

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
GNSO Joint Meeting Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) & Non Commercial
Stakeholder Group (NCSG)
Saturday, 11 March 2017 at 9:00 CET**

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

Stephanie Perrin: I'd like to encourage anybody and everybody to come to the various meetings. I know at NCSG we've managed to get that teed up for Tuesday with whoever is left. It will not be (Gianni Budarelli) who is leaving on Monday. But the session is Monday afternoon and it should be well worth attending even if the – all of these speakers are not getting a whole lot of time to speak, but they will respond to questions from the microphone.

So that was my first intervention, I just wanted to plug that and make sure everybody knew and that it's kind of important. We haven't had an open dialogue with actual very senior level people in the data protection community for many years. I believe it goes back as far as 2004 or 2005. So certainly in recent years they haven't come.

(Budarelli) actually came way, way back when he was Italian DPA, sometime around 2004, and Mr. (Rotota) was the Italian previous DPA, he was the head of the Article 29 group. So it's not like these people have not intervened

and if not send things over the years. ICANN has just basically ignored them.
Thanks. That's a personal view of course.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Stephanie. Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Again, I kind of come – Sam Lanfranco for the record. I sort of come off the wall I guess on some of these. At the same time, the list that Stephanie has given is almost what I would call the group who are looking at best practices. At least from their perspective best practices.

At the same time, about one third of the world's population in two countries now is coming under national regimes that have their own internal practices. And it's as though we kind of don't think about that. I mean, they're, you know, 35% of the world lives in China and India and there are regimes being developed there that will impact on what we are doing but I don't see the dialogue.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. So I think some of this is extremely important for our European registrars where they are very concerned about data protection and how they store data and who has access to it because of local law. Probably less so for North American. And I'm – yes, sure.

Darcy Southwell: So this is Darcy Southwell. I actually think especially with the new GDPR, I think North Americans are going to have to really change their view on that, so it's going to become a big issue.

Graeme Bunton: Right, perfectly reasonable thing to say, it is probably about to become a bigger issue for us. And I don't have a sense yet the registrar colleagues outside of Europe and North America, but maybe – Pam is seeing if she could weigh in, have some thoughts on that. Okay.

But it's certainly something that we are discussing and care a lot about inside the Registrar Stakeholder Group, you know, Iron Mountain was mentioned

earlier as well and how we store data and who ICANN is contracting with to store data, how long we keep it, those things are very important to us. Maybe that the dialogue we should be having a bit broader with the rest of the community.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks. Michele for the record again. A couple of things, I mean, first off ICANN still does not have a privacy officer of any kind.

Stephanie Perrin: Or a policy for that person to enforce. Stephanie again.

Michele Neylon: Well I knew you were going to say that, Stephanie, so I didn't have to. Even in a company the size of mine, which Graeme keeps on reminding me, is really, really small, thank Graeme, at least I can see over the steering wheel, you know, it's best practice for any company in Europe to have a – at least one employee who's roll is to act as the data protection, data privacy point of contact.

ICANN as an organization has over 300 staff at this point across multiple jurisdictions and an access data controller for thousands of registrars, thousands of registries and mandates policies via contract around quite a large amount of personally identifiable information. Yet they don't have a privacy officer. And when this has been raised with them, they seem to stick their heads in the sand and not want to address it. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy to go off and shove people in offices in various weird parts of the world for no particularly good reason.

A lot of the Europeans we find it a bit odd that ICANN's main point of contact for most of us is actually outside the European Union, so in order for us to be compliant with the requests to deal with, you know, various queries that we might get about domains and our clients, we then have to transfer the data to actually answer the query outside of the European Union.

Now of course we could say no, but I mean, again by making 50 cents on a domain name registration and it costs me €300 per hour to fight this legally, you know, come on, be practical. So, you know, there's a lot of issues there and I don't see them resolving a lot of them in the short to medium term.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele.

Sam Lanfranco: I shouldn't say this, but, Michele, there's now a complaints officer.

Michele Neylon: And?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. I wanted to respond to Sam's intervention about when are we going to start having a dialogue with India and China. From a data protection perspective, that dialogue is taking place or it could be taking place. I mean, obviously it takes two to tango. There is not just that Article 29 Working Group now, the Article 29 being of course the data protection supervisors in Europe.

