

**ICANN**  
**Transcription ICANN Johannesburg**  
**RySG Membership Meeting**  
**Monday, 26 June 2017 at 9:00 SAST**

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

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

Paul Diaz: Recording set thank you. Welcome everyone. This is Paul Diaz Chair of the gTLD Registry Stakeholder Group. This is our abbreviated Stakeholder Group meeting or a policy forum. Today is the 26 June. We're going to go right into guest presentation.

Jonathan Zuck, the Chair of the CCTRT is with us. This is an abbreviated sort of a speed dating version of catching up and discussing. We provided a lot of feedback to the CCTRT in our public comments opportunity to explore some of the issues that we raised. We have also or the CCTRT has arranged a fuller block of time noon tomorrow in Pavilion S8. So all are welcome to stop by further explore the issues we raised. But with that Jonathan thank you for your time and I'll turn it over to you.

Jonathan Zuck: Hi, good morning. And this is really my first time speed dating. I'm a Virgo. And as such was very focused on trying to have an empirical analysis of the New gTLD program. And that was a challenge because of the numbers. And it's been a perennial challenge for the organization to do empirical analysis and numeric or database success factors and things like that.

I'm joined by (Lorraine Kapens) from the FCC who was the Chair of the Safeguards in Trust Sub Team within the CCT Review Team. And we have a very brief time this morning. We don't want to take too much of your time and want to use it primarily as an opportunity to entice you into coming into that session tomorrow where we're going to have a broader discussion.

We really appreciate the comments that the Registries Stakeholder Group filed. And we're going through them ourselves but at the same time we thought that it would make most sense to just start a dialogue with you because obviously a lot of what we ended up recommending was more data and that ICANN acquire more data along the way in terms of pricing, specificity of the success of safeguards for example from compliance and so it was an interesting outcome for this review that what we're really trying to do is set up the next review to be better enabled to perform this analysis.

That said there was I think a lot of news that came out of our report right? Something like 1/2 of the new registrations came from new gTLDs or if you include ccTLDs then 1/3 of them came from new gTLDs. The measure of competition that we used in the CCT review is something called market concentration.

And there was actually an impact on market concentration in one year in which there was a growth year right? In the time that we were measured we didn't even have all of the new gTLDs delegated at that point and that - and still there was a movement of the needle if you will even in market concentration.

And so from a competition standpoint I think the indicators are good. But I think that we can probably all agree that the better we understand the market the healthier that it'll be. And so that's why we're advocates for the collection of data by ICANN and finding the most efficient way to do that and the least burdensome way on the contracted parties. And so that's why we want to kind of open a dialogue to try and better understand the issues that you presented in your comments and make sure that we come out with a final report that's win-win.

And so I'm without further ado I think what we'd be interested in doing is just getting feedback from you for the next few minutes here and hopefully get you to update your calendar for noon tomorrow at Pavilion S8 so we can really deep dive into the issues that you raised and make sure that we're addressing them in a satisfactory fashion. So are there questions, comments, concerns, et cetera, that you want to put on the agenda this morning?

Paul Diaz: Yes it is early. We haven't had our coffee but anybody I mean there were a number of folks involved in the drafting of the comments Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry Services. I guess I'm going to turn it around and ask you all have had time to read and review the Stakeholder Group comments. Do you have questions for us?

Jonathan Zuck: Sure. Yes we have had a chance to read them. We just came out of a two day face to face meeting here in Johannesburg where we began the process of going through them. And we have started to go through the comments in more detail. They're going to end up happening - getting addressed in the sub teams in the coming weeks at a more specific level.

We had a lot of interaction with ICANN staff where they made an attempt to cost out some of the recommendations that we made in their comments. And a large part of your comments centered around the kind of cost benefit analysis if you will of the recommendations that we made. And that's

complicated obviously because it's difficult for us to pin down what the actual costs are at a dollar level although ICANN staff made an attempt at costing them out of third parties where responsible for collecting them.

And what we - our take away if you will was that our responsibility was really to be as specific as we could about the benefit. And so I think that us was trying to be in a position of figuring out what things would cost is problematic but we will take on the burden of trying to be as specific as possible about the benefits that we see enduring from the data collection that we recommend.

So I think the broad question that we have back to you is, is there a way to find a middle ground whereby we're - ICANN is beginning to accumulate the kind of data that we think is necessary for them to be a steward of the market place without it being unduly burdensome on you either from a financial standpoint or from confidentiality or market competition standpoint which I realize is an issue as well?

