and perspectives on that.

So I don't have anything to share as far as draft comments at this point. As soon as we do have something to share, we'll circulate it with the Registries Stakeholder Group for review. But I guess that's where we are and we're continuing to coordinate with them and, you know, unless we see some, you know, issues or concerns with their comments, my recommendation is to let them take the lead and support their position on the comments.

Wim Degezelle: Thank you. The only points and I put this in - especially in red, the deadline of the comments is on a Sunday evening. So basically, the 4th of November. It's probably the Friday, the 2nd of November which is the end of the next week as a deadline.

Then there are four documents out for comments with a deadline that's later. First up, (unintelligible) and operating plans and budgets. They're relatively short. I'm looking in direction of Jonathan as you helped last year. If you have comments or suggestions, please let them know and then we can take it further.

And then thank you to (Jeff) for again sending the slides around about the new gTLD auction proceeds documents. I think it's the idea to have lead and I don't know if I can again look into (John)'s direction and a number of people helping is very welcome and I think it goes way easier. I would suggest that I send out a reply on (John)'s e-mail and ask who is volunteering or would like to help with writing that comment and deal with that.

Then the next two on the list are the CCTRT report that's out for comment. I know the previous person that was out last year in our - yes, last year, the Registries Stakeholder Group comments I would like to ask those that are following the issue, please have a look at the report. I will also go back to the previous report due to comments that was sent in the previous report and reach out to the people that submitted comments or helped to put together that comment.

And the last comment that was, I think, yesterday or just before the weekend was sent out or was published was the (ASEC) review but that comment only has - has a deadline the beginning of November. Beginning of December.

So that's the overview. I think this is a great opportunity to see you face-to-face and it's a great opportunity also to have a drink later on. So even as you drink, you can just continue and say "Okay, I want to help with that or that comment."

Are there any questions at this moment? I'm happy to answer.

And then hand this back to Sam.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Wim. This is Sam again. Just wanted to take this opportunity to reiterate something that I said at the last meeting or with you guys on our biweekly calls, especially noting that the CCT file report and the auctions report both have the same deadline and it's right after the US Thanksgiving holiday. Just a reminder to provide inputs early if you want to be involved in helping draft the comment but don't have the bandwidth to sit down and hold the pen and write the whole things out, that's what Wen and I are here for, even if you just want to send some bullets or send some thoughts to us. It's very helpful. But earlier input is always better. It's easier for us to make sure that, you know, if we get it in front of the rest of the stakeholder group. So kind of like Donna said, vote early and vote often. Comment early, comment - vote separately. But we're here to help for - if you need any assistance with the actual putting pen to paper.

Kristine?

Kristine Dorrain: Hey, Kristine from Amazon. I will volunteer to help with the auction proceeds comment but I'm not going to hold the task. Thanks.

Woman 1: Kristine, we're calling on you for the (unintelligible).

Kristine Dorrain: As I understand, they're not going to overlap, though, right? Okay. That's what I thought. But thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: So just a quick comment. This is Jonathan for the record. I mean, I think that way in which we've done a couple but not quite sure if we're doing them all the same way but things like - that structured method where we break it down into the recommendations then look at a comment, test whether we're prepared to accept that or not. For me, that's a very efficient and useful way of doing it. And if we could do something similar with the auction proceeds because we have an initial report of some recommendations we can either absorb or, you know, try - or comment in a way that we want to reshape them. So that, for me, is a very effective way of getting through the workload. Well, thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Sam. That's great feedback. So let's put some hands up both here in the room and on the list. And once we get us a feel for who wants to contribute, we can pull something like that together for the auction proceeds. And maybe - I'll admit that I haven't looked at the report yet. So we'll figure it out. Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes. In regard to the CCTRT final report, I wanted to note that I'm a member of the subcommittee of the International Trademark Association's Internet Committee that's going to be reviewing that final report and contrasting it to (unintelligible) comments and filing comments for board consideration. So it would not be appropriate for me to also participate in drafting for the registries but I - it's going to compel to carefully read that entire report. I'd be happy to consult with anyone who is doing the drafting for the registries and then share thoughts but I don't think I should be, you know, involved in the drafting. It might not appear well. Thank you.