There is an international conference that is all set up, I can send anybody the link if they want it. ICANN also bore them with a big long list taken from, what's his name – the guy in Australia – Asian Data Privacy – if you Google Asian Data Privacy you will find the name of this Law Prof who I've known for 30 years and now can't remember his name. That's life, eh?

Anyway, there are lots of laws, there is an international conference – I believe last year it was held in Morocco, there's a new Moroccan data protection commissioner, so that dialogue takes place through those working groups and through the international working group on data protection and telecommunications which is the sort of geeky group that looks at geeky issues in data protection.

That's not coming to ICANN, ICANN is still viewing this is a – as a California EU fight in my view, I think it's, you know, carrying on the great tradition that

ICANN was born in 1998, that was the year the directive came into effect. They were still fighting. They were still pushing back on European states to not implement in order to make the directive fail. So this is a long-standing fight. But the world has carried on.

And I think it would be great if we could facilitate a better dialogue. One of the reasons the Council of Europe is interested in this is the Council of Europe have revised Convention 108 and if somebody else doesn't ask questions I'm going to bore you all to death with privacy stuff until your eyes roll back in the sockets.

But Convention 108 has been updated, the Council of Europe is trying to get everybody to sign onto that as they would the cyber crime treaty. And those of us who are around in government when the cyber crime treaty was hatched said, why don't you, instead of saying whereas there's all this human right stuff, why don't you make people sign onto Convention 108 if they're going to sign onto the cyber crime treaty? That would have solved some of our law enforcement issues right there because it's binding and you have to bring into place in your jurisdiction the law that enables that commitment.

However, so I'm sure the Council of Europe will talk about the merits of signing onto Convention 108 when they're here. But that instrument is open to everybody. And they have been trying to facilitate an international dialogue. And, you know, anybody can go and participate so.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Stephanie. So it seems to me – was – David, was that getting yourself in the queue or was that just stretching? That was queue? Okay. So it feels to me like we do have lots of common ground especially on privacy stuff. And while we know already that you guys are allies on many of that, that we need to do a better job perhaps of reaching out, communicating and working together to push some positions forward and so maybe these meetings are part of that process.

But let's try and make sure that we have those conversations and that we can work together to solve some of these data privacy issues. David.

David Cake: I just wanted to agree with what Michele said about ICANN does not have a privacy officer and it's kind of staggering. One of the problems I think that we always have with privacy issues is ICANN seems is kind of willfully ignorant of a lot of the details. They don't want to have a privacy officer, they have to do what they said, kind of thing.

And we always have these dialogues which are really lacking in kind of obvious knowledge from the ICANN side. I think one of the things that it may well be worth doing is through our respective, you know, Board member contacts and things really start going why is it that ICANN does not have this institutional knowledge? We're doing pretty well in terms of institutional knowledge about privacy in the community, there's plenty of us here who know a lot about it, I mean, not particularly including my compared, you know, compared to Stephanie and people who have to deal with it day and the registrars and so on.

And yet ICANN does not apparently seem to – want to have that knowledge, let alone have it. This really should be something – I've been banging on about it for a few years with – and, you know, got sort of encouraging nods from the then CEO and that was about it. That, you know, oh yes, that sounds like a good idea and nothing was ever done. ICANN remains kind of lacking and perhaps we could work on – that would be one thing we could coordinate a little bit on as, you know, rather than tackling this fight by fight, let's try and improve the institution.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. I have – thanks, David. I've got Stephanie and then Michele. And then we're hearing a lot from the same people and we need to get a little more diversity of opinion from the room. So maybe we can talk – find some places where do have some tension and disagreement between us. I'm not sure

what those are off the top of my head but that might spice things up a little and we'll look at the rest of the agenda too. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. And you're reading my mind, Graeme. I would note that Graeme used to invite me to come and visit Tucows but then when I started talking about how well if ICANN wasn't going to listen to reason, i.e. the nuanced dialogue on data protection, we would have to start a global campaign, ala Max Schrems, and sue their ass off. And, you know, I haven't been invited over since.

The reality is, and this came up yet again, I won't bore you all with crumbs from the RDS struggle, but somebody said the other day, well if the data commissioners have been saying this, why haven't they taken any enforcement action?

Well, it's because the whole gestalt in enforcing data protection, they do depend on reasoned dialogue, and when they tell you you're breaking the law, they expect you to pay attention. They don't expect you to wait until you're served with court papers.