So I mean I think finding that middle ground and being creative about that is our objective going forward. So the extent to which I have a question it's about trying to get to the root of your concerns so that we're not inadvertently, you know, big footing into your business but at the same time trying to empower ICANN to really be in a position to analyze the market in a way that seems appropriate So that's the feedback that I'm hoping to get from you and through a dialogue is to try to find that creative middle ground whereby we can evaluate the market.

I - it's my opinion that it's in everyone's interest to do so. That it's a healthier market if we understand it, it's a healthier market if people feel like they can trust it. And so in that environment we believe that it's win-win. We believe that it's better for your businesses for us to better understand the market. And so we want to find creative solutions with you in the coming weeks so that the final report we put out there, you know, finds that creative solution.

Dirk Krischenowski: Dirk Krischenowski from .berlin, going through your review one thing in particular concerned me it was about the pricing. I thought we are collecting prices for our GO top level domain group as well doing some key performance indicators and pricing is one key issue. And what I'm usually doing is asking a big registrar or having a count of who is a big registrar which has all of the new gTLDs all the free ones or somehow restricted ones and then you get the prices. So there would be quite easy to do it with a registrant. But I agree with you that having this data at ICANN updated regularly would make a lot of sense and it's not a burden to send our wholesale data I think as registries to ICANN then.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you. And this is Jonathan again. And that's great. And I think that wholesale pricing data and retail pricing data are both valuable because you're looking at two markets in a sense I mean in terms of looking for competition. And there's at least a pervasive notion that there's been or has become enough for competition in the registrar marketplace at this point although there's a lot of people looking to see if the end of registry registrar separation for example has had an effect on that.

But I think there's a belief that there's a great deal of competition there. And so we look at measures of marketplace concentration those numbers are much better in the registrar market. And so I think people are looking for the program to bring about more registry competition and that's why the wholesale pricing becomes important. And obviously we hope to see a downstream consequence for retail pricing when doing an overall competition analysis but that's why we're looking for both sets of numbers if that makes sense.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Dirk thank you Jonathan, other questions? Again there will be opportunity to go deeper dive on these issues tomorrow at noon in Pavilion S8. All are welcomed and encouraged to attend. But if no other questions then thank you Jonathan, thank you (Lorraine) for making the time this morning.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, thanks for making the time for us. And do please some subset of you join us tomorrow because it's a perennial problem of throwing stuff over the transom and seeing how it'll be accepted and then let's just work it out. I'll sing a Beatles tune for you, you know, when you get there because we can work it out. Thank you very much.

Paul Diaz: Thanks again Jonathan. All right with that we're back on schedule so we thank everyone. We have an administrative item and I'm glad that Chuck has joined us because actually Chuck you are our administrative item today as everybody is probably aware and much to our collective pain Chuck is retiring from VeriSign at the end of this month in fact.

Fortunately Chuck will be remaining engaged with the community for at least six months maybe we can get a little more time out of him. He'll continue to Chair the RDS Working Group but for Registry Stakeholder Group purposes today we wanted to present a small token of our appreciation Chuck. You have been a tremendous leader, friend, and colleague and mentor to many of us for quite a while. We won't even try and tally up all of the years.

You were last year's multi-stakeholder recipient extremely well deserved. And at least from the stakeholder group we have (Stephanie) with something and from the group ourselves another little token of the appreciation if you want to open the big one and the smaller wrapped box.

Chuck Gomes: I can't wait to see this.

Paul Diaz: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: How many of you were there? Just a few of you were there. Oh how nice. That is great. You know, when I and I better get closer to the mic I guess but when I walked - sorry I was so impressed. This stakeholder group has so

many great people and so many new people that have become active. That is so rewarding to see. So I just complement all of you.

You know, we thought when we were going into the new gTLDs that the Registry Stakeholder Group would see major changes and we did. But you know the one thing that didn't change even though we're all competitors we still all worked together and contribute. And that is really fantastic. So thank you for the recognition and the thanks. But thank you for coming in and making it work because you have and you are and I am really pleased.

Man: (Unintelligible) as well which made the (unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Okay. And for those who haven't had opportunity the giant card we'll make available so you can share your thoughts. There's still some space and think it will take you a little while to get through it Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't really come prepared for this. Let me read it Chuck Gomes thank you for making such a huge difference in our world your friends, Registries Stakeholder Group. Thank you very, very much.

