

**Transcription ICANN Dublin
Tuesday 20 October 2015
Joint RySG, RrSG and GDD
Morning Session**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct>
The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much Paul. So everybody ought to be thinking about that issue. But right now we are morning joined by GDD Staff. So I'd like to welcome Akram and Krista, and Cyrus and the team. Always appreciate you being here with us. And while they're getting - I'm sorry. And, yes. Thanks 'everybody. We have an agenda before us. It's on the screen if you'd like to check it out on the Adobe. I'm going to -- at this point -- hand it over to Krista. And maybe Krista, if you'd like to just give a quick overview of the things that we're going to talk about today, from your perspective. And then we'll get into the substance. Thanks.

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. Good everybody. Krista Papac from GDD Staff. So, on the agenda this morning, this is sort of the things that you guys requested. And then maybe, at the end, any other business. There's a few updates we can provide you with as well. And some things we want to share with you. So we are going to - Francisco's going to give us a quick update on the (RDOT) proposal that's been sent to the tech mailing list. As well as the proposed implementation time line on that. Under new (GTLD's), Karen's going - we weren't sure about the first couple of bullet points. So -- I think -- you guys might have some questions there, so I will give us just an update on where the program reviews are at and sort of what the next steps are there. Have any of you guys had GDD portal questions, safe harbor, universal acceptance. We'll get an update from Don Hollander on where that project is at.

And then you guys had - I think you want to talk about three character country code names as TLDs. Then we'll get an update on the registry agreement working group development. Specification 11 working group, I think that's actually security framework. It's not about Spec 11. It's about - it's not off the contract. It's about frameworks done for handling security threats. I think that's what you mean.

Abuse reports is on here. I'm not quite sure what that's about, but we'll be happy to talk about that. And then any other business. So when you're ready we'll have Karen - pardon me, sorry Francisco's going to do the RDAP timeline.

Keith Drazek: Okay very good. Yes Cyrus, go ahead, thanks.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Keith. This is Cyrus. Just wanted to make sure since this is a joint session with the registrars if there are any specific topics there that we needed to sort of include in the discussions I guess for Michele and his team.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Cyrus. Michele for records and transcripts. The agenda was drafted between both the registries and the registrars because some of the topics are of common interest. And we thought that it would be far more efficient to be beat you up once properly rather than giving you a light pommeling twice. So we have first aid down the back and we will be able to look after any of the blood and tears later.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you. Just for the record we don't mind the recurring abuse actually.

Keith Drazek: All right, thank you Cyrus. Thank you Michele and I should just take a moment to note that this is something new where we're doing a joint session at an ICANN meeting in person of registries, registrars and GDD staff. And we certainly look forward to this discussion. Welcome Michele and the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele again. Just to clarify as well, I mean, what we have been doing previously is on Sunday evenings the ExComms of both registries and registrars have been meeting with GDD staff and others to discuss some of these points. And we decided prior to this meeting that it'll make more sense to have one session together in this format. We can always revisit it for future meetings.

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks Michele. And that was actually - that decision in part was made because I think we were all getting feedback that, you know, the ExComms of the groups were really technically supposed to be focusing on policy issues - registries and registrars - and that engagement with GDD staff at the ExComm level might have been excluding people who were actually, you know, in our groups interested in talking about more operational type issues, not really policy discussions.

So in response to that feedback, I think the ExComms decided well let's make sure that this is a sort of a full and open discussion rather than keeping it at an ExComm level. So I fully support that and look forward to getting into the details. So Krista let me hand it over to you and to Francisco.

Francisco Arias: Thank you Keith. Good morning everyone. So it's a short presentation on RDAP, the registration data access protocol. This is about replacing the WHOIS, what is originally known as Port 43, the old protocol that has been in use for a long time, since the 80s. So this started in just a brief background on where this is coming and where are we now.

This started in 2010 with (unintelligible) discussions and then in 2011 (RSAC) published their (SAC) 51 advisory, recommending the replacement of the WHOIS protocol, which was adopted in a vote resolution in the same 2011.

Then work started in the (ITF) to develop these new protocol in 2012. And around the same time contact operations were agreed in several of the legacy gTLDs, namely most of the largest TLDs. These (unintelligible) was also included in the new TLD agreement and in the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement. So with that we have (unintelligible) in most of the registrars and registries in the gTLD space.

Then finally this year the IETF Published the RFCs that make the RDAP standard in March. With that a group within ICANN started drafting what we call the gTLD RDAP profile, which is you can think of RDAP as many of things that can be implemented. So the profile, the RDAP profile, defines what things would be required to be implemented by gTLD registries and registrars.

This profile is also mapping you could say the contractual requirements that registries and registrars have in regards to WHOIS -- also consensus policies in RDAP. So it's the mapping between the current contractual and policy requirements into RDAP.

So this was shared with the community in the gTLD tech mailing list last September. We have had some input from some of you here. For those of you that have not hear about this, please join the discussion. It's gTLD-tech@icann.org. Set up the mailing list. Anyone can join.

The plan there is to - oh maybe we should move to the next slide please. This is the current timeline that we have for RDAP implementation. So the plan is to keep discussing this in the gTLD mailing list and hopefully get to something that is not necessarily final but is of a decent quality by mid-November that we can put for formal public comment, which we expect to last until January.

And then in January we will be publishing the final gTLD RDAP profile. And with that there will become the formal notice to require a contracted parties to implement RDAP which according to the implementation calendar we have been using with contracted parties. We'll give you at least six months to implement which means the implementation of RDAP would be required if everything goes according to plan by August of next year.

In the timeline we're also showing a couple of extra things that need to happen in the IETF there is a couple things that are missing - functionality that is required per the registry and registrar agreements and consensus policy that is not in the base or the standards. And as some of you and some registries have put forward proposals to implement this missing functionality in RDAP.

It's not a big functionality that's missing, just a couple things like having for example a current mapping of (BVP) statuses. So it's minor things but need to be developed. So that's the current thinking on when this could be implemented. And if you're interested in more information there is a session

on Wednesday. I will leave about 12:30. You can find it on the full schedule of the meeting.

We'll be discussing detailed profiles so you're more than welcome to join and as I said there is also discussion going on in the mailing list in gTLD-tech@icann.org.

And finally, not exactly related to the RDAP profile but if you were in the GDD update, Akram mentioned that we have a pilot for them. (API) (unintelligible) if this is for the registries. If you're interested in testing this (API) that will give you access to real time data or what we are seeing in regards to monitoring the services of your TLD, please send a (GD) Portal case and we can give you access.

The plan is to have this pilot open until the end of the year, maybe January, depending on how things go and eventually give access to all the registries for all the TLDs. So with that, thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you very much Francisco. So let me pause and see if there are any questions or comments. I'll take a queue if people would like to put their hand up in Adobe or here in the room.

Paul Diaz: Okay it's Paul Diaz for the record. Francisco just be clear on the calendar, for our purposes, you figure by the middle of next month the public comment period will begin on the operational profile. And we'll have probably till about the end of the year, do you feel?

Francisco Arias: The current plan is to have the public comment starting in mid-November, correct, and to end in early January to give enough time for people to comment.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And then for all my members, that's a nice window of time but of course with the holidays it'll be tricky. So, you know, as we've been doing, developing a call for volunteers and what not, we probably should begin looking at that as soon as possible when it's made available to us so that we can as a stakeholder group get comments in by the deadline in early January.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks. Any other questions or comments before we move on? Yes Rubens, thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, NIC.br. I got the impression that reference implementation was commissioned by ICANN with a third party. And that would be provided and that would trigger the six-month implementation period. What's the status on this?