Now, life is different in the intellectual property community, it's see you in court and, you know, time stamping who used it first and whether you can get away with trademarking a color, which I find, you know, staggering. But anyway, it's a different type of legal apparatus. And if the only thing that is going to get ICANN to listen, because this has gone on for so long, is a whole pile of wildcat complaints, unfortunately, a lot of those complaints up until recent times might have arrived on the doors of the hapless registrars, which is why yours truly hasn't launched such a campaign and I could.

It would resolve differently in each different jurisdiction, you might have some jurisdictions actually finding in favor of ICANN's approach, that's the luck of the draw. But normally in these things you sort out which jurisdiction you're going to file in and it better be the best one and until recently Austria has

been a really good one. Ireland is getting a lot of the traffic lately but things that go to the court of Europe of course wind up with good opinions these days, but there are other jurisdictions where we're getting good opinions including, sadly, for Tucows, Canada. Supreme Court has been very good on privacy lately. Australia has not.

But that's the kind of eventuality we're heading towards and that is not what the multistakeholder model was set up to produce. So the fact that we might have to do this I'm not willing to put in more than six years of hard pro bono labor in this place, banging my head on a wall to fight this. So the clock is ticking. We're less than two years left, as far as I am concerned. And then if you can't get anywhere in the multistakeholder model, you have to go back to the court system. And that's the way the cookie crumbles.

So I think we have an incentive to work together and figure out how we could actually get this dialogue to work. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Stephanie. Any follow ups from that? Michele, right, sorry you're in the queue.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Graeme. No I think, look, I think we agree on a lot of things here around various aspects of privacy and how that kind of impacts our operations. So maybe the takeaway from some of this is instead of working or not – or trying to work together on specific little battles, that maybe we look at raising up one significant one. For example, you know, pushing ICANN to have a dedicated privacy officer or whatever that actual job title would end up being.

I mean, from the registrar side, we were assured repeatedly, by ICANN staff that there would be a clear simple process for us to be able to get waivers around the data retention as we're obliged to handle in the 2013 RAA. My company was the first one to request the aforementioned waiver, yet it took us the better part of two years to get it.

And the only reason we got it was because I think the following ICANN meeting was being held in Dublin and I was making a personal thing of embarrassing them about this. Other European registrars around the table I know have dealt with it. Theo I think, got it eventually, did you – you got it? How long did it take you, Theo?

Theo Geurts: Two point five years.

Michele Neylon: So for the record 2.5 years to get a waiver. I don't know whether one.com or Larsen Data or any of the others around the table managed to get it, but any registrar you speak to none of us got it in under a year and most seemed to have been two plus years.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. I see Theo in the queue.

Theo Geurts: And to pile on to this a little bit more, there are still registrars out there who haven't got it and they're in the process for four years now. So it's really sad that we're talking about this and it's 2017 and there's still registrars out there who haven't gotten a waiver yet.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme. That's crazy. Theo, do you know if that's ICANN dragging its feet or is that registrars not being smart about how they check their boxes and jump through the process? A combination of both?

Theo Geurts: Though I can't speak for this registrar, because I'm definitely not working for them, from what my point of view is, it is just the non-acceptance of ICANN's point of view which is dragging this out and this is in terms of ICANN not willing to recognize that specific law in that country and that is the whole problem. We had similar issues back with our data retention waiver request. At a point there was not dialogue anymore because we were going like these are the sections of the law and we have to comply with it and the requests you are making as ICANN we can't comply with it.

And this was back in 2013, somewhere in November, and we stopped talking to each other see there was zero progress. And after six months suddenly ICANN came back to us to those registrars, this was a collective process, and after six months suddenly ICANN came back like if you're going to change this text, and this and this and this and this and our lawyers looked at it and we got some progress again. And there was dialogue again. But we were going no, we are not going to sign off on this data retention waiver that you are offering us. It took quite a long time and it's still going on.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Theo. All right, Sam, right?

Sam Lanfranco: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: I've got Sam and then Michele in the queue.