Becky Burr: So we have many important awards like the Ethos Award that Chuck has received but on upon his retirement we had to create an entirely new special category award including a new order. The order of the picket fence has been created. And in recognition of tireless service, infinite patience, endless integrity and unsurpassed commitment to the ICANN community Chuck Gomes is hereby named guardian of the picket fence.

Woman: So Chuck did you see that?

Chuck Gomes: I won't to say too much because I know you have a lot of business but everybody knows how important (Becky) is to the picket fence right? And she and I go way back to the beginning when it was formed and that is so critical. Don't ever forget the picket fence. That's really, really important.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you everyone thank you Chuck. And all right we have with the remaining time a very full agenda. For those who attended the special stakeholder group call that we had last week, you'll understand or recognize what we have up on the screen the remainder of the agenda today. The idea is that to prepare everybody for the whirlwind of activities in these four days here at the policy forum.

The idea was to go through the key issues that will impact registry operators to try and give people, you know, a quick update overview of what's the issue, why should you care and then whoever is presenting what are the kind of key takeaways things you're listening for, things you may want to contribute in those very sessions? So if we can Chuck we have RDS your workgroup at the top of the list if you'll take us into it.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. And I'll be fairly brief. But this afternoon from 3:15 to 6:30 is the Cross Community session on the RDS. And we have a very specific agenda. And our goal is really to get interaction from those who haven't been a part of the working group. We have reached about I think it's 26 it might be 27 tentative conclusions mostly to do with thin data so far. We haven't got into the tough part yet.

You can tell that by the working group but - and so this afternoon we're going to go over those tentative conclusions. And they're called tentative because the more we move through everything is interrelated and we may come back and revisit some of those. But we're going to share those with the whole community this afternoon and allow you to share your opinion. What do you think about the conclusions we reach?

Now there are still people within our working group that don't support some of those and that's okay. But this afternoon is going to be an opportunity for you to take a look at those and share your opinion and make contributions to the working group. And then in our working group and in weeks ahead we will

then take the info input we receive this afternoon into consideration. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Chuck. That was super brief and thank you we can use the time. Any immediate questions for Chuck? Any hanging concerns perhaps from last Wednesday or any prep coming into the session? Anything to touch on now? Okay then if not please make the effort, to try to attend this afternoon and anybody wants to join the workgroup they're always happy to take new members. Sam.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Paul this is (Sam) from Fairwinds. Chuck just a quick question. Of those lists of tentative conclusions are there any that you guys are looking for specific feedback from registries on anything to kind of concentrate our effort between now and this afternoon?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think so. They're fairly high level. I don't think they're going to be big issues for registries and I mean - and of course it's mainly to do with the thin data. So I don't think there needs to be that much but it again if any of you do have feedback we would like that. And the working group members some of them do a better job than others but they try to keep their groups informed and represent them in our processes.

But I don't think there are any big issues from a registry point of view. You have several people in that working group that are doing a good job. I see Maxim over here Marc over there. And I'm trying to think who am I missing? I'm probably missing several others because I came in late but it's - and some of you were kind of just observing. Like I said on the working group call last week we're getting to a stage where contracted party is going to want to pay close attention because there are those that really don't care too much about the obligations that we have.

And I don't mean that unkindly they just have a different agenda. And we all as contracted parties I can still say that today, you know, we have some legal

obligations we're going to have and they're really important. So stay tuned. Whether you're going to become a part of the working group or not stay tuned and support the reps that are on the group.

Paul Diaz: Thank you both. Okay not seeing any other hands let's move to our next item the general data protection regulation. (Beth).

Beth Bacon: Good morning everybody. I will try to be similarly brief. Gave a little update last week on our pre-travel call the GDPR I think everyone at this point knows comes in force May 2018. So we are trying to coordinate as registries and then again with the registrars on the, you know, potential operational impacts for the contracted parties that will need to be implemented.

There's a cross community session Tuesday this week the ccNSO is sponsoring and running that. They're organizing and they are intending for that to be a very interactive session trying to avoid the death by PowerPoint that can happen and death by presentation. And to discuss some of the potential impacts that the GDPR can have on the DNS.

And that is a - it's important I think to stay aware of the community views as that will impact how the contracted parties engage and how we move forward. There's also been a small kind of advisory group of registries and registrars working with ICANN to chart a path forward for some coordination so that we can understand contractually how this will impact us and then we can move on to some operational solutions. So there will be some updates I think Tuesday during the session and then as well happy to provide further updates to the group later in the week and going on further. So I'll keep it brief any questions happy to answer.