Francisco Arias: Yes thank you for the question Rubens. Yes indeed we have (CFR) implementation with a help from (CNNIC). And that's in the final stage of testing. We hope to release it before sending the legal notices, not

necessarily link it I would say, but yes the plan is to have it before we send the formal request for implementation.

Keith Drazek: Go ahead Jordyn Buchanan.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks. So Francisco, this outlines the move to enable RDAP. I guess the simultaneous question is like what's the move to disable Port 43 WHOIS? Is the expectation that as soon as a registry enables RDAP that it's acceptable to turn down Port 43 WHOIS?

Francisco: Yes very good question. It's one of the open items I will say. Probably the biggest of all. So far we're not - we're being silent of when Port 43 has to be turned off. My thinking - and this is just me - is that you probably want to have some period of overlap between the two protocols, which may need to be - I don't know - at least in the order of months if not a couple years before you can turn it off.

But this of course subject to discussion within the community. We - like I said - we are planning on that in the gTLD profile. We thought it was not exactly, you know, related to the profile. But it's not just one of the open items that we need to decide at some point when is okay to turn it off.

For what it's worth you may remember that in the registry agreement one of the reports we receive monthly from all the TLDs is the number of ways they're receiving each of the (unintelligible) service or in web WHOIS and Port 43. So we can monitor that and see how things move. That would be one way to go on. So decide at what point we can define it's okay to move from one vertical to another.

Keith Drazek: So okay Jordyn Buchanan you have a follow-up and then Michele.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes I mean it seems like by the time you get to the legal notices stage we probably need to answer to that question because you're basically going to be imposing a new burden on registries. And so having - and potentially registrars - and having some context around when the old burden is going to end would be really helpful.

Francisco Arias: Just one quick comment on that. So it would be great to start that conversation if you can join the discussion here in gTLD-tech or on Wednesday. That would be great.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks. Michele for the record. Jordan's point is very, very important. I mean the timing around enabling/disabling various services isn't simply a technical matter. It's also - it's a policy matter. It's a legal, it's a contractual matter. It cuts across a bunch of different things. And this is not a simple, you know, turn on a new service, turn something else off. It's quite complex. It touches across a bunch of different things.

Disabling Port 43 WHOIS could have very broad sweeping technical ramifications which you guys don't really know about at all because a lot of different services out there rely on WHOIS. However, what's confusing for me isn't actually this part, although that is confusing I suppose.

I'm a little confused because we've got the discussion about several registries moving from thin to thick. We've got the talk about this moving things over to RDAP. Meanwhile you've also got the pending discussions around the next generation directory services and various other things such as - oh I don't know - conflicts between WHOIS policy and national law.

And then into the mix you throw in (CNNIC) or something for testing something out, which does suggest to me - and I could be wrong - that you want to transfer data from my registrants to China, which scares the Hell out of me.

So I'm just a bit concerned about, you know, how this fits in with all of the other WHOIS-related activities because they cannot be handled independently. They do have impacts on other things.

It would seem a bit strange to expect either registries, registrars, or both of us to implement this whilst also expecting Verisign to move from thin to thick whilst also having pending work on something else which could potentially replace all this entirely. So having some understanding of where this fits into that entire mess would be quite helpful.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Michele. Well said. Go ahead.

Francisco Arias: Thank you. Yes indeed this is something we have been considering thoroughly. And I think we have discussed this also policy several times. I didn't add all the details regarding like WHOIS for example which is the thing that is - as you mentioned - already coming up with the same timeline. One of the things that was decided by a couple sessions ago I think with the communities to have RDAP implementation to be tied together or bonded together within the WHOIS and RDAP.

So when we're talking about here implementing RDAP, that means also implementing the WHOIS. But I must caveat that to say there are three phases if memory serves on the implementation of the WHOIS. And the last phase of that which is the actual movement of the three (team) TLD registries to thick. That goes beyond that timeline.

That timeline only covers what is called the consistent (unintelligible) display, so many merchants (unintelligible) WHOIS output, or in this case so the RDAP output for all the gTLD registries. So that's considered together so that there is only one implementation that needs to be done by contracted parties.

Regarding (RBS), I'm not the expert on that respect but my understanding is that's still in early phase to be considered immediately to know exactly what

will be the impact if any. So we continue to implement what we have now immediately available.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Francisco. Any other questions? Yes, Stéphane?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Keith. This is Stéphane, Starting Dot. Just a quick question on outreach and communication. I read somewhere yesterday that there's now over 2100 accredited registrars. I'm not sure - and there's many registries as well. I'm not sure that they're all here or in the ICANN ecosystem. What are you doing to make sure they're aware of this if anything?

Francisco Arias: Well regarding the RDAP profile what I can say is we have this discussion on the open mailing list and that's open to anyone that is interested in the topic that is following the events. That's so far the communication we have done in regards to the RDAP profile.

Keith Drazek: Okay Donna, did you want to get in queue?

Donna Austin: Thanks Keith. Donna Austin. So to Michele's point about the number of WHOIS projects that are going on, the GNSO Council had - Margie Milam gave her usual update about WHOIS during the council session.

I had a follow-up conversation with Margie because there is work being done internally as I understand it by ICANN staff to understand what the whole bucket of WHOIS bits and pieces are. And they are trying to rationalize that in some way.

So the conversation I had with Margie is maybe it's worthwhile having a Webinar so that we can all attend and understand the work that is going on behind the scenes that we don't necessarily see. And then we can have a better understanding of what's going on and perhaps provide input in terms of how it impacts us and how we move forward. So it's a conversation I had with Margie.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. That's helpful. So I think part of the issue from my side - just speaking personally - is I look at all of these different WHOIS related activities and it's like which bits do I need to focus on now. Which bits - if some of it requires development time on our side. Other ones have legal implications.

There's a lot of different WHOIS related activities and, you know, some of these things I know that from speaking to various ICANN staff, okay we're all aware of the timelines that were originally set have to move because it's just impossible. I mean, the prime example being the proxy/privacy one.

Around some of these other ones I think we really do need to get a better understanding of everything that's going on. And if that does mean adjusting some of those timelines then that needs to happen. It shouldn't be a case of sticking blindly to timelines just for the sake of it just because, you know, it's not a simple question of a purely technical matter.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Michele. I think Akram wanted to jump in and then we need to draw a line under this one and move on. We've got other items on the agenda.

Akram Atallah: Thank you Keith. This is Akram. I understand the complexities of all of the WHOIS issues and how all these moving parts are affecting everybody. I think that we're trying as Donna said - we're trying to put our arms around the whole thing and trying to rationalize it and see how - if there is a sequence of events that would make sense for everybody, but it's very tough.

I just want to mention to, you know, the question that Jordyn Buchanan asked about having to turn off Port 43 when you turn on RDAP. It's an interoperability issue. So although maybe it actually has turned on RDAP you have to make sure that all the registrars that you do business with have turned on RDAP as well so there will be a period where the two will have to coexist until everybody shifts to the same standard. So we need to be flexible with that.

I just want to mention that RDAP is critical. It's a good tool that could help us navigate issues with privacy. As we go to thick WHOIS for everybody, if we have issues with privacy, if we don't have RDAP, I don't know how we would solve any problems.

So it is very important for us to get RDAP going so that whatever policy we come up with to deal with exceptions, to deal with waivers that we have to provide, to deal with things like that, we have the RDAP mechanism to do that.

So I think it's the RDAP technically and from the policy perspective is very important for us to get together and implement as soon as possible. It's a very powerful tool. It would provide us flexibility as we try together to figure out the best way forward. So...

