

**ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO – Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) – RSP Discussion Group
Monday, 30 October 2017 10:30 GST**

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

On page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Stephane Van Gelder: Welcome everyone. This is Stephane Van Gelder, and this is a meeting of the Registry Service Provider Discussion Group in that room. God knows what else will happen. And I'm told the meeting has to be recorded, so can we start the recording please?

Good. We're good to go. So, welcome everyone. My name is Stephane Van Gelder again, for the record, and we look forward to having a productive hour and a half, on the topic of registry service providers, and work that we are doing, we being the Registries Stakeholder Group, to look at some of these issues, and try and provide some meaningful output, basically for the benefit of the whole community.

But also trying to key-in to some of the work that's happening at GNSO PDP working group, called the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, of which we have one of the coaches here, Jeff. So, I'll be tying that into what we're doing. Before we start getting into the actual Work Tracks themselves, I just thought it would be useful to give a little reminder of how we got here, and what the group's about.

I've just started doing that, but I will say that this group was created as an informal discussion group by the Registry Stakeholder Group. It has, at the previous meeting, the group decided to welcome anyone from the Registrars Stakeholder Group that wished to participate as well. The group currently is not community wide group, in terms of being open to everyone because we're trying to keep it focused on contracted party issues.

We're not trying to exclude anyone, but this is basically a group that's working on operational issues, and trying to give guidance to the community and stuff – ICANN stuff on registry, and registrar issues. The reason the group was started, was basically two-fold. One, there was an understanding on the registry side, that there were community discussions on topics, such as RSPs, and their place in any new gTLD process, should there be – should the RSP.

The issue of RSP is being handled differently from the way it has been. Up until now, RSPs have no formal existence under ICANN contracts. So, as part of the new gTLD program, apart from being mentioned as obviously entities that exist, but there is no formal contract, for example, between ICANN and RSPs in the same way, as there are between ICANN, and Registries, or Registrars.

So, we had understood that this was a community wide discussion that had been started, and we felt it important for the – certainly a registry level, for the group to have quite substantive input into that discussion, obviously, is, one would assume, the parties that are most directly affected by this type of decision, or can have a direct input, into this type of discussion.

The other factor that played into the creation of this group, as we started talking about it, was that we realized, in particular talking to ICANN staff as well, that there were a number of operational issues that needed to be looked at probably more carefully. And as we started working on this group, we had

a very productive exchange with ICANN staff, and I'll thank them again publically here for being open to that discussion, and having it with us, and providing data as well, which has been very useful.

But in that discussion, we realized there were a number of operational issues that we wanted to look at. Bringing all that together, the group came up with six Work Tracks, and I'll just read them out so that everyone's on the same page, but most people in this room, I would expect, already know them.

Number one was a more secure, stable, and resilient RSP operation. So, we're very much in the operational issues that I've just discussed. This was blended in with number two, which was a more streamlined process associated with changing RSPs. Number three was transition from technical testing, to an ongoing monitoring solution.

Number four was improved services by creating the option for direct communication, between ICANN, and RSPs. Number five is reducing the financial administrative burdens for the Registry operator. And the last one, enhancing the security, and stability of the DNS. So, those are the six Work Tracks that this group has started working on.

The group regularly produces updates on the work that it's doing. That's the latest one, I'm afraid it's not very – it's better now, but that's the latest update that we produced after our last meeting. And as part of that work, and working on those Work Tracks, we kind of – some people volunteered, others were volunteered, but we had a few people step up and become Work Tracks leaders.

And first thing that I'd like to do, now, as part of the work, is just turn over to them, and ask them to give us both an update on their work, and if there's any need for discussion that can help – face-to-face discussion that can help that work (getting) to some output that we want to provide, then that would be useful as well.

And before handing the mic over, just to conclude with saying that, at our last meeting, it's a bit further down on the status update, you can't see it up on the screen, but at the last meeting we had a discussion with Jeff on when would it be useful for this group to provide input for the SubPro Working Group on – at what we're doing, as it pertains to some of the stuff that they're looking at.

And Jeff very helpfully responded, saying that that would be around the end of the year would be the absolute last deadline that we should work to. So, I suggested that we look at December 15th, mid December, for final output from this group. I'm hoping that we can get to that point.

And one of the things that I may suggest later on, but just to give you a heads up on that, is that whatever – we don't need to finish all Work Tracks to produce a – feedback and input into the SubPro, and maybe the Stakeholder Group.

One of the things we'll look at later on the agenda, is how we decide what output we want to produce, how we ratify it as a group, and what do we do with it once we've produced some output, i.e. do we send it back to the Stakeholder Group, and say this is what we've done, would you like us to communicate this on your behalf to the SubPro Working Group.

We may not want to take that decision upon ourselves. As a discussion group, we may want to prefer to have it ratified as it were, by the full SG. So, those are some of the questions that we're going to look at, but right now I'd like to turn over to the Work Track leaders, and, Sara, can I start with you?

Sarah Langstone: Sure, thanks, Stephen. I'll give an overview, and then see where we want to take it from there. So, I volunteer to facilitate discussion around whether or not the introduction of an RSP pre-certification program, or accreditation program, whichever you call it, could create a more secure, stable, and resilient RSP operation.

We started a draft on this, and we circulated it. Now the draft started off in Google Docs, (hands up), I'm not familiar with Google Docs, so I've now gone back to using good old fashioned Word, just because I felt – I was beginning to worry that I was deleting comments in error. So, if I've missed anyone's feedback whilst I've transitioned over, let me know and I'll make sure that your feedback is reflected in the new version.

So, the draft starts by providing some background information on RSPs, and the fact that when they're not providing RSP services for their own TLDs, their independent contractors that sit outside of the Registry-operated organization, and they provide services around the five critical functions of a TLD; notably DNS, DNS sect, who is our DDS, EPP, and data escrow.

Now we make a point of calling out that sometimes a registry operator might select two RSPs, perhaps one for EPP, for example, and another for DNS, and it talks about the three mechanisms in place today, to ensure that RSP operations are indeed secure, stable, and resilient.

So, we have pre-delegation testing, obviously competed prior to delegation; we've got emergency back end operators, which will kind of take over the running of a TLD temporarily as it doesn't meet SLAs; and we've also got ongoing monitoring services. So, then we go on to say that despite having these mechanisms in place, based on the data that ICANN provided to the group, at the time, there were at least 32 cases where at gTLD, had reached one of the emergency thresholds. Now at that time, 16 were triggered by DNS failures, and DNS sect failures, and the remaining 16 were triggered by failures in the RDDS service.

And actually, there's an action in the document for me to ask ICANN for some more information, about some of the data that they provided, and that's highlighted in the draft. The draft then goes on to make some recommendations about how security, and stability can be improved with

some relatively simple refinements, instead of the creation of an entirely new program.

Now the scope of the recommendation includes RSP operations for the new gTLDs that were established through the 2012 application round, and the ongoing operation of these TLDs, and the RSPs that support them. As Stephane points out, Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group is also discussing this, and we would hope that the output of this would be discussed as part of those discussions too.