Paul Diaz: Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually it's a stupid question to both of you. Do we think that the Thin Whois is going to be the ultimate solution of all the registry issues with GDPR?

Chuck Gomes: Could you repeat that Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: The question was do we think that all the registries turning to Thin Whois, is going to be a good solution of GDPR issues? So registries know more have information about the end users.

Chuck Gomes: Well yes I think we're going to learn - I think this whole scenario with GDPR everything else going on is take - causing some to take a new look at that whole issue. So I don't think we know the answer yet.

Paul Diaz: (Beth).

Beth Bacon: I was - I agree with Chuck. I just wanted to add I think as we go forward it's good to get in the mind space that the solutions might not be, you know, as simple as saying Thin Whois, or waiver contract waiver, or it may be multilayered solution and also focus on the fact that contracted parties are dealing with ICANN on the issues with our contracts. If you have internal other handling of personal data you need to do that internally. So it may not be that easy for everyone depending upon your business model but again I think it's going to be kind of a suite of solutions multilayered.

Paul Diaz: (Jonathan).

Jonathan Robinson: Hi this is (Jonathan). (Beth) just one quick question when - in terms of the update from the advisory groups I'm just trying to figure - you guys met already the opportunity to meet at ICANN already and because I'm just thinking with this group is not going to meet again registries. So how would we get any update or...

Beth Bacon: I think of it - so I think that on Tuesday there will be a little bit - I'm going to call (Becky). She's going to talk a little bit about the outcomes of our meeting which was brief and it was more process and here's - we've just kind of said here is our path forward. And then any updates, or calls for information or assistance I think we can do this on the registry list so certainly keep everybody as informed as possible.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you.

Becky Burr: So just briefly we will use the high interest topic session on Tuesday to talk a little bit about the approach that ICANN is taking to this. I mean ICANN is obviously taking several approaches because internally of course it transfers data about employees and participants around. But the goal here is to use an advisory group it's not a policy development process, it doesn't replace the RDS PDP or anything like that. It doesn't replace any policy.

It's really focused on ICANN compliance which implicates of course compliance registry and registrar compliance with respect to the contractual requirements. The goal is to put together with the input from the Community Advisory Group a matrix that says essentially I think of it as kind of user stories.

I am law-enforcement I need the following data elements for the following purposes. I am a rights holder. I need the following data elements for the following purposes go down the list. Fill that out. Make sure that all of the stakeholders users, et cetera, have comment on it. And then use that to get legal advice and interact with data protection commissioners in a very tight timeframe so that you all have the information you need to make your own decisions about compliance.

I don't think that there's I mean ICANN is going to have to figure out what it enforces and what it doesn't enforce on a short term basis. But obviously all the registries and registrars are going to have the opportunity to implement

whatever they think compliance requires in the way. And obviously this is not as (Beth) said not a substitute for a more broad reaching internal compliance review that all of you who have data about you residence will need to do.

Paul Diaz: Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Short question. Could we persuade ICANN to get some involvement of escrow operators because to avoid (unintelligible) at one moment at a time when they say okay all you pay is not enough to cover a single sign of \$20 million or euros. So for example they change procedures so they don't see personal information anymore.

Becky Burr: But the escrow issues obviously are part of the - they're part of the problem and/or they're part of the set of things that need to be in compliance with it. And obviously escrow maintainers are, you know, there input in terms of what they believe they need to have to provide this and what protection they need is part of - is clearly part of this. So I do believe that escrow maintainers will be contacted as part of this and we'll have input into it.

Sebastian Ducos: Yes just - then that I don't see much at the moment so could we talk to ICANN to check if they are aware of these needs?

Becky Burr: Yes. And the point is that the matrix that gets filled out will cover the entire range. So there's a list that basically has every single data element that's collected and every contractual provision that requires it and it points to the escrow provisions as well.

Sebastian Ducos: Just briefly indeed they're not participating much but they've been approached, and they've been warned and they've been invited.