Sam Lanfranco: Sam Lanfranco for the record. You would think that this data retention issue would be part of the DNA of ICANN that when it came up it would be like, you know, a cat seeing a fox and going we have to do something right now or we're going to get eaten. It doesn't – ICANN doesn't respond that way so I see no other way than saying, okay, it needs a – you know, it needs an officer responsible for this just to have a lightning rod, a place where you can just keep pounding away and pounding away and pounding away and saying, okay this is where the aggravation takes place until you respond, until you respond systemically, not one at a time and intermittently.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Sam. We've got Michele and then Stephanie. Just for fun, I'll put this out there, it seems pretty clear that people are interested in a privacy officer in ICANN. I think a lot of us went to a little bit about generating new officer positions inside of ICANN that are extremely expensive and cost our – essentially our users more money to fund these things and increases the bureaucracy within the organization. So it's probably something to think about as we go down that road, but perhaps there is alignment here where it's

something we want to push for. Michele and then Stephanie. And then I'd love more people.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. The underlying issue here is, I mean, based on, you know, the kind of experiences a lot of us have had as registrars trying to deal with ICANN around this, but also in a lot of the ongoing discussions like the RDS PDP, the thick Whois, RDAP, etcetera, etcetera. There is a lack of understanding of how privacy works. There's a lack of willingness to understand it.

There's also a – how can I put it – there seems to be almost as if it's something that they just find to be bothersome to them and they don't want understand it. So, I mean, our experience around the waiver process was incredibly frustrating because they, you know, they just didn't understand how privacy legislation is written and refused to understand. So we ended up in the position where we had to go back to our external legal counsel and go, right, this is what they're saying, this is how they're doing this. What can we give them as answer that is legally okay, just to kind of get it through the stupid hoops that they put in the – in the way?

And the reason why so many people get blocked on that is because ICANN will come back to you with some response that leaves your lawyer scratching his head going, who is this idiot? Like what on earth are they asking us? It makes no sense.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. I'm going to skip Stephanie and go right to Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Just a brief comment on the privacy official. I find it right startling because in Europe it's basically if a company of a certain size you must have a privacy officer at least in Finland, I think it's come from EU directive at the moment. And below a certain size then it's – has to be part time, but if you're big enough has to be basically a fully time person for that.

And ICANN is definitely big enough that it should have one. Despite that it will cost something – it may end up saving money in the long run and having less of this unnecessary time wasted, but trying to find out who's doing what and wasting it, so I think we should make an effort to push for ICANN to have a privacy officer like just maybe campaign it whenever you meet Göran or a Board member, why don't ICANN have – ask why doesn't ICANN have a privacy officer yet? Just get it done. Try to.

Graeme Bunton: I feel like that's something we can work towards. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think that requirement to have a privacy officer originated in Germany. Actually they had a requirement within companies and it spread. And it's good.

I would just strongly urge us to be very careful about who appoints that privacy officer and how they select it and how independent that person is. It's under the be careful what you ask for category because ICANN at present would pick what we call a privacy goalie, in other words, somebody who would deflect all of the privacy advocates' requests and life's tough enough, I don't need some much higher in authority than me guy sitting in the office directed by the Board saying oh well that's absolute you know what, you don't have to listen to her because we're fine and we're all legal.

As it is, the legal opinions that come out of ICANN Legal on privacy are not useful. I mean, they won't help you out in court, they're there to defend the existing status quo. So I don't – I'm not optimistic that we would have an independently appointed person, we'd have someone picked and it's going to be somebody who toes the party line.

So that brings up the broader question about appointments. I mean, I haven't checked on this new complaints officer, but I've heard quite a lot of grumbling that how independent is that person? You know, how – and I think these

officers have to be independent. ICANN is basically replacing as a multistakeholder organization, a governmental process.

And in governments, there are ways of having independent parliamentary officers that are not under the Justice Department's thumb or the Treasury Department's thumb. I don't think ICANN has developed that. We certainly don't – I can't think of an example. And for the privacy officer, it'd better be independent. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Stephanie. I've got Darcy in the queue. Darcy.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks. Darcy Southwell. And I think in line with all of that, I think the other challenge is even if they did go out and find someone who was very independent and served as a true privacy officer, they're going to meet a lot of a resistance because it – this is a fundamental shift in thinking for ICANN in general.

We talked about this a little bit yesterday, I was talking with some folks, and, you know, it's funny, we all come from different communities and we were all – we've all seen the same thing, there's a fundamental shift in the totality of the thinking that has to happen. And one privacy officer, even if they're very focused on that global privacy concept, is not going to make that shift – you know, make it happen on its own.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Darcy. So I think there's some pretty good agreement around the room on pushing forward with that sort of thing. And with the privacy officer, the complaints officer by the way, is Krista Papac, who is – who was GDD staff. She is not, as far as I know, I don't know how they've structured that role within the ICANN corporate, but she's pretty integrated in the rest or at least has been in the rest of ICANN operations, at least for contracted parties.