So, we make a number of recommendations, so far, from the feedback from all of you that have participated so far. And to summarize it, I just thought I'd go through that. First of all, the testing that was conducted during the pre-delegation test phase, wasn't successful in showing that the five critical functions operate within minimum requirements, and we do think the activity should be directed to improve the levels of testing.

Examples of improvements would be testing for positive success conditions around DNS management, around DNS sec operations, and RDDS, and IPV6 because that's where the ICANN data showed us that there were problems. There's also an opportunity to introduce post-delegation testing, to include stress tests, and emergency disaster tests too. We also recommend that the results of ICANN's monitoring should be transparent to the registry operator, and instances of SLA failure should be treated ubiquitously without discrimination.

There's also a request to see historical monitoring reports that show representations of up time, rather than just incident reporting. Secondly, you know, real frankly, if a (barrow) isn't going to be use because it's more timely to work with an RO, then put the TLD into an – a (barrow), then we kind of wonder what the point is of having it. It appears to be redundant.

There was some suggestion about using an emergency, an independent DNS provider, in case of registry transition too maintain DNS functions. Which, I'm imagining, Rubens will also feed into your Work Track too, around the streamlined process associated with changing RSPs, which kind of also bleeds into this too.

So, on the whole, from the feed back that we've got to far, the group's not confident that the introduction of a RSP pre-approval program, would create any real benefit to the security, and stability, and improve – but improvements to testing, including the pre-delegation test. Perhaps introducing post-delegation tests that look at different conditions and enhance monitoring, that that actually may be more beneficial and increase security, stability, and resiliency.

It's worth pointing out that the feedback that we've got so far, is that the group feels strongly that if this program does exist, a contract shouldn't exist between the RSP, and ICANN. RSPs are independent contractors, there's definitely a case to say that the RSP and ICANN should have some kind of permission to be able to communicate with each other to resolve technical issues, but we feel that that could be resolved by something as simple as just a permission from the registry operator to ICANN, do to so. We believe that the registry operator, not the RSP, should be accountable to ICANN for the performance of their TLD.

While it might be necessary to strengthen ICANN's compliance function, or to improve the flow of information between ICANN's SLA monitoring staff, it's compliance staff to respond to SLA failures more quickly, we just think that introducing a more formal relationship between a RSP and ICANN, is only going to create additional operational burdens, and costs, and possibly not deliver any meaningful improvements to performance against SLAs.

Now some of the group believes that – most of the group believes that SLA transgression should not be published, and that they should remain

anonymous. But that are some in the group that believe that if a RSP program were to exist, there should be an allowance for grandfathering in existing RSPs into the program without further testing.

And this is where this whole anonymity thing, and the grandfathering in thing, kind of gets a little bit tricky. Because if you decide that you're (all) for grandfathering in a RSP provider, is only somebody that's had no transgressions, for example, then anonymity is just going to be waived by default.

So, there were suggestions about how this could be mitigated, for example, if there were post-delegation RSP tests, or RO tests, I guess, as well as pre-delegation tests, that would include stress testing, that would include emergency disaster testing. And the thing is, no one's passed those yet, perhaps the grandfathering concept kind of could become somewhat moot, but that's up for debate. And finally, we wanted to recommend that there was more transparent reporting about incidents, including root cause analysis. We wanted to know that all incidents are treated in the same manner, that it's equitable across registry operators under RSPs, and that there's no discrimination.

I'll give you an example of that, and if a (barrow) continues to exist and it isn't use for whatever reason, we really want details of why it wasn't used. Because if it continues to exist, and then it does get used in the future, but it wasn't used in the past for a similar incident, that could be pressed as being discriminatory, and we would want to avoid that.

So, honestly, that's where we are so far, I mean, thanks very much to everyone that has provided feedback. We really want to hear more about what this group thinks. I posted the most current version out to discussion group this morning. I'm here until Friday morning.

If anybody thinks it's a good idea for a group of interested parties to meet whilst we're here, we – I've got a room – we've got a room that we can use to kind of get us together.

If you want to speak to me individually to feed your comments back into this document, please just reach out to me I'll be happy to do that too. I'd really encourage everyone to do that to make it as inclusive as possible. I mean, that's really where we are today, Stephane.

Stephane Van Gelder: Sara, thanks very much for both the excellent leadership on this, and the depth of work. I'm sure everyone understood, I don't know if I said so, or if you said so, that we blended in – that work blends in the first two Work Tracks, so, (Maxim), I also want to give you an opportunity to speak if you want to add anything. But two questions if I may, the first is, do you feel that – I haven't had time to look at the latest version that you sent this morning, but do you feel that we're now at a stage where you're confident that you can provide this as output from the group, that there's consensus in the group that we can move ahead and send this to either the SG, or...

Sarah Langstone: Not yet.

Stephane Van Gelder: ... someone else, or does this still need work?

Sarah Langstone: It does still need work.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay.

Sarah Langstone: So, we haven't reached consensus on some of the trickier areas. Some of the feedback that's been included more recently, not all of the members have had a chance to review at this stage, which is why I've really encouraged, whilst we're all here. I know time is precious, but maybe if we get together interested parties in a smaller group, and try and thrash it out, then I think that we would be in a position to do that, Stephane.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Sara, that's perfect. Maxim, do you want to say a few words, and then maybe open it up for comments and discussion on both of your Work Tracks?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, for the record. The work stream two is about operational concerns. You've got basically simplification, and the – yes. If we change something, there should be a reason for that, or at least justification. So, the work – if our work stream integrated into the document, which Sara prepared this morning, actually we were trying to combine it, and I hope we managed to lead to something great. The main ideas were that the current RSPs will also act as registries. They actually had like one-year-long test, I'd say, and – yes, because they're performing all the necessary functions, and they provide necessary services.

So, most probably they kept (them a lot) going to initial pool of – yes, RSPs of the next generation. The – during our exchange with (Francisco), it was an idea of like making tweaks (unintelligible), if I'm not mistaken.

And the document suggests that to understand if it's a good idea, or not, we need to quantify it somehow, and the way is to understand how many minutes, I'd say, were of particular services – particular TLDs were out-of-service by week, and how many were like okay.

And the issue is in registry agreement, there is only – there are only two options. One is your compliance, rather you're finished by a (barrow), that's it. So, saying like wow it was 20,000 (officially) reached it's (bet). No, it's perfectly fine under the contract obligations (operation) of registry.

And I suggest other members of Registry Group to look through the text, because some edits were made with – might need further clarification, and, I'd say, we would have something to do with the text, I mean, it should be logically structured the way that all members of Registry Group can agree

with this. So, we reach consensus or show the opinions, minor opinions – yes, thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Maxim. So, let's open it up to discussion at this point. I saw hands somewhere.