Paul Diaz: Thank you (Sebastian). Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Just very quickly and some of you heard me talk about this in the working group meeting earlier this or last week but we are kick - we're hoping to kick off this week the working group an independent legal analysis of the same questions that we asked the data protection experts earlier this year. So that will be another source of information and it will be publicly available to all of you.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you all. Again the cross community session is tomorrow. GDPR it's more help (unintelligible) you have to learn but this is a really important one folks. Please, if you've not been following the issue, educate yourself, go to the session tomorrow, and listen. We will continue to talk about it on our biweekly calls. There will be updates as Chuck just mentioned. There's additional information coming. The sub group that's working with staff and registrar colleagues will continue to update as appropriate as we have information to share but this is really important to your business. I can't stress it enough. As (Becky) said ultimately the information that you learn here will inform your own implementation plans.

There is not going to be a one size fits all or a checklist that you follow. You're going to have to come up with your own plan. So please get educated, take advantage of the sessions and for the questions and whatnot reach out to myself or the other experts in the room we'll try to bring you up to speed.

Okay with that then we're going to switch to geographic names. Jeff couldn't be with - or (Donna) couldn't be with us there's a GNSO Council meeting so (Susan)'s agreed to step in.

Susan Payne: Great, hi everyone. Yes and apologies if this comes out a little bit unprepared but I'm sort of standing here in Jeff's place because he's talking to GNSO Council at the moment. So Jeff Neuman and Avri Doria are the chairs of the Subsequent Procedures PDP. And within the scope of that PDP is the issue about geographic names at the top level. So when we were in Copenhagen they foreshadowed these cross community discussions that would take place

here. And there are two of them. The first one is Tuesday afternoon towards the end of the day and then the second one is a longer sort of double slot session on Thursday afternoon.

And prior to these two cross community discussions people will probably remember that in April there was - there were a couple of Webinars where anyone who wanted to could come along and present either a position or a proposal. And a lot of I think there were about ten people all together came and gave presentations and some of them were literally good at saying, you know, this is our position this is what we think the law says or whatever. And a couple of presenters in particular had specific proposals for dealing with GO names.

Obviously one of the reasons we're all talking about this really is because of the position that some governments have been taking which was presented by Jorge Cancio from Switzerland and from Olga Cavalli from Argentina. And this notion of a repository of geographic terms of significance a sort of unspecified very wide ranging set of terms that governments could sort of put into a repository.

And that the idea is that registry applicants would have to review the repository notice that the term that they want which they may not even have realized was geographic in a country is in the repository. And would then have to be getting consent or wouldn't be able to go ahead with their application. So that's sort of the position on one side.

And as I say a few people made suggestions on particular aspects in the middle and so on. There was a proposal from Paul McGrady which was to try to instead of turning this into a sort of permission based an objection based process. The idea of a geographic public interest commitment so you could say well I realize the government has an issue with this name. I won't use it in a geographic sense. And I'll have some contractual provisions in there. And it

would be enforceable then under the kind of the existing enforcement framework.

So those were probably the sort of two extremes. And Jeff and Avri as the chairs have for the purposes of discussion this week have put together a straw person that tries to take aspects of some of these proposals and just put them out there as a straw person as a starting point for discussion.

The sessions are going to be moderated by an external sort of third-party moderator who I haven't met but I understand people feel that they are very impressed with the level of engagement that they've been showing the rapidity with which they've got up to speed and so on.

And so - and they may also have spoken to some people already or might even still contact people in advance of these sessions to get their input. But really I think it is incredibly important. And I know that there has been a bit of conversation last week about do we need to do this? Can't we just go ahead with the AGB guidance - and the provisions that are in the AGB as stands?

And I think I don't think we can. I mean I think we know that governments have this sort of overarching right to object on public policy grounds public interest grounds. And they've been doing so. And the advice from the GAC I think I said it was in Durban was that they didn't want people to go forward without the AGB provisions being reviewed and essentially their restrictions on geographic names being expanded.

So it's the AGB restrictions as they stand are, you know, and not a kind of done deal. So I guess that's probably all I'll say for now. But I think it's really important that if we can as a stakeholder group we have a position that would be great. I mean it may be that we don't have one single position but it certainly would be useful to talk about whether there's a position that people - that collectively we have and certainly to have lots of participation and lots of engagement at the sessions this week.