But I encourage us to figure out some time not only to do a Webinar but to do a session where we sit around the table, roll up our sleeves and figure out how is this going to look like in the next, you know, few years and draw a path that makes sense, you know. So we're more than willing to sit down and do that. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Akram. I'll just make a comment on this before we move on. To your point about - this is Keith Drazek for the transcript - the sitting down and having a session and trying to figure it out I think this is going to be a long-term issue, a long-term question that's going to require I think continual engagement.

So I think it would make sense - and I'm just suggesting this; we can discuss it later but - of having some sort of a working group across, you know, stakeholder group and GDD working group of people who are dedicated to focusing on this issue and to working together to make sure that you have the

input from the impacted parties, those of us who have to implement, but that we also have the opportunity to better understand the concerns and the needs and sort of the rationales. So maybe we can take that offline and come up with a working group.

Okay, next item on our agenda - thank you for that excellent discussion - next item on the agenda, Krista, who would you like to go next? We just lost the screen.

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith. I think it was Karen.

Keith Drazek: Okay.

Krista: Yes the new gTLD program review, the next steps. You guys, I'm not sure what you wanted with the first couple bullet points. But maybe...

Keith Drazek: Let's go to Karen's presentation and then go from there.

Krista Papac: Okay great. And then you guys can ask questions. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Karen.

Karen Lentz: Thank you. Good morning everyone. So I looked at the points that you had on the agenda. The first one was on the economic study. And just to quickly comment on that, I've given I think both groups periodic updates about preparations for the initial economic study and where we were on that.

It was posted a couple of weeks ago and it's open for public comment now. So I encourage your comments there and then we'll also be going through some of the findings in more detail at a session tomorrow morning.

You know, this graphic that's up on the screen kind of shows the context for where - what's that deliverable going to in the process. So that is intended to be an input to the competition choice and trust review team when they're convened.

On the other item, just in general in terms of status updates on reviews of the new gTLD program, I've given a few updates and I don't want to repeat here. So the next slide is the timeline which I've showed in a few other places so that hasn't changed materially.

And then the next slide is kind of a quick view overall of all of the different review activities and where they are. So the one that is the closest to complete is rights protection, and that isn't really to indicate that there's nothing else to be done on rights protection.

But in terms of the staff activity of doing reports and getting comment, that's pretty much complete. There is potential policy discussion happening there as well as, you know, that being one of the areas that the CCT review team

will look at. So it's kind of transitioning from that reporting and gathering stages to broader discussion.

On the other end, the CCT review itself, the call for volunteers is out there now and so the process is just getting kicked off there. Any questions?

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Karen. Any questions?

Paul Diaz: Hey Karen. It's Paul Diaz. Just for everybody's benefit we go through each of these reviews. They run the cycles. And once all that's complete, that's when we can start thinking about the next round? Is that the sequencing? And if so, what is the general sense of how long it takes to get through those six steps, the six processes up there?

Karen Lentz: Thanks Paul. Can you go back to the previous slides? So this is, you know, all of this review activity is leading up to the question of how and when is there a subsequent round. If you recall the GNSO policy prescribed that there be rounds. And so we're, you know, kind of working under that structure.

There's also a number of reviews that have been committed to as well as it just being, you know, a desire to understand and learn from the experiences that we gained in operating the 2012 application round of the program.

And so the review activities that I mentioned that are part of the consumer - or sorry competition and consumer choice and consumer trust review - those are the top two - actually most everything except the last - let's see - let me start over.

So the program implementation reviews, that's an input to that review. The rights protection things that we have done, that's an input as well. The consumer survey, the economic study, those are both inputs.

The trademark clearinghouse review up there is a little bit of an independent effort as well as the security and stability review.

So, you know, when we give these updates, we're telling you as much as we know. These are the reviews that we've agreed to do and this is where they are and approximately how long we think that they'll take.

When we get to, for example, the - you know, when the CCT review team is convened and actually plans out their schedule and work plan we can probably have a better idea of how long that will take. And along the same line, we're also aware that there is a lot of work going on in different SOs and ACs that is also directed at, you know, trying to gather some lessons learned from this round and potentially be providing advice that they would want to be applicable to future rounds.

So we're also trying to keep very close track of all of that so that we can account for it in these timelines here.

So there hasn't been any decision as to a date or how or when that - the discussion sort of turns from, you know, what are the sort of highlights and key points that we want to be aware of going forward to what's the right process and timing for doing that. So that's...

Keith Drazek: Thanks Karen. I have Donna and Ken in queue. Anybody else would like to get in queue feel free to raise your hand and get my attention. Put your hand up in Adobe. And we also have standing microphones in the room. So if anybody in the room would like to get up and ask a question or contribute to the discussion today, feel free to join us at the microphones. So Donna and then Ken.

Donna Austin: Thanks Keith. Donna Austin from Neustar. So Karen I guess one question I have - and I have two questions. So the first one is who do you think will actually set the date? Is that a community thing? Is it a board thing? Is it a staff thing? So who will actually decide what the date for next round is?

And the other question is given all the work that needs to be done here, 2017 second quarter is five years since the end of the first application period. So long time between drinks. What's the resourcing that you've got to make sure that you get through these reviews and do them in a timely manner?

Karen Lentz: Thanks Donna. So in terms of the first question - who is the deciding party for providing a date - I think it's probably all of the above. I think, you know, we haven't laid out a - you know, a specific process for having that discussion but I think certainly it's a community - you know, there's all kinds of, you know, stakeholder groups that would need to be involved in that discussion.

I think the board would, you know, certainly want to consider it very carefully and I think, you know, as staff our job is to support the community discussions and make sure that those, you know, considerations are put before the board and that the discussion is happening in an open way.

The second piece on resources I think - you know, I think we're sort of turning from a staff driven time. I think from the staff side we've been well supporting all of the reviewed activities that we've done to date. In the case of, you know, areas that call for a specific expertise such as an economic study or the study on the root zone - sorry, root service system - you know we've engaged third parties who have that expertise to do those.

And then the - you know, the last piece of it really is going to become more of a support to the review team. And we have actually a dedicated staff person who's just from the sort of GDD subject matter side going to support that review.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Karen. I have Ken and then Jordyn Buchanan and then we need to draw a line under this and move on.

Ken Stubbs: Yes I'm going to defer to Akram but please keep me in the queue behind him.

Akram Atallah: Thank you Ken, if I may. This is Akram. So the board actually - well three or four weeks ago - considered this. And because the community has asked the board and the public forum previously on a date, the board deferred giving a date by basically saying that there is a lot of review work happening right now.

And as we get closer to the end of that and we get more clarity on what the outcome of these reviews is going to be, it'll be easier to understand what the recommendations will be and how much work we need to do in order for us to open another round. And then we'll go from there. So that was the board resolutions of three or four weeks ago.

And I think it's very important for us to understand that it is really dependent on what the GNSO work will be on this issue. If there are a lot of changes to the previous round we will have to do a new guide book. And the new guide book will generate a lot of implementation work and that will lead into a better view of the schedule. So keep that in mind. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Akram. Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes I'm having nightmares because I'm afraid this sounds like 2020 and not even 2017. I'm a little concerned about a couple of things, and believe me I am so severely lacking in technical expertise. I'm having a difficulty understanding why it would take two years to do a security and stability review of this given the technology and the technical expertise we have in the community.

Now one might say that well we're going to be farming this out to somebody else. I'd like to make sure that the guidelines for the security and stability review are actually reviewed by the community because I have a feeling that we should be in a position to apply some serious pressure. I just - two years to determine whether this is going to be a secure, stable environment to release more GLDs seems just inordinately long. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks Ken. Well said. Jordyn Buchanan over to you and then we'll move on.