Crystal Ondo: Thanks, Stephane. I'm Crystal Ondo, Donuts. I'm a little late to this party, I think, I'm not on the list, or maybe I was just recently added, but I appreciate all the work that's gone into this. It sounds like (Sara's) done a lot of great work, but honestly, Donuts would not support the majority of what she said. So, there – we should meet, we should definitely talk about it.

Sarah Langstone: Yes.

Crystal Ondo: We've moved – I also disagree to combine one, and two. We've moved a bunch of TLDs, and the operational streamlining is definitely different than whether a certification program helps with the secure, stable, and resilient RSP program. So, there's definitely not consensus here, at least based on what I've heard so far.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay, thanks.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes. I think it's too late to change the way the group's working on the Work Tracks, but obviously not too late to comment on the documents. (Jonathan), were you next?

Jonathan Robinson: No.

Stephane Van Gelder: Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon. I actually am technically a member of the group, but have been a little preoccupied with another issue as of late. Maxim, I

have a question about number two, and I apologize because I suspect I may have missed this. Have we requested any data from ICANN, in terms of how many registry – how many contracts have been the subject of changes to the RSP, what was the kind of the extreme in terms of longest transition time, shortest transition time, number of names under management, that type of thing? And if not, is that something that the group has talked about doing?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. At the moment, the transition is just an internal process within ICANN formally, because it's for ICANN to decide how to make the transition, what's assessed, (etc.). And I see all this work has, like, attempt to simply the process, and, yes, for both parties. I'd say, for you, the registry in old state, and the new state because they're going to be different.

The bureaucratic part stays the same, but the technical part, operational part, is changing. And we haven't requested this information yet, and the – since the (broadest) itself it's custom tailored, it's basically not standard. So, I'm not sure how to compare the fastest, and – yes, longest transitions because the transition itself takes a few hours.

If you not succeed with it, most probably you see a (barrow) and the end of your contract. But the preparation work, it's months, and it could be due – yes, it's due to difference in organizations because you have one (be can't) registry, which has different technological ideas, different business ideas, and another.

And at the best, what, you know, the same is the data, and even the form of the data is different. So, yes, we can check how we take – took, and I think we should request this kind of information from ICANN. I'm not sure if it's secret if, if (anonymous), for example, it doesn't hurt to see that, yes, company A did this in six weeks, and company B did this in six months. But we will see the like, numbers.

Kristina Rosette: And to be clear, I was not suggesting that we should ask ICANN to identify for us, which registry operators have changed, and what the former back end was, the gaining, and losing.

I'm just talking more generally, but perhaps, and I'll get at the end of the queue, but I had misunderstood. I had – having gone through the process, I was under the impression we were talking about kind of the material subcontracting assignment process, but never mind.

Maxim Alzoba: It is both legal part, and operational, and technological. It's three part of an equation.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. I've got (Jonathan), and Donna.

Jonathan Robinson: Hey, (Donna), were you going to respond directly to Maxim's point? So, why don't you do that because I wanted to actually just come back to where Crystal was on – previously on that. So, I'll lead back off to you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, (Jonathan). Donna Austin, from (unintelligible). So, Kristina, to your point, I think I've got point number five on this, which is trying to do something about financial administrative burdens on the RSPs. So, I don't have my notes with me, but I've had a conversation with (Francisco), and also (Winnie).

(Winnie) is – has informed me that they're actually working through a process to streamline, the material contacting as part of the exercise they're doing with the JDD portal, or something. So, they're trying to provide some efficiencies within that process. So, that's underway.

She couldn't tell me how long it's going to take, but that – and what they're trying to do within that is provide some better timeline, as to how long all of this will take. And, I think, (Francisco) is here, I don't think they're keeping stats at the moment – oh, sorry, (Francisco).

I don't think they're actually keeping stats at the moment, about how many of these have been through in a, you know, kind of comprehensive way, but I think it's over a hundred, or, I don't know. There's been quite a few. But some of it is about something on RSP, and some of it is other material contracting things.

So, they're almost mushed in together. In terms of the – and I also had a conversation with Crystal, so I think two and five are very much linked, and I haven't had a chance to write my stuff up yet. With the financial burden, so, ICANN is not publishing – they don't publish what the fees are related to a swap, but it is, I think, if you're doing one it's in the order of four and a half thousand.

And I don't know if people remember, but Crystal – (Krista) did, as part of the regional workshop she did very early in the piece, there was a table, if you are a known to ICANN, then it should be a reduced rate, but if you are not known, it's going to be a bigger fee.

So, one example of a swap to a new provider, I think, was (dot kiwi) and, Sara, was a new back end provider for them, and that process to swap from a known RSP to an unknown RSP in terms of the new (GDD) program, that can take anywhere from 12 to 24 weeks, and that is the longest.

So, that's the variable. I'm not sure what the turnaround is on a, you know, a more straightforward arrangement, but if you're going to an unknown RSP, then that's the kind of lead time you're looking at. So, that's some of the research I've done, I haven't had an opportunity to put it down on paper, but I say two and five is, you know, linked.

Stephane Van Gelder: You want to come back on this? (Just go ahead).

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. If interested in those numbers, they were in materials of Amsterdam JD Summit, and if you can not find it just e-mail me.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, and I encourage, Francisco, if you want to come in at any time, please do to. (Jonathan)?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I supposed – a couple, I mean, I just wanted to back track on a few things. I mean, (Sarah's), obviously done some work to create the kind of straw-man type document, get people working on that. And I think it's important to recognize whoever – anyone is in the room that, I mean, they were – if edit's been coming in, in sequence, including over night last night.

So, as Sara explained, I mean, this document I don't think has the buy-in of any of us yet. So, to be clear, it's not that, and so – and – but I think you've got that, Stephane, it's not in the state where it's ready to be transmitted. With that said, there's quite a lot of substance in there that to – work with. So, I think that's (level sets), and I think you're about the origins of it.

I mean, clearly there were these two origins, one was the drive from ICANN to say, you know, we're got some concerns about ongoing performance, how about a RSP program, and then there's the work that's going on in the Subsequent Procedures Group, where – which had some (unintelligible) mentions of that in the chart, and at that point, that's the genesis of this group.

We stepped in and said, hang on, there's a lot of discussion about what Registries are doing, the Registry should come together with the relevant expertise, knowledge, and experience to say actually what are we thinking, and feed that expertise on those recommendations back to staff, and then get in the dialogue with staff over that, and secondly into the Subsequent Procedures.

So, that's the sort of where we are, and, I guess, Crystal, that – the invitation with Sara is great, that we can talk one-to-one with you, and try and get into a

huddle, but it would be great, here, if you could spell out a little bit more any concerns.

Because one is clearly about, you know, trying to make sure that any ongoing technical testing or in a – that is more effectively done, or however that's managed than the other is. So, it'd be great if any objections or concerns you've got – I don't know if you're able to articulate those enough it's too early to say, if you're just...

Crystal Ondo: I haven't reviewed the documents...

Jonathan Robinson: ... (sort of flagging) – yes.