- Paul Diaz: Thank you (Susan), perfect. Would you please just remind again when the sessions are held?
- Susan Payne: Yes so the first one is tomorrow Tuesday. And I believe it starts out I'm going to get this terms - are you going to tell me Karen?
- Karen Day: Five.
- Susan Payne: Five thank you. It's 5:00 until 6:30. And then on Thursday its 3:00 until 6:30 I think or 2:15 until 6:30 something like that.
- Paul Diaz: Three fifteen yes. Okay so Tuesday, Thursday in the afternoons, questions concerns? To your point (Susan) I don't believe the stakeholder group has a collective position right now. They're certainly ideas that have been floated. And again everybody is strongly encouraged these issues that impact your registry operations attend the sessions have your voice heard. (Susan).
- Susan Payne: I was just going to say I don't know whether people have looked at the straw person yet. If people have and they've got any comments that would - I think that would be really useful. And I know Jeff and Avri are quite interested in having kind of feedback even in advance. But if you haven't looked at the straw person I - can I encourage you really to look at it and really think about it. And, you know, think about the aspects of it you think are good and things that maybe need work on that would be really helpful.
- Paul Diaz: It would. (Susan) if you wouldn't mind could you post that to the list so people have it at the top of their inbox? Okay are we good with GO names? All right not seeing any questions then let's just keep moving on. And we have ICANN priorities listed. There's a cross community session Wednesday afternoon in Ballroom Number 1. We don't have a lead on this. If you look at the posted agenda the official schedule the description it's really getting at, you know, questions about the priorities.

What are ICANN's priorities and who sets them? So this cross community session is going to try to wrestle with that idea. You know, the goal is to hear the different perspectives, dialogue, converge and act. It seems kind of high level. I'm not exactly sure how (Bart)'s going to pull this off the staff lead but everybody if you're available Wednesday afternoon 17 - 5 o'clock to 6:30 encouraged to attend that session as well. (Jonathan).

Jonathan Robinson: Has anyone got any insight into the sort of genesis of this? What's driven this and where did it come from because I heard this morning I think Göran said this is an SO AC prompted thing. And I'm just trying to understand, you know, because it's supposedly some kind of community driven desire to - I'm just really struggling to understand where this has come from and how it fits into anything else but anyone got any insights? Anyone was on any of the committees that were working out the sort of schedule for this meeting?

Paul Diaz: I can just say at a high level (Jonathan) and as part of the SO AC leaders list as we went through as we identified cross community issues I believe this one was inserted requested by staff. And it may not have the status of a cross community session. It's a cross community dialogue or something a little bit lower than what we're going to talk about say GDPR or the GO issues. But I'm not sure where the community they came from. I think it was driven - pushed by or put on the agenda by staff.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks Paul. I think we should try and find this out. We should ask a little more. So I would encourage others to do so because it's kind of it's almost this kind of slightly Alice in Wonderland type situation where you end up with Göran standing up at the - not the opening ceremony but making the opening remarks and saying the community has asked for this.

You know, it's normally the priorities have been set by the SO or AC either coming up through the - and yet your feeling is that it might've come from staff. So it'd really be good to understand where this has come from and who is driving it? Is it one particular group that's maybe whispered in the ears of

staff and said look we really need to do this are how is it? So it would be great to see if any of us can do a little bit more to uncover and understand why this is there and what we're trying to achieve with it. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And the only reason I know any more than you do and not much (Jonathan) is because they asked me to be a co-moderator of the panels in that session. So I had to come up to speed a little bit. Apparently there was a session on priorities in Copenhagen. I don't know if any of us were in it I wasn't. I know so there is some history of some of this. I think part of our issue is we tried a long time ago in the GNSO to start working on priorities and we found out a hard that is because of competing priorities. But anyway I think it will be a very interesting session.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Chuck. Any other questions? Sorry (Jonathan).

Jonathan Robinson: Just one - I mean I guess one remark thank you Chuck that's a little bit of help anyway. And I guess that the - if the formal answer would be that ICANN's priorities are set through the strategic planning and budgeting cycle I would guess. But then so I sort of then - and one of the questions we're going to have to discuss is if there's another mechanism being is how does that differ from or coordinate with the strategic planning and budgeting process but look let's see how we get on in the session and take it from there. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. My thinking is that in big organization as ICANN where the staff is driven by desires of managers all you need is to understand KPIs who said it? So the way they increase their salary by KPI bonuses it's the way they lead an organization. So ultimately I think it's financial planning

which sets the goals by KPIs which managers follow to earn the money.

Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thank you Maxim. Anyone else? Okay then next on our agenda is the registry service fraud or RSP issues discussions we've had. (Stephan) is really constrained this week with the nominating committee responsibilities. He was going to try and get here we're slightly ahead of schedule but he's not here right now.