Jordyn Buchanan: My first question was going to be exactly what Ken just asked. Why does the SSR review take so much longer than even the CCT review which requires multiple surveys to be deployed in order to complete?

Karen Lentz: Thank you Ken and Jordyn Buchanan. That timeline includes a few things. So if you look at where we are now, we're in Q4 and that actually includes the whole process from when we started like posting the RFPs. So that's part of it.

It also includes a public comment period in it and so that's part of it as well. But in terms of the overall timeline and the methodology, I would encourage you to come to the session at 1:00 this afternoon because the point of that session is to go through the methodology and to get community feedback on it. And there actually is a comment period planned on that before the study begins. So...

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Karen. And thanks very much for the presentation.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thank you. I just had one more...

Keith Drazek: Yes go ahead Jordyn..

Jordyn Buchanan: That was first (unintelligible). So actually just to follow up on Donna's point I think I'm hearing a strange implied statement that all these reviews have to be completed before there's a next round. I don't know where that requirement is coming from if that's the case.

Karen Lentz: So there's a clear commitment on the last topic of the study regarding the impact on the root (service) system that is a pretty clear requirement based on a previous commitment to have any future rounds. But there's no - there hasn't been a definite statement about, you know, this is a prerequisite and this is not.

You know, we're showing you the review timeline that we have there, but there's no - you know, there hasn't been a statement from us that, you know, all of these things must be completed.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much Karen. Thank you for the very informative presentation and discussion. And yes, thank you Cyrus. Go ahead.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Keith. I just wanted to sort of highlight the fact that from our perspective, from the staff's perspective, the staff's work on transacting and leading these reviews is really not in the critical path. If the community - in particular the stakeholder groups that are here - want to help set a particular pace, a faster pace, I think you need to let the board hear that.

When you come to your joint session this afternoon to the board, let them know that you want to have commitments made by the board or write to the board. It's your board. And really that particular pace and those milestones that lead to the next round need to be driven from that angle and needs to be heard from the community. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Cyrus. I have a follow-up question to that then. So clearly if we the Contracted Party House, want to encourage, you know, this to accelerate and to move more quickly, certainly that message needs to be heard. But is it a question of just A, trying to make things happen more quickly? Is it a question of resourcing?

Would additional resourcing to your team for example or to support for the community be able to move these forward more quickly or is it more a prioritization issue in terms of helping things move forward?

Akram Atallah: Thank you Keith. This is Akram. I don't - well maybe if we actually get the subject to move much faster we will see some resource issues. But right now we're not - the staff is not - and resources and the staff are not the bottleneck.

I think that the sense right now is that it will be premature to set the date before we see what the reviews provide as an outcome. I mean at least that's the sense. It feels like it's premature to do that and that's what the board resolutions we're talking about.

Now remember that there was a previous board resolution before the round opened, committing to having a next round. So there is a commitment to have a next round. The question is how quickly can we get the output of here to see what the next round should look like. And I think the GNSO work in that is also very important.

Whatever policies we get from there will dictate also how quickly we can move to get the next round. So it's not one question and one answer.

Keith Drazek: Understood, thank you. Ken you wanted to get in queue and then Stephane and then we'll move on.

Ken Stubbs: Yes my biggest concern is that people are going to keep deferring making a decision until they have 100% of everything. I think that's a mistake because we have a commitment for next round and I hope - pardon the expression - it's before the second coming of Christ.

But for all intents and purposes I think that we need to get more clarity on these processes so we can understand for instance that if in fact (looking at) security and stability is going to take two years, what's holding it out? How can we make this more efficient and effective? And what benchmarks need to be met? And that's what I'm concerned about.

For all I know there may be an RFP out already to the people who are doing this job. We have no idea the specifications and most importantly might...

Man: (Unintelligible)

Ken Stubbs: Yes. I know, I just wish some of our technical people were there too.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Ken. I think Jeff wanted to respond to that. But I had Stéphane in queue. Is it a response directly to that or...? Okay Stéphane and then Jeff.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Keith. This is Stéphane. I would never defer to Jeff but... Just the clarity question actually I think is the main one here. I think we probably need

more clarity on what needs to be done during the review process and afterwards. And that was a point that was just made I think by Cyrus .

But you know what if these reviews say things need to be done? What's the plan there? What's the timeline? What have you taken into account in terms of possible effects there for a second round date?

And also it feels like you guys probably need more clarity on what the process is as well in terms of what needs to be done. Do these reviews need to be completed or just initiated? Do they need - if they're completed do you need to have the work that flows from the reviews completed or just started before you can initiate a second round?

It sounds like, you know, when we're having these conversations - and this isn't the first time - you tell us that you also need clarity from be it the board or the community and what needs to happen next. So it all feels like it's very much in flux at the moment. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Stéphane. Jeff and then we'll move on.

Jeff Neuman: Hi, Jeff Neuman at Valideus. I think, you know, to me I'm not actually worried about the timing of these reviews. I think what worries me more is the GNSO. And I think that's what we have control over.

So if we really feel strongly as a group about setting a timeline I think the best way to do that would be to make sure that our counsellors keep pushing the GNSO to start their process because I think frankly that will take a lot longer than these reviews. So I think that's really important to get the community, to get this started.

And also it may be - I'm not sure whether the board is hearing from any groups that the new gTLDs are having another round is important to anyone. So perhaps this is something that the registries and registrars may want to address with the board if there's a strong feeling.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jeff. I agree. So this is Keith Drazek. We're going to move on now to the next item on our agenda. I'm going to hand this section over to Paul. This is action items from the GDD summit and next steps. Paul's going to run this because I was not in Los Angeles for the summit and he was. Thank you Paul.

Paul Diaz: Certainly Keith, no problem. We've gone over this on our last stakeholder group call. Staff was with us so not going to ask to put it up on the list. I'll just read off because we do note that there are a number of issues that are well underway or we're even going to hear an update later today.

But coming out of the Los Angeles summit we discussed registrars are working on a best practices for new TLDs document. That's underway.

Universal acceptance - Don will be providing a quick brief update for us here. So that's good. GDD portal is also on our agenda today.

We heard from (Christine) on our call. There is a timeline in view there. The various guides that are coming out - Krista updated us. Another one was published in the interim around - forgetting which issue - but there's progress there. There's a timeline and that work is being done.

One issue that we registries in particular have not really moved forward on in spite a couple members' offers, the question about a comprehensive reserve names list and develop it ourselves. That's still pending so that's on us registries to continue.

We've been talking about next gTLD round. Just a high level question coming out of Los Angeles about the timeline and what not. It's what we've just been discussing so obviously that's getting there.

Working with the domain name association we talked about an archive of key documents, like a one-stop shop for all of us - registries, registrars - to go to for the key documents. There's already something in existence and we'll have further liaison to flesh that out yet further.

Abuse reports is an action item that came out of Los Angeles, much like the bullet point on our discussion list today. Not exactly sure what people wanted there. There was some talk about perhaps providing guidance on how to sync up or at least simplify reporting so that there's consistency that could lead to data analysis later on.

If everything is sort of free form, it's very hard to characterize or provide any sort of insight in what is really driving the various abuse reports. Not sure if there's more that people wanted or perhaps we can tease it out further and our discussions later but that's still pending. And we had the registries as the lead on that, so we'll take that one.

Later on in our private session we talked about a more marketing focus summit. What we did in Los Angeles was more the traditional ICANN led policy focused. We talked about a commercial or more marketing focus. Colleagues from NamesCon are in the room. We'll be discussing that opportunity perhaps doing something in January's thing, January's event. So that's good. That's moving on.

And then there was the final question about outreach for new members. As Keith noted we've had some very significant growth. We have an outreach program. The hope was that we would leverage more insight from a lot of the consultants who helped various applicants through the process so that we can further improve the stakeholder groups or registry stakeholder groups. Cherie has the lead on that and that's underway.