Crystal Ondo: ... so I'm not familiar.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, yes, yes. That's what I thought you might say, but if it would be – so we may need, you know, we may need more kind of meeting time to discuss, and bring you, and Kristina, and others in because that's one thing we've all struggled with, again, just to put more context on it, we've all had other things going on.

So, this is kind of taking a second, or third, priority even though it's important, and it's frustrated Stephane in his roll as chair, and I think we've got to kind of pull together a bit now, because there's clearly – there's a sort of clock ticking on the Subsequent Procedures, staff wants some help with, you know, we say we don't want in the RSP program, but we have put some great ideas – yes, but what are they.

So, it's kind of up to us to now put up or shut up, and it would be great if, and I include myself in this, I know I kind of, you know, lecture to anyone else, we've all struggled with, like I say, other priorities. That's my two cents worth I suppose then, thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, thanks. I think that's very useful for you to have said that, that the – it has been frustrating at times, and I don't think that there's a problem anyone coming in at a later stage and saying, right, we'd like to have a look at this, but there is a deadline that we want to get to, and I don't think it would be helpful to restart the whole process at this stage, because people that haven't been involved before, are coming in now and saying we'd like to be involved.

That being said, you know, to work into what (Jonathan's) just said, and add that what I said before, this really is an informal discussion group, that's all it is. So, anything that we produce is informal, is lined to help the Stakeholder Group's own thinking in these areas of work.

As you can see from reports by three of the work team leaders so far, Maxim, Donna, and Sara, there has been a lot of work that's already being put into this. So, my hope, as Chair of this group, would be that we are able to provide – to coalesce and provide some output at some stage, probably sooner rather than later, at least to the Stakeholder Group, and then for the Stakeholder Group as a whole to decide what to do with it, that's fine. Jeff, I see you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. The question I have really is not about the document, as I've been participating with Sara, and I put some comments in there, and a lot of them have been addressed and going through that.

I'm still a little confused as to the relationship between this paper, and the RSP program as discussed by the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, and that's track one, and I know, (Sara's) behind me – (Sara Bockey), and (Dave Chan) from ICANN staff.

The rationale for the RSP program in that discussion, is – or to the RSP program in that discussion, is really referring to basically taking whatever evaluation we decide is appropriate for new gTLD's, whether that's pre-

testing, post-testing, no testing, whatever it is, that we take that and have that portion of the evaluation prior, to the opening up of applications from everybody else.

So, it's a timing issue. The rationale is now because it creates a more secure internet, or secure stable internet. So, it's a good discussion as to whether it makes it more secure or not, but it doesn't really matter whether it makes it more secure or not, as long as it doesn't negatively impact security, and stability.

But the real discussion is, for the Subsequent Procedures, is having that process before we receive applications to enable those front end registry operators that want to apply, to know in advance which registry service providers have passed that testing, or have passed the evaluation criteria.

That's it. It's really a timing issue, it has nothing to do with creating a more stability, security, resilient, whatever environment. So, I don't – other than the paragraph on the contract, which does relate to the work, it's whether there should be some sort of agreement. Other than that, I'm not sure I'd necessarily see the tie between this work, and the program itself, at least the program as it's now being worked on with Work Track one, of the Subsequent Procedures. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jeff. Donna, and Sara?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jeff. Donna Austin from Neustar. So, this is how I see it. With the Subsequent Procedures work, we're, as you say, we're working on whether some kind of preapproval process for RSPs is the path forward. Within this group, we're trying to address some of the concerns that were raised by (Francisco) about how to, you know, rather than an RSP program, or some kind of accreditation, as the mechanism for secures – well, for security, and stability as it relates to RSP operations.

What other mechanisms do we have to ensure that? And I think one of the things that Rubens has brought up, and is part of this is monitoring, right? So, monitoring of the RSP, and the way that I see that fitting into the Work Track one stuff, is that we have – I expect that we're going to have a discussion about grandfathering.

So, does every RSP have to do that pre-testing before they can, you know, be identified as a provider for any subsequent round? If we can establish, as part of this group, that mechanism for monitoring that says that the RSPs are safe, and that they are operating in, you know, recently well in terms of the registry agreement. Then if they, you know, the monitoring has been going on since 2012 now since the delegation of the TLD started, if we can agree that, you know, monitoring is the path forward that would, to some extent, allow us to get rid of PTD, but to link the monitoring back to the Work Track stuff, if (Francisco) can say that, you know, all the RSPs currently operating have been, you know, a hundred percent compliant over a 12-month period, then that should be the mechanism to allow them to be the RSP without going through any preapproval process in the new gTLD.

So, that provides the – if we get into a conversation at grandfathering, which I think we will, this hopefully will be what we can turn to and say, well we're actually addressing that, and we think we've got the answer to that.

So, if an RSP, through the monitoring that ICANN is doing, has, you know, been on a good path for the last 12 months, then they should be grandfathered in, and wouldn't have to go through that pre-approval process. So, that's where I see the connection.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry. Just to respond, that makes a lot of sense, thanks. And I would just add the caveat that that's only to the extent that there's no new requirements, right?

If there were new – and I'm not anticipating new requirements necessarily, but just putting a placeholder that, if for any reason, there's new requirements on TLDs going forward, we'd have to take that into consideration in the grandfathering process too. So, maybe it's only testing the new component, or whatever it is. I'm just putting that in there. Thanks. I understand now, thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Sara, do you want...

Sarah Langstone: I was just going to say that maybe you should that maybe you should – maybe we could think about it as being new requirements on post-delegation testing, as opposed to the introduction of an entirely new program. Because I think that testing, monitoring, I think they're the things that we can do.

And you're right, we are very focused on the stability, and the resiliency, it was the, you know, it's the scope – it's the scope of this. And, you know, just to remind everybody that 32 of (barrow) trigger incidents, you know, it should be in someone's scope to consider that. So, I was just going to say that.

Stephane Van Gelder: Right. Thanks very much. I see no further hands, so perhaps I can turn to Rubens for an update on work track three.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, for the record. We've had some discussions that the (item I committee) that we started discussing the RSPs, and we haven't had much discussion after that. And reflecting on that, I have noticed, that most of the teams of the Work Track actually belonging within Work Track one, and two.

So, either this about the streamline process for changing RSPs, or about ongoing security. So, my suggestion is for us to close this Work Track because it actually showed up to be really a feature of other Work Tracks, and what we can do in the (air of), and choosing that is something that we need to try whether this belongs in the RSP discussion or not.

But sounded like something that we should consider is the phasing out of a (barrow), and replacing it with a different (continuity), and transition mechanisms. So, if that belongs here in the RSP discussion, so this could be the new work track fee, and I would volunteer for that, and if not, I still volunteer to do that in the (IRSG) and, not in the (RSP) discussion.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. So, we have a motion to at least modify one of the Work Tracks by deleting it, which is an idea that I personally love, but, obviously, I'll let you decide. And perhaps, what Ruben's suggestion is that this is already being discussed elsewhere as well.