Anybody who's been involved in that ongoing discussion group want to provide an update? I mean the session on RSP issues follows right after our meeting today. And I know some were intended to stay in the room to get up to speed to listen in. But anybody who has been involved anybody just want to share a quick update where it stands, what we're doing planning next steps?

I have to admit I was hoping (Stephan) would be here. I'm not prepared to do it myself. All right then let's note again that session will follow in this room immediately after our meeting today. So for those who are trying to get their heads around where we stand, what we're talking about what the issues are it will be an open session. So, you know, it runs the possibility of other members of the community coming in raising questions. But if you're trying to get up to speed maybe that's a great place to start because there will be coming in from square one. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Following that a bit I recommend registries that are able to participate in that session because I can try to I'm not saying smuggle but to involve a situation where the SLAs are going to be (worse). And they don't base it on like say (unintelligible) grounds. And there was no mathematical analysis done but more like wording say we have to do it better why because we have to do a better? And ultimately it will interfere with the way we do our business. So I recommend us to be in that session.

Paul Diaz: Yes. And importantly this is an example particular to the letter that we wrote first in December and then in February the stakeholder group and the registrar's joint letter to staff asking for different thinking on how to proceed instead of driving or facilitating. I think on this issue it's fair to say that staff has - they're listening. This is our issue to drive.

And to your point Maxim concerns that we have it's up to us to make clear why we're concerned about the way that it was proposed, how we think it would be more appropriately worded or implemented so it's important. It's something that we - it will impact many of our businesses. So if it is an issue of concern please come to this session, have your voice heard, participate in the workgroup calls that we have on a regular basis and make sure your voice is heard.

Okay then if there's nothing else on that we're ahead of schedule now which is always a good thing. Let's switch to rights protection mechanisms. And I've got (Kristine) and (Jon).

Kristine Dorrain Hi. (Kristine)...

Jon Nevett: Hoping (Kristine) is on.

Paul Diaz: Perfect, thank you (Kristine). Yes go ahead.

Jon Nevett: Well I'll just note that is 12:53 in Seattle so good job (Kristine).

Kristine Dorrain Hey thanks everyone. I'm actually in Minnesota where it is 2:53. Anyway yes so the rights protection mechanism session is Thursday morning I believe 9:00 am local time. And I do hope that everyone will be able to join. Two key things that the working group is going to be focusing on during this working session -- and this was supposed to be a very active working session -- we are going to be going over the work product of both the Sunrise Sub Team and the Claims Sub Team.

So both sub teams have been working very hard to refine the charter questions, turn them into something fairly meaningful, and meaty, and substantive and at the same time identify places where the broader working group wants to gather more data or more information to try to answer the charter questions. Many of these questions the data that's being requested is going to be posed to the contracted parties.

There's information being sought about the practices behind registry reserve names, those questions behind registry sunrise pricing and the practice of premium pricing. So there's a lot of discussion around whether or not registry practices are sort of co-opting or end running around the sunrise mechanism that was designed to protect trademark holders. So to the extent that we are able to show up and present our data and present information I think it will be really helpful.

The Claims Sub Team is particularly interested in part abandonment. And what happens to the registration process from the perspective of registers registrars I'm sorry or integrated registrar registries? They're really interested to know where in the process domain name registrants are leaving the registration process in order to either not come back or to come back later and are they being deterred by the claims notice? So one of the key things that we've been really discussing is whether or not the claims notice is itself is causing a problem. And we're talking about whether or not protected parties or even in a position to provide that information.

So we were - are hoping to really get a substantive discussion about these data questions and really understand whether or not this is the type of data that contracted parties can or would be willing to provide to the working group. And then furthermore bringing that to the next level for next rounds what sorts of data should we be collecting in the future to try to make sure that we have this sort of data going forward. And those are the primary

outcomes of the Thursday meeting at 9 o'clock in Johannesburg. Thanks everyone.

Paul Diaz: Thank you (Kristine). Thank you for dialing in at such a rough hour. All right and just to remind again this session will be Thursday 9:00 to 12:00 in this room Ballroom 2 so it's easy to find. Any other points to raise? Any other questions?