We've got about 20 minutes left. I think we've sort of beaten that topic around quite a bit. Michele has got his hand up again. Can you do it in 10 seconds?

Michele Neylon: I can try. I was just going to say is there something that the NCSG wants us to know about since we've been the ones doing all the talking. Which isn't privacy-related preferably.

Graeme Bunton: Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: I am not a one-trick pony, Michele. Stephanie Perrin for the record. We recently had a – what the heck was it called – an intercessional in Iceland. Sadly I had to tune in via remote. But that was an attempt for the Non Contracted Party House to have a little kumbaya moment.

And I'm wondering how you people feel about GNSO restructuring? Because this is clearly on the agenda of our colleagues in the commercial side of the house. And there is another GNSO review coming up in a few years, we're all enjoying the ALAC one right now on the noncommercial side of the house and taking valuable lessons from it. But looming behind the next GNSO review is the restructuring that the – that our colleagues are going to want to push again.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Stephanie. I might throw that more onto my – Darcy who participates in that. But I think broadly we have pretty deep concerns about GNSO restructuring because we have contracts with ICANN and between us and the Registries, within the structure of the GNSO, you know, we have some power to control what becomes part of our contracts or not. And that's important to us and obviously opening that up for change has deep fundamental existential risks. Darcy.

Darcy Southwell: Thanks. This is Darcy Southwell. Yes, during the implementation – the drafting bylaws group that's been working and we're meeting later this week, there was a huge push from the CSG to restructure whether – restructuring the total GNSO or restructuring how the Council operates was a hot topic. I

think it's concerning for so many reasons, for us obviously as a contracted party, that's a critical problem for us.

I don't know how much farther that conversation went in the intercessional, so be interesting maybe to hear a little bit more about that as far as detail. But I know it's starting to swirl it feels like and we need to be on top of that.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie. Just in order not for me to talk again maybe we should have a little chat and discuss what's going on.

Graeme Bunton: Let's do Tapani and then Sam.

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes, just – about from the intercessional, we did not actually talk all that much about the restructuring, but we had a meeting about that with the CSG in Hyderabad, some – let's say their initiative there was basically (unintelligible) well let's put it perhaps it a bit embarrassing to the certain CSG people proposing that so it has not been – nothing concrete and open about that is going on at the moment, but they are – that current – that maybe having something that's nothing in the open that I know. But I know that some people still want it and may come up with some new proposals at some point, but in the intercessional, nothing concrete about that took place.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. Sam Lanfranco for the record. And I'll just – I'll share with you something that's mainly from my end of NCSG, NPOC, and that's that all of this sort of as members of NCSG, we basically represent the interest of the non-commercial stakeholders. We don't represent the non-commercial stakeholders because that's a huge population out there, organizations on my side, and they are completely in the dark as to what we're doing.

And the kind of outreach and education that goes on now is completely, well, it's well meaning and inadequate. It can't all be mounted from here anyhow, but what is mounted from here pretty much is poorly constructed in terms of

the reality of the civil society, NGO, not for profit community groups that exist in most of the world in particular in the developing areas of the world.

So how this multistakeholder model on the NCSG side, those legs on the stool are very thin and very fragile. And as Internet governance becomes really important, ICANN meets in Hyderabad and Cashmere is closed down, I mean, the Indian government is closed down, the Internet and the cell phones, except for the government cell phones to Cashmere while we're there, and, you know, we can't say a thing about this. And the groups that are there are going, they're waiting their hands, we can't hear them.

So there's this whole massive portion of the multistakeholder community that basically isn't here except for a handful of people who address the issues of that community but can't in any real way represent that community. So that's a concern on our side. And with a GNSO review and so forth, if Michele on the margins sometimes, Michele looks like Mt. Everest from where we are.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, that's interesting context. Anyone else on the queue on this topic? No? Okay, oh, Stephanie. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. And I'm sorry I'm talking so much. And how come Michele never has to apologize for talking so much?

Graeme Bunton: He did.