So, and if that feels like that's what's happening, I don't think it's an issue to, if we feel the discussion in item three is not specific through item three and can happen else where, I think that we can do that. But would anyone have any objections for us deciding that now?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, I'd like to support the idea because Rubens already incorporated the ideas of that work stream into the document, which – into the document which Sara works on. And yes, it's mostly operational concern on how we monitor it. And since the monitoring is formally monitoring of registry, yes, according to the contract, it's not necessary monitoring of RSP, yes, because it's subcontractor. So I'd like to support this notion.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks. Donna Austin from Neustar. I don't understand why we would get rid of it, so I'd like to understand a little bit more about that because I think Number 3 is kind of – it's a conversation that we need to have because currently what we're relying on is PDT for a lot of things, and I think what Francisco and his team want to do is move to an ongoing monitoring solution. So, Rubens, if you can just expand a bit because I don't exactly understand

why you're asking to move this out. I think there's a distinct conversation that we need to have around this.

Rubens Kuhl: What I notice my opinion is that that either go about streamlining changing RSPs, which is probably what you are thinking about, because you mentioned PDT, or it also goes to more secure, stable and resilience RSP operation. So it goes both ways. So it actually belongs in both discussions, not that it doesn't belong anywhere.

Donna Austin: Yes, I mean, I agree but I don't know why we need to drop it. I understand that – I mean, a lot of this stuff is – I can't think of the word, overlaps, but I think it will be helpful to draw out that as a discussion topic and specifically address it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: So just to be clear, the suggestion is to blend it into other topics and Donna's response is that this is best served a standalone topic otherwise we won't be able to get to the detail of it. So we have two competing options. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, and my response is probably consistent with Donna's. I would say not yet, let's flesh it out a little bit. I mean, also I think we might hear something more from ICANN, I mean, about any thoughts you've got about ongoing monitoring, Francisco, I don't know if that's – I think you might be wanting to talk to us about that soon anyway or I don't know if you've – and so if that's coming down the track I would say let's just a hold on it, let's hear what – let's flesh it out a little bit more from our point of view what might be required, let's hear what if anything ICANN is going to be talking about, that staff are going to be talking about, about some form of ongoing technical compliance monitoring or whatever they've got in mind, and then see if it either makes sense to keep it in there or blend it in.

I mean, I'm not saying no but I just think it would be premature to sort of do that right now.

Stéphane Van Gelder: So it sounds like we don't want to drop it yet, but that Rubens may want to drop it, which means that we may have to put someone else on the spot to volunteer to push this forward. And I can't put Donna on the spot because I already did that at the last meeting, so I just – that's a warning for anyone else that might want to speak on this, you might be volunteered. Sara, I can't volunteer you either.

Sara Bockey: I was going to say, I mean, you know, in the spirit of what Donna and Jonathan are saying, just as I was writing this document, as I was getting feedback from all different parties and I'm sure, you know, after I've spoken to Donuts too, it was highlighting new issues that nobody had thought of. And so I just think from an exercise of getting everybody thinking about it, and then making it – because it all does bleed into each other, there's no doubt about that. But, you know, not me please.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Right, so we'll put on hold for now and Rubens, if you want to at some stage reignite then we'll reignite. Francisco.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry. Just to clarify, we're not putting the topic on hold, we're putting on hold the prospect of dropping it, right? The topic is alive and well...

Stéphane Van Gelder: The topic is in there. What we're putting on hold apparently is really fleshing it out for now.

Jonathan Robinson: No, I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: That's not what I've heard.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay, so...

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: ...continue working on it?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, you put a proposal to drop...

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...the topic and we're saying no, let's not drop it, let's keep it alive subject to...

Stéphane Van Gelder: And Rubens has confirmed...

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: ...that he'll keep it alive.

Jonathan Robinson: Great.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks.

Francisco Arias: Hi, this is Francisco from ICANN Org. so related to this topic I think we mentioned before to this working group or I can't remember if it was this discussion group or it was in a response to the PDP but we have some plans for (unintelligible) monitoring on the existing Registry Agreement provisions and that is – we're making progress on that regard. There is an item in the agenda of the Registry Stakeholder Group tomorrow and the GDD briefing where we're going to talk – give an update on that upcoming effort.

And briefly, we are finalizing requirements for what we call technical compliance monitoring system that will be in addition to the requirements we already monitor with the SLA monitoring system so requirements other than

performance requirements that is. And that's coming very soon and just wanted you to know that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay, you want to just...

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Which particular session do you refer to? To which particular session of this meeting do you refer to when you say that you are going to deliver new information?

Francisco Arias: Oh, tomorrow's Registry Stakeholder Group meeting, there is a slot for the GDD update, and one of the topics in the agenda for that is this update.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. So Work Track 3 is not on hold but it's on hold kind of thing. Any further comments on that?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...on hold, the only thing that's on hold is dropping it.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: It's a private game of tag between me and Jonathan and we don't intend to stop. But any further comments on this? Okay, so can I turn to Raedene for Work Track 4 please?

Raedene MacGary: Hi. First I have to apologize, I haven't been able to progress this work track to everyone, and I apologize for those who've reached out to me and I haven't been responding to. I do believe this is a very important topic and due to scheduling and communication issues I've missed a number of emails and

meetings. Just to say a little bit of background why I volunteered to assist this work track is coming from CentralNIC where we're not a registry operator and yet we're operating 35 TLDs and we're in the middle of transitioning a further 10 to our platform, having a direct line of communication with ICANN would be really welcome.

And partly even my participation in this group is kind of hindered because we're only acting on behalf of a client, we don't actually have any standing on this because we are simply just a backend registry operator.

So to move forward, I'm really keen to reach out to the community and anyone else who wants to contribute to this issue about direct communication. I mean, we find that a lot of clients don't really care about the operational and technical side of things, they just want to get things done and they rely on us as the registry service provider to really facilitate and make things happen and just get things done.

And we're always a bit hindered because we don't have the direct lines of communication, we don't have any standing ourselves with ICANN and yet we're responsible for a lot of important issues with regard to like I say, currently 35 plus TLDs and another 10 coming on board. And we've also gone through a number of these transitions to our services and a lot of repetition.

So again, I would like the opportunity this week if anyone – I can work with to help facilitate this discussion or if anybody wishes to contact me directly please reach out to me. But I'm afraid I don't have anything further to share at this point.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Raedene. On the contrary, I think you've just shared quite a lot. And it could – my suggestion would be that your specific issues that's CentralNIC having could start off the discussion. Obviously it's a discussion at you need to have with us as you've just said, but that could be a

start off point. And the way that you've got into this issue and what's interested you as a – as a company to get involved in this issue could be a starting point. So that's just a suggestion, may not be the route that you want to take but it might be a way of kicking this off.