The last issue was the restructuring both the Sunday evening - which we all agreed that wasn't working so we put it on hold for now. What we're doing today trying to get together, we often have a lot of the same questions so we appreciate staff accommodating us.

In the same way we'll see how the session with the board goes this afternoon. A little confusion about what we were looking for. We were hoping for by combining our time we would have a more substantive debate. We're going to wind up being all together but in one time slot because of the confusion. And that was really on us.

We need to better coordinate in the future but we'll see how it goes today and we can follow it up for future meetings. So that's ripping through the list but clearly we're making progress on most all the action items and just a couple that we let languish. Krista.

Krista Papac: Thanks Paul. Krista Papac, ICANN staff. Not on the list of action items but just a question from the staff too following the summit is from a next steps perspective, you know, we talked a little bit at the end of the summit about do we do this, how often do we do this, what about location should we rotate that.

And I just, you know, we still would like to hear more from you guys on that. I don't know if you're prepared to discuss that today or share that but, you know, for our own planning purposes and preparation we'd love to hear more about what we can do. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay thanks Krista we'll take a queue and (Stephane) go ahead.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes Krista thanks for asking that. I wasn't able to be at the summit because it was in the U.S. so I'd love to have some sort of rotation built into the summit agenda.

I hear very good things about the summit. I think everyone is in agreement that it was a very successful event, very worthwhile. So I'm sorry that I wasn't able to attend.

As to frequency I don't know if there has been discussion there but I would expect that more than once a year would be difficult for people to manage on top of all the other meetings. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Stephane. Cyrus.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Paul, thank you (Stephane) and thank you for the feedback. I think it was really for the first of its kind that we actually conducted it was quite successful.

We just posted the results of the survey that we conducted from all the invited guests to the summit which was I think about 2000 actually, the emails went out.

We just posed it to the same Web page that we put together for the GDD summit. So it's icann.org/gddsummit. The number of responses received was fewer than I had hoped for I think 38 is all we received but there was some good substantive comments there.

All in all we had 150 people attending non-staff in person and at its peak through the Adobe Connect we had in excess of 50 people actually participating so far, participation was really good.

What I wanted to suggest going forward was perhaps the registry and registrar stakeholder groups can come up with sort of a small party working group that we can work with in designing and defining what the next summit should be.

I think that would operationally make it very efficient for us to just come up with a process, define it, put a timeline in place, pick a location. We don't have a preference we want to accommodate you so if it needs to be outside of the United States for sure we can do that.

So just a suggestion maybe four or five of you can work with us. We can really move it faster. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Cyrus. Go ahead Reg.

Reg Levy: Reg Levy from Minds + Machines. I think that the best thing about the DD summit was the access to staff because so many of you guys showed up and that was absolutely wonderful.

I would have a request that more people from legal show up next time.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Reg. In fact that was part of the reason that I personally insisted to have the first one in Los Angeles because it does really make it a lot easier for us to have, you know, a number of staff that are located in Los Angeles just easily be there.

So this is one thing we would probably lose a little bit of if we moved it away from Los Angeles. We just won't have the ability to have as many people participate from this staff site. (Makaley) go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. And I think if we were to plan this far enough in advance and, you know, work on topics far enough in advance so that we're well prepared both sides would that help you with respect to bringing certain key staff members to an event but I assume that yes but Akram I'll let you tell me.

Akram Atallah: So again I think it is very important for you to look at it as it's your summit and will that support you. The more (unintelligible) you provide us the better the support will be and the more time you give us the more time we have, we get to plan for it and make sure that everybody shows up to it.

And whether it's legal or other resources and organization if you give us clarity what are the topics absolutely we will make sure that the right people are there.

Paul Diaz: Any other questions? Krista.

Krista Papac: Thanks Paul, Krista again. Not a question just a comment that from the staff perspective here you guys have all shared, you know, how great the summit was for you guys and we're very happy to hear that.

From the staff perspective is also really a great experience and just from my perspective seeing the ability of the registrars and registries to interact in sort of a different environment I think was also really helpful.

We learned a lot from hearing you guys talk to each other about the things that are going on between your different parts of the industry and so I just wanted to thank all of you for that because it was really good for us as well.

Paul Diaz: Excellent thank you Krista. Just for a resources perspective a question for staff. You've budgeted in fiscal 16 for another summit so we should - if we all look at our calendars be thinking between now and June.

Otherwise if it was to come later in the fall like we did this year that would be a fiscal 17 issue. (Rob).

(Rob): That's a very important point Paul because if we need one in FY 17 we want to know before FY 17 budget is made. So yes.

Paul Diaz: Okay thanks everybody and thanks very much for that discussion. I just want to take just a moment to note. I regret I wasn't able to be there but I've heard nothing but good things about it.

So I think that this is something that we would like to see continue. And I think you've certainly heard that here today. And this is an important point that, you know, the ICANN meetings where we are here today are often a lot about policy and they should be about the policy focus and working, you know, through the community structures and doing the things we do here.

So having a separate event that is focused on, you know, sort of the engagement between the contracted parties and GDD, dealing with operational questions and challenges and, you know, and basically finding time to work better and more closely together in a more collaborative way I think is a very positive development.

So I think from what you're heard today from my perspective until you hear otherwise I think one of these a year would be a positive thing.

Okay, next item on the agenda I think we have a presentation coming from Don on universal acceptance if I'm not mistaken.

Krista Papac: This is Krista. We do I think you guys have that presentation for Don and Don is going to - he wants to present from the microphone over there. So thanks Don.

Paul Diaz: We can make some space for you here at the table Don if you like.

Don: Hollander I'm okay.

Paul Diaz: All right.

Don Hollander: But thank you. So I know everybody has a really full agenda. One of the things we tried coming up to the meeting is rather than ask for specific time in your agenda we sent out a report as to what had happened up until last week in terms of the UASG.

So I'm assuming people have read it or will read it and what I'd like to do now is just talk about what's happened in the past couple of days in Dublin and happy to answer any questions.

So universal acceptance, next slide thank you. So we had a workshop on Sunday and as a workshop it was truly a working event. We had just a couple of presentations and mostly just a lot of discussion. So we had more than 50 people there a broad section of the community, diverse skills knowledge.

Particularly I want to note that there were geeks and non-geeks and we came out with more than a dozen specific tasks including who is going to do what and when are they going to do it by.

So next slide please, thank you. So this is a summary of some of the tasks and you'll have the slides no doubt and we're in the process of preparing quite a detailed report for the community but that will take some time as in weeks not hours to produce.

So here is a list of things. I just thought I would highlight and this is a slide that we used in yesterday's public forum, UA public forum. Some of the things and a topic that I'd really like help from this group on.

So one of the things that as we talk to the software industry people are asking for some documentation. So I'm a CIO I'm a systems architect. Give me the documentations so that I know what I'm looking for in universal to make sure that my guys can work on getting, get us universal acceptance ready.

And so that's one of our documents that we've started on. We're on the third version of an introduction to universal acceptance and on Sunday we said

we'll break it's getting quite long so we're going to break it up into smaller bits and continue to work on that.

So that's quite an important document. The group wanted to establish relationships with a bunch of other groups so we've got ISOC, GSMA, the DNA, (MOG) and other groups for different aspects.

ALAC for example has ALS' throughout the world. So we're saying can we work with them as local focal points in their own respective communities. The same with ISOC who has chapters throughout the world.

So if you just - universal acceptance is not an ICANN issue. It is a software issue and we just have another 98, 99 million people to talk to to make sure that they have it.