Samantha Demetriou: Understood, Phil, and thanks for offering.

Phil Corwin: Yes. And (unintelligible) leadership meeting in New Orleans in two weeks and that's going to be a major topic of discussion in the Internet Committee. So I'll know more on two weeks which is about three weeks before the deadline. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Donna?

Donna Austin: Donna Austin. I think the (unintelligible) Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review team is probably something that we might think about doing a Webinar to see if we - among the group or a call with anyone that's interested because I think this directly impacts us. So it might be worthwhile to do it that way, see if we can get some interest.

Samantha Demetriou: Yes. That sounds great. And, Wen, if you could circulate the old - sorry, not the old, the last version of the comments that the stakeholder group prepared on the initial report, the initial recommendation and that way, people can do a little background, so we can maybe use that to help structure that call.

All right. So two action items for me in terms of organizing those two comments. So keep an eye on the list, guys.

Jonathan Robinson: The same with auction proceeds, we do have a prior comment on that.

Paul Diaz: All right. Awesome. Are we good with our comments? Okay.

Then let's wrap up with our admin business and start with treasure support.
Karen?

Karen Day: Hi, Paul. This is Karen.

Paul Diaz: We hear you perfectly. Go ahead, Karen.

Karen Day: Hi, everyone. So treasures report for the year, the FY18 year, we ended - closed our books for the favorable balance of \$84,912 in the bank carried over to this year. We invoiced the 1st of August 134,000 in dues. As of October the 8th, which is the last time we ran our numbers, we have received in roughly 62,500 in dues. The payments are all due by the 31st of October. So that means that between now and the end of the month, we hope to collect the remaining \$71,500 from the membership. It is some of our larger members that are corporations, probably like mine, that's scheduled a payment for the last day so that they can be sure every interest and they'll all come in.

In the last week, SAEs were there. So I'm not worried about it. But that's where we are right now. We've got about another 71,000 to come in for our budget for the year.

We've been really good and I want to thank our members for watching out for wire fees this year. We've had very little bank wire fees that we've lost. People have been good about covering that. The majority of the fees that we've lost this year that we've had to absorb have been paid out and we knew that, you know, we're now going in that last fee that we have as a business expense. So thank you for checking with your banks before you send the money and make sure the wire fees are covered.

But that's it for me. We're in a good fiscal position and I think next year, budget looks good and I think we're turning things over to Jonathan in good shape. Happy to answer any questions anybody want to have.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Karen. Any questions about finances? Just a reminder, often it's not the people who are here at the meeting. But if you have any doubts about whether your organization has paid its invoice, please inquire. Best if you e-mail now while you think of it back home. You know, we've tried to change. We changed the cycle for the billing. We'd really like to try and have

the books in the order before the end of the year and not through the mad dash to December 31st like we used to.

And with that said, if we - when we get into November and we're now past due, you know, we have to start sending that and calling people and stuff. So let's avoid that if at all possible. And if it's not your direct responsibility, please just confirm with your colleagues back at the office that the invoices have, in fact, been paid.

All right. Sue?

Sue Schuler: Sorry, before we move on from the treasurer's report, could we give Karen a great big thank you for everything that she has done, particularly with the incorporation and everything, all the work that she's done?

Paul Diaz: Absolutely. And, Karen, I have a shout out as well when I do my last thing on looking to the future and the massive contributions you've made.

All right. With that, let me turn to Erica, a quick update on Evo 4.

Erica Varlese: Hi. Erica Varlese. Just for a quick update on the Evolution 4 working group, for context, we are looking through the charter for any updates. We had started a working group last year but it was paused during the incorporation process since there were other elements we needed to take into account in terms of having the bylaws and charter meet the requirements for the Florida - lots of incorporation in Florida.