Jonathan, sorry. I don't know who was first.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. So to surprise everyone, I agree with Stéphane. No, I think that, I mean, I agree. I think it's a good starting point. And I just wondered, Raedene, if you I mean, as I understand the existing proposal on the table is, I mean, clearly ICANN's keen to maintain their direct relationship with the contracting party, the RO, but seems to recognize this and you've obviously highlighted how it's an issue for you.

But the current proposal, the existing proposal is a letter of authority or something similar. Does that strike you or would that be helpful? And is that – could that be the start of your straw man, I mean, any thoughts on that so a form of letter of authority from the RO, from each specific RO or collection of ROs for the RSP to work directly with ICANN on a set of specified issues.

Raedene MacGary: Certainly you know, that's one level that would help us to open direct lines of communication because ultimately it's our tech team who can solve the problems if we get a compliance ticket, sending it to the client who's unable to actually address the critical issues isn't always that helpful. Surely having a letter of authorization to speak directly is like a step in the right direction. Recognition that we have a standing in – with ICANN would, you know, be also a step forward. But anything is welcome at this stage because we do find ourselves ducking and diving trying to get direct communication sometimes.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so just one very brief follow up and one thought I have is that we might like to start to workshop in this track what the scope of that letter would be, you know, what particular – what – sort of flesh out what could or could

not be in that and that would be a good straw man to look at the, you know, what the scope of that is. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. So I have Rubens next and Donna, Jim, Jeff and you.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl here. I just wondering whether the name servicing portals already addressed that issue or if their roadmap will because they actually did some changes of delegation and so forth so it might be possible now or perhaps possible in a future release of the name servicing portal. So this problem might already be solved on after being cleared out.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Stéphane. Donna Austin from Neustar. So one of the things that we did in the CC2 comments for the Subsequent Procedures PDP, and I think Kristina – this was your suggestion. And it's along similar lines to what Jonathan was saying is that I think Kristina's suggestion was that there is some kind of authorization but the registry operator would always be copied on any communication between ICANN and the RSP.

And I actually think if we can work with ICANN on this I think we can probably get this as a pretty quick win so I think it might be helpful if we start to have those discussions because it would help overcome potentially some of the problems that Raedene has experienced with the change out of a, you know, bringing on board new TLDs. So maybe this is something we can try to pursue, you know, not urgently but quickly with ICANN.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you, Jim.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, picking up on that – Jim Prendergast. Russ, I see some head nodding so I don't need an official yes this sounds good but is this a path this group should continue on or is it a dead end? The letter of authorization or

something like that, before we go do all the work are we headed in the right direction?

Russ Weinstein: Yes, this is Russ from ICANN Org. And yes, no I think this is a good area for easy like low hanging fruit path to an improvement here. And I think there's some opportunity in the naming services portal to advance this and then there's probably some additional work like an authorization letter or something. But no, I'm pleased to hear this development.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Great. That's it Jim? Thanks. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. I think at the end of the day I remember having this discussion a while ago, and I think this is partially also a kind of a legal liability issue. A lot of the registry operators are you know, at the end of the day it's the registry operator that's on the hook, it's not the RSP. And, yes, it's the RSP technical team that has to fix it, but, you know, from a contractual standpoint with ICANN the registry operator always has to be in the loop.

And so I think what Donna said about having a letter of authorization with the CC to the registry operator is a good start. Usually – and then we'd have to think through how this is done, but usually an RSP supports more than one registry operator so in the case of what like Neustar it's like 200 or whatever it is. So do you CC all 200 registries, right?

So but that said, each of those 200 registries would – registry operators would need to be CC'd or BCC'd or some way. So it doesn't – but that's the problem, right? So if you're working on an issue that affects let's say Neustar is working on a compliance issue that affects both – or multiple brands, right? How do you deal with that? At the end of the day it's the brands that are in breach, not Neustar as a backend operator.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Hang on, there's a queue.

Kristina Rosette: Okay.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Is it directly to this, Kristina, or, okay.

Sophia Feng: For the record, Sophia from ZDNS. And we have similar issue as CentralNIC because we are a backend for 20 TLDs in Asia Pacific. And including some brands who never participate in ICANN and just get – also have limited domains in their under management.

So the challenge we find is the communication right now the mechanism right now is not sophisticated and defined in terms of the technical issues. Of course we – when the registry operator gets compliance letters in – regarding some monitoring SLAs, as a backend we also get that notification from Francisco and from the team. However, I think it just increase a lot of workload to the RSP that we have to deal with all the notification from ICANN and also with the compliance letters that we provide all the answers and every registry operator have to reply to it.

So it just simple example and a case that without the, you know, the direct communication in some of the issues without kind of searching kind of level of authorizations, and actually the operation itself it's time consuming also is waste of resources when it comes to three party to communications with RSP, registry operator and ICANN. So we definitely support that kind of discussions going on to see in what kind of scope and what kind of topics and pushback that we can improve the operations in the second round and going forward. And definitely like to maybe we discuss and help Raedene to carry the conversations and discussions, yes.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Sophia. I've got Maxim next then Kristina.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. As I see it, I think gradual authorization would be required because some registries they do have front end because they do not want to be dependent on the backends. And it means that some services,

they might agree on the interaction between ICANN and, yes, one of the backend providers, for example, yes, (NCost) Network and in case for example big (NCost) Network, discussion (NCost) Network is under huge (unintelligible) and there is a need of instant communication between the NOC, Network Operation Center, of ICANN and them.

And for example, they do not agree to, yes, to allow consultation on Whois service because they have – they own front end and most probably consultations will cause confusion at the best. So it leads to station where the text of authorization letters are going to be different one from another. So we might need to think deeper into it to make it work – to make it more (unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. So I've got Kristina, then I and Jeff and then I want to cut it off to give time for the other work tracks. Thanks.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. I do think it may be worth having a more precise conversation with Russ about what is and is not possible because for example in my mind as a registry operator that works with a backend registry services provider we would want to provide authorization on a TLD by TLD basis. There are some TLDs for which we would certainly authorize communication directly, and then there are others that for whatever reason are – we would want – we would want to have that information come to us directly.

So I totally see Jeff's point but I do think that there's got to be a way that it can be done a TLD by TLD basis. And without making it too broad, I mean, I would imagine that at this point between the registry operators, you know, the RSPs and ICANN we could come up with, you know, maybe 10 categories and it would be a checkbox and you would have to opt in; it would not be an opt out because that is not something I would ever support.

But I do think before we get too much farther down the road it makes sense to sit down with ICANN as Jim pointed out, and say you know, here's what we have in mind, is this something that if we design it and we get agreement on it, can you guys actually implement it? Because otherwise let's not waste our time.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. Jeff Neuman. I'm – I don't think – I think we're agreeing, I guess my only point was, you know, in a case where there's an authorization for a company that supports a couple hundred TLDs or 100 TLDs or 50, you know, that would never – that should never be seen as a mechanism to avoid discussions with the front end registry operator. In other words, it could be on a TLD by TLD basis, but every registry operator that's having an issue needs to be made aware of those problems because at the end of the day it's the registry operator that's legally on the hook.