Stephanie Perrin: Did he? But that was gratuitous. Anyway, on the subject of what's coming in a potential discussion of restructuring, as Tapani said, there's nothing on the surface but it goes underground like, you know, buried barrels of mercury, it's leaking out somewhere. And my own view is very much like yours, not only are our interest rather closely aligned to the guys who actually deal with customers, but I don't feel the pointy end of any of the policy stuff or the costs hitting the commercial folks as much as they're going to hit the end users and the contracted parties.

So all of the things that I want in privacy are going to cost money, I'm very well aware of that. And I'd like to know who's going to pay. And when I hear IP guys say well, you know, why hasn't the data protection guys enforced? Well, it's not that particular guy who's accessing the data who's going to be dragged into court to pay millions of euros to fight Supreme Court cases. You know?

So I think there is an alliance there, there is a very grave risk because the non-commercial folks are fundamentally divided in what we conceive of as our role here in ICANN. Like for me what Sam has just described is being done at WISIS and I'm not really sure I'd rather see more effort go into WISIS and get some more money for that than import it into ICANN because I see ICANN as the hard work of policy development in this area and a lot of the outreach we do does not bring people who are either ready or, you know, able to do the hard work of policy development and increasing the outreach doesn't help us, it increases the risk because a lot of the folks who aren't aware of the deep politics can be seduced by travel kibble seats and money.

And that's going to topple the balance that is currently in place at the GNSO. So I guess that's a pretty blunt statement that you guys ought to care about what happens in our side of the house deeply. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks. And that's a good reminder, Stephanie, to make sure we do that. Is that you wanting in the queue again, Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Yes, I just want to add, yes, the issue in terms of our constituencies is not going to be solved within ICANN. We're having to do that work on the outside. So I just wanted to make it clear that along with Stephanie, I don't think we should import that task into ICANN. ICANN does a little bit of it, does it very badly, but it's the bigger - it's another elephant in another room, but it's a big elephant. And it's one that has to be addressed elsewhere.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. Thank you. And I think that's perhaps a problem that registrars don't appreciate quite so much because for the most part the people who are active in our space are members of our constituency. There are certainly – I think there's some 2000-odd accredited registrars but the actual meaningfully separate registrars is probably around a couple hundred.

Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just on that, it's Michele for the record. The members of the Registrar Stakeholder Group account for something like 90% of domain registrations globally or something like that. I mean, if you have most of the biggest registrars are members. So ones between Go Daddy, and Tucows, because now Tucows are like, you know, ridiculously big, which means that Graeme has a much bigger budget to be buying us all beers later. Thanks, Graeme.

Between those two – between two or three or those companies they control the bulk of domain registrations. There are one or two registrars who are quite big who aren't members but they're in the minority.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Just a reminder that I'm in policy, not in sales.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: And what about this thing about Canadians being nice?

Graeme Bunton: Not in that way. Nice doesn't sign my expense checks. Right, eight minutes left. I think we've had some good discussion. Briefly, very briefly, there is, again, a subset of registrars that are deeply concerned about privacy and proxy. I know there are a number of members from your house inside that IRT, there is a working session this afternoon in that IRT for those involved. Correct, I'm pretty sure?

And we're already conflicted all over the place so there will be people in that and there won't be. But and I'm not sure we have the time now for this discussion, but we should both of our houses should be aware that they're, you know, the public safety working group is working on a framework. I'm not even sure what the mechanism is going to be for integrating that framework inside the IRT if it comes out and that feels like policy then it should have been done inside the PDP, not the IRT.

So there's going to be some pretty serious questions coming inside that IRT how to accommodate what the public safety and GAC are up to and their concerns. So I want to put that on sort of everybody's radar that that's happening, if you're – care about privacy and proxy it might be interesting to attend that session and – but let's make sure that we are working together where we are aligned, and there's not actually uniform alignment on this issue in registrars, but I think there is a fair amount of common ground.

Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry to talk again. Stephanie Perrin. But I think I'm kind of alone in having signed up for the implementation, the PPSAI implementation. And I notice that it's frequently in conflict with other groups I'm on like Council and the PDP, the RDS PDP which quite frankly I feel I can't miss a meeting and I think I've only missed one.

So if there's something – if that thing surfaces I will have deep concerns. I've been screaming about doing policy and the implementation and the – I realize that we had a compromise we had to come up with at the last minute, and kudos to you guys for negotiating it. But, you know, how the heck do we incorporate a policy decision in an implementation in a way that works?