And we're not going to be able to do that ourselves so we're looking for different channels. But we are working to develop the collateral, the documentation, test suites for that community.

On the right hand side I created a generic document for registries and registrars readiness scorecard. This is where I'd like some of you or at least geeks within your - and I say geeks in the nicest possible way.

So geeks within your organizations who might want to say yes I'd like to participate in this. We're looking for a small number but we want to develop a blueprint guidebook for you guys for this industry so that you can figure out how to go through your systems and not everybody has to reinvent the wheel.

So we've had a number of registries and registrars look at this already and it is hard, not impossible but it is hard. And one of the things that one of the organizations doing this is ICANN.

And we had a presentation from Ashwin in Buenos Aires and he said process is hard. And we've had an update from him on Sunday and he said yes it's still hard but we've got a handle on it.

And I would recommend people have a look at that, those presentations and if you have questions ask him because he has got his IT department has an imperative to actually make this happen.

And the other thing that I just want to highlight is we've identified that (linkification) is A, not in the dictionary, not in the spell check but it's where you type a domain name or an email address into your word processing application or into Twitter, into Face Book or some other application.

And that application has to figure out is this a domain name and if it is I'll establish a link or is it a mail address or is it something else. So how does that work?

So we're not going to do specification but we're looking to do good practice guides. So hopefully I didn't talk too fast and I gave you some flavor as to what has happened since the note that I sent out to you before last weekend. Happy to answer any questions.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Don. This is Keith Drazek. Thank you for your efforts and your work on this and this is obviously a very, very important topic for new gTLD's and for the industry as a whole.

So I just want to note that while it is not an ICANN only issue I think we should all appreciate the fact that ICANN is in fact contributing resources, financial resources, human resources to help coordinate the effort.

This is really a much broader community issue outside our typical and traditional ICANN community certainly. The outreach is going to have to be significant and long-term.

But the role that ICANN is playing here in helping to coordinate this effort I think is to be commended. It's really an important thing and in my view this is the kind of thing and the kind of rule that ICANN really can help with and clearly is in this process. So thank you for that.

Let me take a queue, any comments or questions on universal acceptance? Yes Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Michele for the record. I think this is great to see some nice progress. Also in terms of ICANN's involvement here I miss this is what you guys should be doing but it's a technical issues, technical coordination.

This makes perfect sense to me. But there have been suggestions in past meetings about certain things that ICANN should be doing around new gTLD's that personally I felt were completely out of scope of ICANN's role.

But making sure that the technical plumbing works and that people can actually sign up for a service using my shiny new dot Irish domain or dot rocks or dot ninja or whatever that's key because otherwise it's pointless. I mean if you can't use the damn things we might as well not have them.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Michele anybody else like to get in queue on this? Yes Cyrus thank you.

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Keith and thank you Michele. I really wholeheartedly echo what you said. This is I think turning out to be a model example of how ICANN can actually enable the community to get the work done for all of us.

I do also want to emphasize as Don said and as I'm sure all of you know that this is something that takes the whole village to really move the needle on. So

those of you I was going to actually ask you to raise your hands but I won't, that are not involved in it please get involved.

Sign up at least on the email list to know what's going on, to know the progress. Don and of course you know that Don is being supported by ICANN, I myself am personally involved and invested in this.

Let us know how we can help you to get some sort of participation because it really needs every bit of energy and muscle behind it to really get it moving. I know quite a few people around this table are heavily involved in it, (Edmond), (Jennifer), Jordyn Buchanan was there and I thank all of you for that but we really need more as much as we can get, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much Cyrus, anybody else? Okay we have about 25 minutes left in this session and we have quite a few topics that we want to get through.

I may jump around a little bit here while we have the benefit of folks in the room. I think one of the items we want to talk about and (Makaley) I may turn to you to help with this one because you're probably certainly far more expertise than I do but it's the safe harbor issue.

We have Allan Grogan here in the room with us and he's offered to engage with us around comments or questions with regard to the recent legislation and could I had this one over to you to run?

Michele Neylon: Thanks Keith and thanks for warning me well in advance, nicely done, nicely done nothing like putting me on the spot. Okay, so safe harbor the short version is unless you've been hiding under a toad stool for the last couple of weeks most of you are probably well aware of the trends decision, the ECJ, which is the European Court of Justice which essentially has rendered safe harbor null and void.

There has been a lot of discussion in various legal circles on both sides of the Atlantic, some of it informed some of it terribly misinformed about what various options are open to companies and entities that need to share and transfer personal data across borders.

In the context of registrars and registries there are a number of obvious issues. In order for ICANN to contract with us and to audit and to do various other things ICANN sometimes requests information which is personally identifiable which falls within that and obviously there is the entire thing around data escrow.

So Allan I am now going to put you on the spot. It would be helpful to get an idea of where ICANN's thinking is on how you are going to face some of these challenges.

I don't expect you to have a definitive answer today because I do realize that some of the best legal minds in the world are still trying to wrap their heads around this.

But it would be helpful to have an understanding of where you're at at the moment. Thanks.

Allan Grogan: Sure, so I'm glad you don't expect me to have a definitive answer today because I don't.

Michele Neylon: This isn't my first ICANN meeting.

Allan Grogan: So the court decision invalidated safe harbor as a legitimate basis for a transfer of data from the EU to the United States. It didn't make the transfer of data from the EU to the United States illegal it just invalidated one potential justification for the transfer of the data.

And there are other potential justifications under EU law. Consent is one, model contract clauses are another, for internal transfers of data within affiliated company groups there are other bases for transfer of data.

So to the extent that a party has been relying on safe harbor as the sole basis for transfer of data they can no longer rely on safe harbor. That doesn't mean that they couldn't rely on some other basis for transferred data.

And I think we've done an informal survey not extensive at all but when we look at the list of companies that are registered for safe harbor there are very few members of the ICANN community anyway that are registered that appear to have relied on safe harbor for transfers of data.

ICANN has never relied on safe harbor for transfer of data to ICANN. So it doesn't have an immediate impact on ICANN itself per se for the transfer of data to ICANN.

There are potential impacts. Iron Mountain for example has relied on safe harbor for the transfer of data to Iron Mountain. I've had informal discussions with Iron Mountain and they're working on a solution probably involving adoption of model contract clauses or it's just one of the other ways that you can transfer data.

We're also exploring options for whether we could I mean registrars and registries are free to use data escrow providers besides Iron Mountain. So if someone is concerned about transfers of data to Iron Mountain one option would be using a data escrow provider that's based in the EU so that there is not a transfer of data.

And we're exploring whether or not we should establish a relationship with an escrow provider other than Iron Mountain and subsidize it the way we do with the Iron Mountain relationship.

The European Commission, the Article 29 working party, various individual DPA's in EU member states have all indicated that they will be providing additional input and guidance in the coming weeks on their views on how and when solutions need to be implemented.

And there have been high level talks on going between the EU and the United States on a replacement for safe harbor that those discussions have been underway for years but I think they will be accelerated because there is huge motivation on the part of both the EU and the United States not to stop the free transfer and flow of data.
So that's kind of a quick overview of the landscape as I understand it right now and more to follow hopefully.

Michele Neylon: Thanks I think that's helpful. Do we have any people in the queue Paul?

Paul Diaz: Not online, in the room? Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Allan I have one question. What do you think about audit when the personal data is forwarded to ICANN directly? Actually (sealed) personal data. Have you thought about how do you think we are going to deal with that?

And the second question is the procedure for registries to deal with conflicts in law because currently we have only procedure for registrars for dealing with law.

In registry agreement if you look for conflicts with law you will read something that it might be created later if required. It might be the time to create it actually because all of these waivers for Whois is for registrars we have nothing for registries and we have to have it.