So at this point, we've picked it up again. In our last meeting, we've covered a fair amount of ground. Overall, we were able to identify about five pending changes, some of those inherited from the previous working group. Most of them we agree on. There's two that are kind of outstanding, one relating to weighted voting, which is something we're going to be working on likely in our next call, mostly trying to figure out if it's something that we still think is

useful. I guess the proposal was either to remove it or leave it as is. Obviously, that's another option. Or slip things out just based on feedback. We've received and we're planning to work through that further, talk through it and see if it is something we will change. If so, how would that might look like and that might be something that we reach out to the group as a whole to get a pulse on. So we will be meeting. Sort of jumping ahead a little bit but we will be meeting before the next Registries Stakeholder Group meeting on the 7th. So we will have an update on that by then, I imagine.

And the second element that we're still working on has to do with quorum for annual votes and that's another one we just had to, again, get a pulse on within the group before sharing it.

We are currently working on developing a frequently asked questions document which we will be able to share with the stakeholder group as a whole once we are ready to share the changes with everyone just for an overview and also because we think it will be a helpful document to share when this does go to the ICANN board since there has been material - like, within the actual context of the charter, there hasn't been many changes to the meaning but there was a lot of reformatting, so to speak, again, just to make it in accordance with the Florida laws incorporation.

So it looks like a lot more changes than there are. In many ways, it's kind of a scary-looking red line but it's not actually as scary as it looks when you look through it and that's why we wanted to create this frequently asked question documents kind of ahead of these questions since I'm sure folks will have them.

And in terms of timeline, we are looking to hopefully get the drafting done prior to the holidays just so we can - we would like to send out the - what we would propose to the group early next year. It will need to go through review with our legal team in Florida as well. So that would - ideally, we're looking to get that out in probably January and then get everything submitted to ICANN

still within Q1 next year. We're obviously not at that point yet but that is what we're looking at and I think we're still in pretty good shape.

That's about it for the update. But happy to take any questions and answer them to the best of my abilities.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Erica. Any questions for Evo 4?

We have a really good work team and - because a leadership will be reporting back and we're pushing to try and get this done, not cutting corners but definitely to get it done, as quickly as possible, share with the group because we know on the other side, there will be the longwinded ICANN review process because it is basically a charter change.

All right. With that then, let me - next to last item on the agenda and we have - we've listed as the secretariat transition but as folks are aware, we - when we built the budget this year, we anticipated Cherie transitioning and Sue taking on additional responsibilities. I think I've posted fairly recently to the list that we were able to accelerate that effort. And so Sue is now taking on-board many of the responsibility. Cherie has - and Cherie transitioned into a more support role in particular with Evo 4.

That said, of course, Cherie, we want to take the opportunity here to thank you for all of the things you've done for this group for so many years. A truly irreplaceable asset to the organization. We know you're not leaving us and we're very thankful for that. But with that said, we - truly, this organization has grown dramatically. You've helped martial it and coordinate it and keep us, you know, professional. You know, we couldn't have achieved the point that we've reached without you. We are very, very appreciative. We have a little something for you. And we all certainly like to thank you now but also toast to a good year at the reception later this evening. So to Cherie. Thank you very much.

Cherie Stubbs: Well, I can tell you it's been one of the most fabulous 18 year temporary jobs I've ever had.

((Crosstalk))

Woman 1: Same to you.

Cherie Stubbs: Oh my goodness. But as Paul said, I'm not - the world is still round and I'm not falling off its edge. So hopefully, I will see you all in the coming year.

Paul Diaz: And certainly in about an hour and a half. A few hours. And please, everybody, I know scheduling here has been insane, the double, triple bookings in the evening, but we are sponsoring a reception for the stakeholder group and our registrar colleagues and some other invited guests. Please swing by for a bit even if you have to duck out early, like we said. So Cherie as well.

We're in (Banquet) Hall, right? Or (Banquet). Yes.

Sue Schuler: It's two floors up in the (Banquet) Hall and that's 6 o'clock.

Woman 2: Oh my gosh.

Paul Diaz: At 6:00.

Woman 1: I can't (unintelligible).

Woman 2: Oh my gosh, Cherie says your dedication to the registries over the past 17 years has meant the world to us. Look at that. How cool?