So I'm waiting for that submarine to surface. And if I'm not there at the meeting, you're there, please call me, reach out because I can probably skip an RDS meeting, it would feel good for a change. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: My understanding is that RDS meetings are infinite.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. And painful.

Graeme Bunton: And so probably you can skip one or two. Do we have any other business? We've got about five minutes left. I see Michele's hand. I feel like we're hearing lots from – does anybody else have stuff they want to weigh in on? No? Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele again. Graeme, you did mention this very, very briefly earlier on but I don't think it was picked up on, the crossfield validation. The NCSG you guys really need to be aware of this, do I need to explain – I probably need to explain it. Okay.

So there is a contractual – there's a set of contractual clauses within the 2013 contract, which are conditional on a couple of things, so they're not currently active. Essentially this is a bit of compromise language because there was no way we would agree to it when we were negotiating that contract but there was no way that ICANN would let us have a contract without including it.

And essentially this is all around – moving towards using the Whois in some ways as a kind of way of verifying people's identities. Sorry, I'm going full black helicopter by the way, just so we're clear. The crossfield validation stuff would be the idea that you would check to see that the town exists in the country, that the street exists in the town, that the number of the building exists on the street.

Which is all fine and dandy in a kind of I can't think of any reason why this is a bad thing sort of way except for the fact that nobody has a database with this information, nobody. And I mean that. There is not a single entity out there that has a comprehensive database that covers all of it. And secondly, the cost of actually doing this.

So for example, I live in what would be considered a first world country, you may have heard of it. And for me to actually verify with my own bloody government that I have the right to vote in the next election, I have an online tool I can use, but because of the way that they record my address, I can never, ever, ever validate that I have a vote. Yet I always get one which I find hilarious.

Trying to deliver, you know, putting in your address for delivery information, you know, you have no way of knowing what way they've recorded the address. And that's for a first world country.

When it goes to developing countries, developing economies, then you have – it becomes a total and utter mess. And I won't even mention countries where there's more than one in script.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Yes, it's a good point that the crossfield is going to impact developing world much harder than Europe and North America for the most part. And we would be excluding people from essentially registering domain names and that would be super bad. We should have tackled this topic a long time ago, we have two minutes left and I saw a bunch of hands. I think I saw one from Pam and we haven't heard from yet. So let's hear.

Pam Little: Hi, everyone. My name is Pam Little. I am here representing Alibaba for the registrar for the first time. And obviously thank you, I'm new to the group and new to this session so I'm here on learning mode and listening mode. We hope to be able to contribute to the discussion in a much more meaningful way in the future especially on privacy, data protection, obviously as Alibaba is becoming a global operation and these topics and issues will impact our business and our operations in a great deal so we are very interested in those topics and will be engaged in the discussion going forward.

That wasn't the point of my raising the hand was about the crossfield data validation, I was just wondering, because I wasn't around in 2013 when this 2013 RAA came out, what was – just trying to understand the rationale for having to validate a postal address in the digital age when we don't - we hardly use snail mail anymore. So I just like to understand that because we...

Michele Neylon: We don't know the rationale either. You're asking the wrong people.

Graeme Bunton: My understanding is it came from law enforcement. I will say very briefly, because we're just about out of time, that there seems to be a conflation amongst many that the – the data in Whois, the registrant information is somehow also transactional information, that the people who pay for or purchase the domain are necessarily the information that goes into Whois, and that is not the case. And I'm speaking personally here as Tucows, that's not the case all the time.

And so we need to be very careful as people say, like look, Amazon and Google and whoever can verify who's transacting, well that's not the point. We're not talking about transactions; we're talking about Whois data. They're very different things.

I saw other hands but it's now 10:30 and people have other places to be. And first I will say we were – we'd asked for Chinese translation of this session as part of that reaching out and having more interaction there and that hasn't happened so we'll see if we can get a translation of the transcript. I see Tapani, one last thing, but thank you, guys for joining us, very much today. I think that was some good discussion and hopefully we'll do more of this in the future.

Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I just wanted to say the thank you for inviting us. This has been useful, I think, and we should try to make this a tradition, keep doing this. So maybe in Johannesburg. Again thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Yes, please. Thank you. All right, thank you everybody for coming. We'll end this session now.

END