Please tell us what you think about it. When could we hear something about the procedure when you are going to design it et cetera? Thanks.

Allan Grogan: On the first question on transfers of data to ICANN in connection with audits, we're sensitive to that. We'll look at the issue, we'll try to assess what justifications might permit the transfer of personal data.

We also generally during audits are willing to consider limiting the types of data, they're actually disclosed and allow redaction of data. So it often is not necessarily critical that we get personal data for purposes beyond it, it depends on the nature of the audit so we certainly take that into account.

In terms of assessing some kind of procedure for compliance with the law for registries I think we would consider that. I don't know Akram do you want to address that or Krista?

Akram Atallah: Okay so Krista is telling me that it allows for both registries and registrars to get waivers.

Maxim Alzoba: Actually if you read word by word our contract it says that if work group decides so from their appointments that if that was decided so maybe it starts - we need to start the procedure.

Akram Atallah: Okay, so but Maxim you have to believe that we will work with you on these issues. I mean we don't want you to get in trouble that's not our - we don't put the contracts for you to get in trouble.

So if there is an issue we will address it, we will work on it and if you want to actually help us do that we can start looking at working with the community on how best to implement this for registries if, you know, we feel like there is no current process to do this.

But we can take it offline and resolve it there is no problem with that. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: (Marcus).

(Marcus Flore): Yes, (Marcus Flore), (Clover Village) EU based registrar. Well I would be very happy if I am wrong here but to the best of my knowledge there is currently no EU based escrow provider that is ready to sign you on. That's good.

I had a very short conversation with Cyrus and Akram about that and they said there may be one but they were not sure.

Michele Neylon: All right just to clarify - this is Michele for the record. The issue at the moment is not whether there is an EU based escrow provider it's whether or not there is a escrow provider that is compliant with EU law that ICANN will cover the cost of.

So if you want to cover the cost yourself you could use I think there is at least one but there might be two providers. At the moment the only provider that ICANN is willing to pay for is Iron Mountain.

(Marcus Flore): Well we are trying to sign an agreement with one provider. We're willing to pay for that. Up until now the status is that the agreement between them and ICANN has not been approved.

Mike Zupke: So if I could - this is Mike Zupke of staff. So there are currently two escrow providers in EU who are approved by ICANN as what we call a third party provider of escrow services which means, you know, as (Makaley) has noted that at the registrar's expense they can elect to use that escrow agent services.

And so in this specific case that (Marcus) is talking about that escrow agent that was approved came to us I think 2 years ago and asked us to approve a

formal agreement they could use going forward for all registrars and we did that.

They've since come back to us and asked to modify it to change some of the terms. So we're in the process of considering those changes right now. But if you wanted to sign under their existing agreement if they were still willing to do that you could do that today.

Michele Neylon: Thank you Mike, go ahead Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, now in my role we're presenting one (unintelligible) registrars. They can all get off registry. Actually there is one more thing in the registrar escrow agreement.

It's about who is going to be the (head) of the information. Most probably it should be the same European, any European registrar. For example like it was done for Russian registrars.

So you could think about it because a way the escrow provider which is (EU) somehow transfer data to America for example. It's not good actually, thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay all, I don't see any other hands and nobody answered the mike. Thank you this is obviously a hot issue I mean the ruling there will be a lot of change.

We meet every other week so if there is new developments from staff you're always welcome to join our calls. You can provide - I believe in the weekend session there was even some talk of perhaps setting up a panel for Marrakesh to go deeper, dive deeper into this, the operational implications and we should know more by March we can probably speak to it better then.

But with that then we'll move to a different topic.

Michele Neylon: Sorry just one last comment I just want to make sure it's on the record. The issue for speaking as a European registrar I mean while I personally love the idea that I could escrow my data in Europe I don't feel that I should be put at an economic disadvantage for complying with Irish and European law.

So, you know, it should be, should have equal access in that respect. So having the option to escrow within Europe it should be available to us. I supposed with the current situation where it is available to North American registrars but not to European ones in terms of the costs.

So I think that's something that's key for a lot of us.

Paul Diaz: I think you opened a can of worms. Go ahead Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: It's Jordyn Buchanan. So Michele I don't disagree with you in this specific instance because it's such a - because Europe is a relatively big market and has a relatively coherent set of rules across that market.

But certainly I don't want to set the precedent that ICANN needs to be willing to make it so no registrar in any jurisdiction has to make up for the cost of operating in that jurisdiction.

Like any country could pass some crazy law that would make it expensive to operate in that country and ICANN shouldn't have to make it so you're not at a competitive disadvantage because of the laws that your country chooses to pass.

Michele Neylon: Jordyn, we I think we agree. So I think that's I don't think we disagree.

Paul Diaz: One more Akram go ahead.

Akram Atallah: Yes just to say quickly to (Makaley)'s point we are as (Allen) mentioned already we are working with Iron Mountain to find out if there is a way for them to provide assurances and we are considering if not we will be working also to figure out how to do that in Europe as well thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay great, thank you very much. Keith do you want to come back?

Keith Drazek: Just to keep things rolling because we are going to run tight on time. If we can jump around a little that bullet point about three character country code names is TLD's.

Colleagues in the stakeholder group is this a reference to the comments that we recently posted? The work group is this another issue? We posted some pretty straightforward comments about whether or not country names and territory names being excluded in any future rounds.

But three character country code names is TLD's was also addressed in that. Is there more? I'm not sure how this got on our agenda list I'm looking for did somebody put this on list because they wanted to make a particular point? Need some help. Okay yes then let's kick that one off.

Okay thanks Paul. Yes I don't see anybody raising their hand or wanting to engage on that so Jon can we move to you for the RA amendment update?

Jon Nevett: Sure, I think we'll talk about the specifics of the changes when we're together, you know, just the registries. So we got a - just to give everyone an update though we got a red line from ICANN just before the meeting and we're reviewing that.

We met as committee yesterday and have some changes to propose back but overall we think we're getting relatively close to having an agreement that

we could post or ICANN could post for public comment and that would be the next part of the process and then it would go to a vote.

So I encourage everyone on the registry side to look at the agreement I sent around yesterday. Send it to your legal folks, you know, this is getting pretty close to something that is going to get posted.

So read it, review it, let us know if you have any last minute issues. Hopefully not and we'll talk about it later when we're together in our registry only group meeting. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much (John). And (Makaley) I want to make sure if there are any other issues that are particularly of interest to the registrars that we make sure we have time to focus on that.

We're starting to - we have about 7 minutes left before the break.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, I know that the abuse reports topic I think there was some of that came out of the GDD summit which in common with yourself and (Stephane) and others we couldn't attend for various reasons. I was at a wedding, which was actually more fun than the GDD so I'm sorry and not my wedding.

The abuse on the abuse report side of things there has been a lot of discussion between members of the registrar stakeholder group and probably I assume some of the registry people as well with (Allen) and his team around abuse reporting and the requirements to do so and how we are handling it and all that within the 2013 contract.

As had been mentioned at the last meeting when (Allen) first put out a blog post explaining, you know, various different things and we held a closed session on Sunday afternoon for registries, registrars, operational security people I think there might have been some law enforcement and others there just to have, try to move the conversation forward a little bit, abuse reporting and abuse handling.

This is being done kind of outside of ICANN, it's very much an industry led type discussion and after that we took it to a pub which I thought was the best way to deal with these things is after you have a heavy conversation go to the pub and have a pint.

So we also had another kind of more relaxed social thing with some of the law enforcement and operational security types down the road. And just to make you aware that we are having discussions with a lot of these entities who are involved in reporting various types of abuse to us.