((Crosstalk))

Woman 1: It spins on its own. Yes.

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you again. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: All right.

All right. So in my last official (unintelligible) as chair, before handing the baton to Donna, ask to get some thoughts about the future of the group and where we've been. And basically, what we've just heard and said about Cherie further reflection, a lot has changed. Change is the key theme for the stakeholder group. And the three years that I was chair and the couple of years before as vice chair, you know, was a dramatic change for the stakeholder group. We went from effectively a club with about a dozen members, active members to where we are today with close to 100, you know, representing a wealth of business models and personality types and focuses and everything else. And we - and my reflection is that we have managed this change as well as could be expected.

So there have been bumps in the road and my shout-out to Karen. You know, Reg left us because she took a different job, still in the industry. It's great to see Reg but, you know, Karen had to step in as treasurer and immediately, you know, filled that role very well. In fact, with Karen's professional expertise has been an incredible resource for the organization. Most probably won't ever fully appreciate how much she's done to help us with our incorporation efforts which, again, was a major change and a necessary one. We talked about the invoicing. Many, many organizations joined our stature and reporting requirements. They could no longer write a check to an individual person in care of the stakeholder group. You know, they needed formal invoice and bank accounts and all the rest. So we've embarked on the incorporation path. It took a while and it was - we were going down the wrong path for a while. Again, kudos to Karen, to Sam, to Sue and Cherie as well, everybody that's been so helpful in getting us to where we are which is fundamentally a very good place.

We talked about the auction proceeds. If anybody has got it in the back of their head, we theoretically could be eligible for proceeds for outreach efforts or something like that in the future. Certainly, there are caveats but our incorporation status, you know, is an achievement and an important one.

Of course, change also - you know, there was the tragedy, tragic circumstances of Stephane's passing. But again, you know, how the groups come together, how Sam stepped up dramatically to fill in the role. Wim was already doing fantastic work and didn't miss a beat through it all, you know, making sure that the voice of the stakeholder group and its rain capacity continues to be heard. It's been wonderful.

And all of that is not a - not that it wasn't happening previously but it is - I think it's fair to say when you look around ICANN that the stakeholder - Registries Stakeholder Group is, you know, seen as we've got our act together. We are professionals. We work very well in managing the range of interest that our membership represents and are very effective in having our voices heard, our positions known and whatever the issue may be right now. And the major issue is EPDP but, you know, going back over the years, just any number of challenges that we've risen out to me and I have full expectation that we will continue to do so very ably, very professionally in the months and years to come and certainly with the leadership team that we all elected with Donna and all of her experience, Sam, Beth, Jonathan as well. And of course, our councilors, good luck tomorrow, Keith. You know, we're expecting continued success and leadership in this community that we're part of and, you know, hopefully, we get to have a little bit of fun as well. Maybe a couple of more receptions.

But, you know, I feel genuinely comfortable with what's happened under my tenure. I'm sure there's more that could have been done. But I don't think there've been any huge misses. We've ably moved around any of the hiccups that we might have experienced and, you know, hopefully I'm leaving

a stronger organization today than where we were three years ago when I started.

So hope I get it right and, you know, hopefully I'll wait for those things at the reception later.

All right.

Donna Austin: Well, before we say goodbye, I think, Paul, we will be very remiss and not extending our sincere and heartfelt gratitude to you for your leadership not just as the chair but also previously as the vice chair and your years of service for the stakeholder group.

I don't think I could have come in to this group and, you know, been able to integrate myself and being part of this without your guidance. And I think there's other people who can probably say the same. So I will agree I think you've done a great job over the past couple of years.

The Registries Stakeholder Group is a very well-run operation. You know, I think we're able to do good work. We're able to get, you know, a lot of things done and a big part of that is attributable to your leadership. So I think I can speak for all of us when I say thank you so much and we really appreciate everything.

Paul Diaz: Thank you.

Sue Schuler: Two floors up at the (Banquet) Hall. Okay. We can end the recording. Thank you.

END