Now if there are arrangements when the RSP wanted to take that liability or indemnify that's something different, I'm sure we're not talking about that. But at the end of the day as long as the registry operator is on the hook with ICANN, there's got to be communication back so if there was a failure of 100 registries all those 100 registry operators would need to be notified.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. So Raedene, I'm going to give you the last word obviously on this, but I'm going to make two suggestions. The first – first I think this has been very useful for you and for all of us to realize that there is actually quite an intense group of people that are interested and want to participate so if you've made a note, for example, of the people that have spoken today they might be the first people that you want to reach out to.

I'd also suggest that by the end of this week if possible you produce an initial document that summarizes your incentive for looking at this perhaps with a very short summary of a case study from your company of however you want

to frame it, but something that comes to the discussion group by the end of this week would I think help – be helpful in carrying the momentum that we've seen today forward on this track.

And to that end, if you want to send me an email to make sure I've got your right email address, that's probably useful as well. And please have the last word on this. Thank you.

Raedene MacGary: Just a quick one, with regards to the point between the relationship between the RSP and its clients, I believe not all clients are the same and – but I think that relationship between the registry operator – the registry service provider and its clients is for us to define and really ICANN should be able to communicate with us and the intricacies about the communication with our each individual client is something that – as the backend registry operator we have agreements and how we manage those services with them. So I don't really feel it's a question for ICANN to have to worry about the subtleties of each different client relationship, but again, it's – everybody has their own opinion and I just wanted to state that. And thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. So it won't be the last word because Jeff wants the last word.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. Sorry, I disagree with that. From ICANN standpoint they don't care about your relationships or an RSP's relationships with their RO; they have no insight into that, right? But at the end of the day if there's an SLA violation they're going to go to the registry operator and they're going to say you're the one in breach of your contract. So from – I understand that the registry service provider and their registry operators have contracts between them, but as between ICANN and that – with respect to that particular TLD, it's the registry operator on the hook.

Now if we want to change that, and that would be a separate contract which I'm not advocating at all, a separate contract with the RSP that has the

indemnities and then the other things that flow, that's something else, but we're not talking about that. As long as ICANN is holding the registry operator responsible for that TLD, then every communication or anything that can affect that regardless of the – regardless of the arrangements that you may have made internally, but from ICANN's standpoint it has to be direct with the RO.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. So it sounds like we've got some very rich discussion on this topic. And there is something that we can look forward to in the next few days coming to the discussion group mailing list to kick this off. And that's good. We have two more work tracks left, 20 minutes left in this meeting, and another two agenda items. We may not get to the next step one. I'm going to change the order, I want to talk – I want to hear from Jeff not the SubPro Working Group before getting to agenda Item 4, which was next steps for our group.

I also want to apologize and thank – apologize to and thank the people that are standing on this wall; apologize to you for the layout of this room which I think is unfortunate that you don't have any chairs, I don't know why that is. And thank you for having the patience to listen to us whilst remaining standing for so long.

So Work Track 5, Donna has already given us an update. And she has authorized me to skip over to Work Track 6 which is a very quick update from Sarah and then we'll get to the SubPro discussion. Thank you.

Sarah Langstone: Thanks, Stéphane. I just had to say one last thing to have the last word on that previous comment, which you have closed out. And the reason that I have to do that is because this doesn't happen very often but I do agree with Jeff. You know, if you – if you've got a third party or anybody trusting their service to a third party, they're trusting, they're paying in good faith, they should know if the, you know, that party isn't following through on their promises.

What's the worst thing that can happen? It might cause the RSP to have an uncomfortable conversation with their customer. The customer might get – the RO might get an email that they would choose to ignore, but I'm with Jeff on that so just wanted to say that.

And then very foolishly I thought that I would focus on the security, stability and resiliency issue first, put that to bed and then work on this. And it just – it hasn't worked out that way. With hindsight I wouldn't have done it that way. But I just haven't had – I'm loathe to put out a personal statement without actually having had conversations with other people first. So I just want to be able to float my ideas and add to the initial draft before I send it out. And so hopefully you'll see something soon.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Just a question, brainstorming, is this – would it be helpful to you if we try and get someone else to volunteer to lead this one because you've already volunteered to lead another one, which has just morphed into two. So I'm just mindful of the workload that you've taken on and thinking it may be fair – yes...

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, just on that, can I understand the difference in scope between 6 and 1 since the paper in 1 is enhancing the security, stability so...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes, what was envisioned as the difference?

Stéphane Van Gelder: So you can answer.

Maxim Alzoba: Actually lots of items from this work track are already incorporated because it's certification, the need for additional certification, the testing and the historical, yes, analysis of historical data. It's something addressed already there. And it's things we need to understand the impact of changes on

security and, yes, and the financial part on the costs. So it's already incorporated. We might highlight it there that these topics are important and shouldn't disappear from the document. But I don't see the reason to separate it into different documents.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Stéphane. Donna Austin from Neustar. So just a reminder, that these six topics actually came from Francisco in an email that he sent to the group many months ago so he's probably forgotten that he's the reason that these are here. But so – and the context was that in the conversation we were having with ICANN Francisco came back to us with, you know, a number of items that ICANN was interested in working with us, you know, to try to get over this problem of no relationship with RSPs and how do we do what we can to make sure that things are more secure and stable and reliable.

So that's the context of where these things have come from. And I think as we're discussing them now some of them are interrelated and we just should acknowledge that. Thanks.

Sarah Langstone: I was just going to say – well thank you for the offer but, you know, with your permission I would like to continue to work on this as a separate track. If it is – it makes sense once we've come to some kind of agreement that it bleeds or melds with another one, that's absolutely fine. But I would just prefer to do it separately and give it a different focus. There's nuances, name collision, I know ton of different things, okay, that bleed into this that don't bleed into 1 so much so.

Stéphane Van Gelder: That's perfect. So despite my best efforts we haven't managed to kill off any of these work tracks today, but I will keep trying. And, Donna, you make a very useful reminder which I should have made initially which is that the way we split these work tracks and they did come from our initial conversations with ICANN staff and Francisco and these were suggestions

that ICANN made where they would have liked or they wanted to have more information from us and more dialogue with us, so that's where this has come from.

But it's good that we've talked about all these today and we all have a better understanding of why they exist and why we want them to continue existing. So thanks to everyone for that. Thank you to all the work track leaders for the work that's been done so far.

I now want to get on to an agenda item that was initially scheduled for Number 5 but which was a discussion that I thought it be useful at least – I thought it would be useful for us to hear from you, Jeff, on the – I mentioned the deadline that you gave us for our output to be useful to you, you being the SubPro Working Group. And I thought it'd be useful to hear from you why that's useful, the context or what kind of output you expect, just to frame that a little more.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. And really I think the usefulness of all this work really relates to two particular work tracks within Subsequent Procedures PDP. There's Work Track 1 which Sara's still here, okay, Sara Bockey is one of the coleads along with Christa Taylor. And that one – in that working group covers things like the RSP program, which we're spending a lot of time talking about, but only in terms of the preapproval process, not any other kind of RSP program. It doesn't deal with the transition of backend providers or anything like that. It's literally just the preapproval process at this point.