Jon Nevett: Hi Paul. I would just reiterate again that this applies to every registry. This is not just for the subsequent round. So if you're looking at some of the proposals on the claims for example extending it beyond 90 days that would apply to every registry that's in existence. And then the call for regulation on voluntary practices that some registries have also would apply to all registries. So we should - shouldn't think of this as just something that just implicates subsequent rounds but it implicates all of our businesses. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you (Jon), critical point. Okay so hope to see everybody Thursday. Oh Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes few words to add. Also there are quite wild ideas which for example might lead to a situation where every registration will lead to a creation of lots of claim notices. For example currently the yes the match (unintelligible) the string which is TMCH claims notice is sent if it's in claim period for this TLD. And something event is like close match which actually a set of rules which if you profess semantics will generate almost 100% of it. So the idea of notice (fades) it should be not everything and not like thousand or hundred notices.

Yes so there are things we should like at least take close look at, at that session. So I recommend to be there too because those of us who participate in these PDP are like fighting quite hard there to prevent really wild things. But we cannot do these on our own to (unintelligible) where just versions of few like strange guys thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Maxim. All right not seeing any other questions final item on our list was subsequent procedures. I believe that Jeff is still briefing the council so Karen are you prepared to - wonderful thank you. Please.

Karen Day: Hi everyone. This is Karen Day. I'm one of the Work Track Co-chairs for Subsequent Procedures stepping in for Jeff while he is presenting to council today. Subsequent Procedures has our face to face working session tomorrow morning 8:30 till noon. We are in ballroom - I think we're in this room. We got moved.

And we will be discussing tomorrow we're splitting the session into sort of two sections. First the overarching issues that we are working on with the whole PDP issues such as rounds versus first come first serve, whether or not we're going to try to categorize TLDs and subsequent procedures. And then we will be going into we'll have a dedicated time for each of our work tracks to discuss the subject matters that they are working on.

Those topics will include closed generics, geographic names, vertical integration, a registrant non-discrimination, applicant support and my work track Work Track 3 we'll be looking at the impact of GAC early warnings and GAC advice. And I believe Work Track 4 is looking at name collision and IDN variance.

So we would encourage you to come and participate in that. It's going to be very interactive. We need feedback. We need input so that we can drive this thing to conclusion. And the only way we're going to be able to do that in a time that's going to come close to enabling the registries requested opening of the subsequent rounds fourth quarter of 2018 is with participation and with input so that we can do that.

Our goal right now is to have a preliminary initial report out at the end of this year. And but we again need your input especially on some of these issues

that we know are gating such as the geographic names. And that's what I have and would be happy to answer any questions.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Karen. Yes and to confirm you are in this room tomorrow 8:30 to 12:00. Questions about Subsequent Procedures and the various subgroups for part of it? Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette Amazon Registry Services, I don't have a question just a comment. I have been bouncing among the various work tracks. And I would say that I would really encourage all of the folks in this room who have not yet really actively participated to start doing so. We're getting close to the point where it may be too late to change the direction that some of the recommendations are heading. So I would very much encourage everyone who isn't currently participating who cares about this to start doing so.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Kristina. Okay all right we're a couple minutes ahead of schedule. Sue Schuler has asked if we could as we did in Copenhagen just stick around for an extra moment or maybe come up to the front of the room for a photo just to update the content on our site. It's nice to have a picture of current membership those who are here. Are there any other questions any other issues before we turn to that or cut everybody loose? Like to raise - Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I have one question where are the two sections of picket fence? I'd like those. Oh okay thank you.

Paul Diaz: Nothing else then let me plug if your organization has not voted on the current ballot which includes this year's budget proposal as well as the elections for a couple of officers, a GNSO counselor and NomCom rep please vote. My understanding is that we're still below the minimum for a quorum and, you know, this is kind of ridiculous. The ballot has been open almost two weeks and we haven't met that threshold. So if in doubt please we can double check for you. Ask Sue Schuler and I we can make sure either

the primary or the alternate can vote. If you need the link we're happy to get it to you but we really need people to participate.

All right then we won't go any longer but please do come on out for kind of cluster for a photo. And then we'll see you all in the various sessions. And those who are staying again RSP issues will meet in this room at the half past. Okay everybody I guess we can end the recording then.

Sue Schuler: Okay for lighting purposes anybody that's a member of the Registries Stakeholder Group, if we could all gather maybe from where (Jim) is sitting down to maybe Dirk and then behind. And maybe a few people in front and just gather back there and we'll take a photo.

Stephanie Duscheneau: Can Chuck join and hold up his picket fences?

Sue Schuler: And we need to do this fairly quickly. There is another group coming in after.

END