The other work track that it affects or impacts is Rubens, Work Track 4 which is the leaders are Rubens and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And that work track is handling everything from the evaluation criteria so that's the technical, financial business, to what Sarah just mentioned, name collision, that's another item that's within Work Track 4.

And other more technical issues, things like delegation rates or maybe that's not the right word, but there's a rule right now limitation on the number of delegations there can be per year, so we've sent out a note to the SSAC and the Office of the Chief Technology Officer as well as the GDD and the root servers to just get their thoughts on the – whether that limit, the 1000 names per annual – or per year – still holds true given the recent studies that have been done on the root.

So basically kind of seeing whether that – the recent studies have changed the minds of anyone because if we do get in this next round and there are hypothetically 25,000 applications, well at a limit of 1000 delegations per year, you know, you're going to have to tell people that applied, oh I'm sorry, but we'll talk to you in 24 years. That's probably not the best way to work things.

So or if it is, and if it turns out that there is a ruling that no, we can't have more than 1000, then there's got to be some mechanism put into place to either screen out certain ones or to – I don't know, I mean, it's – we haven't even – yes. We haven't even thought about that. So we're assuming based on the study that was done on the root server that the number won't be 1000. I don't know what it will be or whether we'll get a definitive number, but I'm assuming given that there were no issues that it's going to be something higher.

So yes, so at the end of the day our goal, the full Subsequent Procedures Working Group – and now I'm talking between – it's confusing because we both use the term work tracks, but in the Subsequent Procedures PDP we have four – we have now five work tracks. I'm going to ignore the fifth one right now because that's on geographic names at the top level and that just started.

But our goal is to do a preliminary report for work tracks 1-4 as well as the overarching issues to come out at the end of Q3, maybe actually April 2018.

So that's coming up. So that's why we asked for the information all by the end of the year because our model is working towards really getting our heads down and drafting sections in the months of January and February to – so that we can not only get it approved within the work tracks themselves but then it has to go to the overall PDP working group and that has to get approved, so you're assuming changes and revisions. And so hopefully all of that will lead us to getting it out in April.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jeff. That's very useful. So it's the end of Q2, right, you said the end of Q2...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...that's what I was going to say, clarify, because you mentioned Q3.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: So just...

Jeff Neuman: No, no, wait hold on.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: You said Q3 and then you said April which confused me.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, I didn't realize I said Q3. Okay, I apologize. It is April is the date that we're hoping to get out – maybe lack of sleep, sorry about that. Thank you. It's April that we're aiming to get the preliminary report, then we're aiming to get public comments, obviously after the publishing the preliminary report and our goal is by Q4 – early Q4 to get out the final report.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much.

((Crosstalk))

James Galvin. So if I may, James Galvin, and I'll speak here with wearing an SSAC hat in particular. When you were talking about – I just wanted to clarify and be very specific, and I think it's useful just in a public forum for everyone to sort of hear this. I don't want to take away from the fact that the SubPro group is asking for its input from the CTO and SSAC and the other offices, I mean, all of that should always be redone and gotten again.

But if we look at the facts and the history about how all this came around, that 1000 per limit is actually not a technical limit. And I think it's important to understand that and to know that. The root server operators have made it clear that, you know, they've, you know, they don't –there's really little chance that we will ever have enough applications that will, you know, disturb any operation that they have right now.

SSAC has clearly stated that the issue is about the rate of change; there's no maximum number, it's about how fast you do them. And in fact the registry operators have agreed with that point too, that there's no cap on the number it's actually how quickly you change them that matters. And so the limiting factor, and where that 1000 came from is the administrative processes that create the number of applications and process them.

So it's, you know, it's the backside of having to go through all of the testing and the contracting and that kind of thing because there's a certain amount of manual process that goes with that so it's naturally limited by how many people that you have and, you know, I mean, originally the first experience that's where it came from. So, you know, we should just keep that in mind. I want to make sure that, I mean, as a community we understand that that's where the limit came from and whatever change we want to seek is fine, but you know, make sure that it's a policy issue, not a technical issue. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jim. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I agree with you mostly. There's – the part that's the problem and the change that we'd need, and we've got to back to the original SSAC paper, you're right, the SSAC asked ICANN how many applications they think they can handle and at the time they said they just threw out a wild number, I think it was like 500 or something and then you doubled it – or they doubled it to – whatever it was. But at the end of the day it is referenced in the SSAC paper.

So the 1000 number is referenced in there. So that's why there would still need to be a change to the paper itself. I agree with you, the ultimate recommendation was it wasn't really a technical issue, but there's still a reference in the paper of 1000. So that's why there has to be some change to it. We'll talk offline on this, it's – but you're right, it is the administrative limit and that's why we also sent the letter to GDD and the Office of Chief Technology Officer, so you're right.

But still an opinion from the SSAC or a new paper or something that says as little as this is not – there is no technical limit or something, whatever, it's a policy issue on how fast you can process these. That's fine. But there still has to be some tweaks to that original SSAC 46. We'll go – I'll talk to you about it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay, thanks guys. I probably need to wrap this up pretty quickly, we're getting to the end of our time. There is one item on the agenda which least I'd like to us to start considering and you probably won't get to resolution on this today, but it's certainly something that we need to discuss, we can do so off – on the list.

But we should think about how – once we have output from the various work tracks how we – what we do with it, do we just send it to the SG and say this is what we've done, can you send this on everybody's behalf to the SubPro Working Group and to ICANN staff? Should we do something else? I mean,

that sounds like the easiest suggestion. I don't think this group has or should have any authority to send something directly. So that sounds like probably the best thing that we should do.

And obviously I see Paul's in the room as well, Paul Diaz, Chair of the Registries Stakeholder Group, we can discuss that also with Paul. But just wanted to get you guys thinking about what you'd like to do and how you'd like to see once we've reached an outcome how you'd like to see that progress. Happy to take a few very brief comments and then we'll have to close. Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think it could be something like document with few sections of text because it's good to avoid contradictions in the text. And the better thing is – yes, the best thing is to see it in the same space, I mean, the ideas. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you. Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, Stéphane. I think we've recognized that there are two different purposes for what we're working on. There will be one document that probably captures all of it but I agree the Registry Stakeholder Group sends a letter to the Subsequent Procedures Working Group with the context and then we use it as a basis for further discussion with ICANN staff to talk about what the, you know, how we can practically move forward with the problems we have at the moment and what we're trying to solve at the moment.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. Okay, I see no further hands. So thank you all for what was another very useful face to face of this group. Before, I mean, the meeting is now closed so we can stop the recording. There is now a meeting of the Registries ExCom so if you're part of the ExCom please stay in this room; if you're not, please don't. Thank you very much.

END