However, it has come to our attention that there is a lot of discussion within the GAC about trying to get quite prescriptive around the topic of what qualifies as an appropriate response.

And I think that is something that should be of concern to everybody in this room and do we honestly want the government to tell us what the appropriate response is to an abuse complaint?

And Akram if you say yes I'm going to - I can't reach you you're too far away but I think you know what I'd like to do if you do. But I think that's just on the abuse reporting side of things that, you know, we are having what I would hope would be productive conversations and will continue to have those between registrars, registries and other operational security types. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Makaley). Akram.

Akram Atallah: So in the last communique from the GAC they asked us to actually if I remember correctly standardize or something like this all the abuse reports. We've replied to the GAC in the last resolution which should have been posted.

It was about the, you know, in the board meeting about two days ago. All the days are mashing now together, Sunday. So we replied to that and we said that we will - what we are going to do is what we are doing right now on the abuse reports and that there are outside industry reports available and things like that.

So if you would look up the scorecard and our response to the scorecard that will give you an idea of what the board replied to it. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Akram. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Question about compliance if I may. We as registries we see growing number of I'd say sometimes cases, sometimes inquiries. As I understand currently the compliance has incentives meaning that the more case you resolve the better for you are.

But since we have to spend (unintelligible) time and resources on responding to any case usually we just call people on weekends, we try to deliver information as soon as possible et cetera, et cetera.

I'd like to suggest that the cases which were open outside of the scope of the contract they fall into negative incentive. So people think before open cases. For example they check what third parties like from the window of (unintelligible) compliance what they put there because other way we will see more and more cases which are just outside of scope of the agreement and that should be closed in the first place. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Maxim. Anybody else want to get in the queue on this one? I don't see any other hands. We're starting to get to the end of our scheduled time, our allotted time.

Any other business at this point, any other discussion? Okay, so all right so I have a queue. I saw two hands go up with Cyrus and Krista. Volker is at the mike and (Donna). Okay so Volker first go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Volker Greimann speaking. Just a general question about process regarding spec 13. I was a bit surprised after being one of the registrars that had originally commented against spec 13 and that led to a certain amount of changes in that.

And requirements that a TLD would have to fulfill to be eligible to get that spec 13 exemption in their registry agreements. So I was surprised to see a registry that I feel did not fulfill one of the requirements, one of the basic requirements of being eligible being out for public comment regarding their application to public - to spec 13.

I would have assumed that not being able to fulfill the requirement would exclude them from even going to that step. So if you could just give us some explanation of how that got so far.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Volker. So a question to ICANN.

Akram Atallah: I don't know which application he was talking about but...

Volker Greimann: The one about the thing that we love most (unintelligible).

Akram Atallah: If you could put your comment in the public comment forum we will...

Volker Greimann: It's in there I just wanted to ask why it was put to public comment if the applicant doesn't meet the requirement if that's back.

Akram Atallah: Okay that's your assumption that they don't meet the requirement but let's take it offline and we can discuss it with you. We don't discuss specific applications in public anyway so thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Volker, thank you Akram. So Cyrus and Krista your hands went up simultaneously and then (Donna).

Cyrus Namazi: Thank you Keith. Two things I wanted to mention as we get closer to closing. One is that earlier this month Krista and her team actually updated a process for the release of two characters at second level.

I'm sure most of you have seen that and this is essentially to deal with and resolve the comments and objections that we receive from several governments over the release of their particular two letter country code.

I understand that there is for lack of a better term a great deal of concern among the GAC members about this process and what we've proposed. So just wanted to highlight to you that it might be a few and this would be us to

contact your GAC representatives to get the details before the Thursday timeline when the GAC actually issues that advice and things like that.

The second thing I wanted to bring up is that we've embarked on a project to essentially consult with the community on coming up with a metric or a set of metrics to measure and track what we call the help of the domain name marketplace.

So this is essentially for us to come up with the gauges and perhaps a dashboard that helps us on sort of a semi-regular basis to measure whatever these metrics need to be and show hopefully that they're moving in the right direction.

We have a paper ready to be posted for your input and your comments. Just wanted to let you know I think this is something that in particular would be important to the stakeholder groups here and invite your active participation and input to that.

So look for the paper to be posted within the next week or two. We had aimed actually to post it before Dublin so we could actually have the discussion here but we just didn't get around to doing it. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Cyrus. Krista and then over to Donna.

Krista Papac: Thanks Keith, it's Krista. I just want to add one thing to what Cyrus said about two characters and I had a couple updates. So I'll add to (Cyrus') and then maybe I can defer to (Donna) and then I can give you guys just a quick update.

So I don't know if the transcript posted yet but the GAC discussed this in their meeting on Sunday evening. I know Donna you were there and if the transcript is posted I would encourage people to go read it.

I think to Cyrus point not just talking to your GAC reps but talking to the GAC reps that expressed concern I think would be really beneficial. One of the things that we've heard from them too is they're interested in hearing from you guys what you think your mitigation measures might be or they might have ideas about what that could be.

I'll leave it to you guys whether you want to engage on that but it might be helpful for you to have that dialogue with them now and certainly prior to later this week when they're doing their communique.

If the transcript is not posted like I said (Donna) was there and I know she was listening intently as we were and I'm sure if she hasn't already will give you guys an update.

So with that I'll defer to (Donna) and then maybe I can just give my quick updates at the end. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Perfect thank you Krista. Donna over to you.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks Keith, (Donna) (unintelligible) staff. So my issue was the same one it's the two characters. And there was quite an impassioned speech from the representative from Spain.

They don't like that the process only pertains to confusion they think it should be much broader than that. And they don't particularly like the fact that they have to provide clarifying comments to what they've already provided.

What I would ask from ICANN because I do expect that there will be language in the communique to this effect. Push back, push back very hard and I would ask that the board does that too.

I understand that there is a process it has to go through. If they reject the advice but really the time is now. We've been through this, this has been going on for months.

I think we've reached a point that, you know, that the GAC is getting the better end of the deal than what, you know, obviously we think we are. So, you know, please push back on this one.

You've got the process out there now. They should fall into line as, you know, we've had to. So really push back. We will encourage the board to do the same because this has gone on for far too long. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Donna. Krista back to you.

Krista Papac: Thanks for those comments too Donna. I appreciate it. So Krista Papac just really quick. I just wanted to - the registry team is just getting started this week here at ICANN so we have quite a few sessions going on over the next few days that I just wanted to raise everybody's awareness about.

There is tomorrow is a big day for us. The implementation review teams for two policies are meeting tomorrow. One is the Whois which I know we talked about in the context of its synchronization with our (RDAP) as well as Whois laws and things like that.

So I would encourage the IRT meeting but I would encourage those of you that are interested to attend that session tomorrow morning. There is the IGO INGO full name identifiers implementation review team meeting tomorrow.

There is the security framework that's being worked on. That meeting, that team the drafting team which is a joint effort by registries, registrars and GAC representatives which are really law enforcement folks are working on that together and I would encourage folks to come to that session.

The (RDAP) session which I know Francisco already mentioned and then we're having a portal users group update tomorrow and that's where we'll get together with anyone who is interested talk about where we're at with the roadmap, when we expect to have that and then really introduce some of the key staff at ICANN.

We have some new folks at ICANN that are key to the ongoing work with the GDD portal. And then talk about the engagement, the engagement work with registries and registrars will look like going forward once we do have a roadmap next year.

So I think that's it for me let me just check one. Sorry and then I think Cyrus mentioned earlier we've been publishing somehow to guides for registries.

There is a couple that have been published over the last month or two. I'd encourage you to please take a look at them and provide feedback to us. How you feel they are or are not, how clear they are things like that.

So that's it for me thank you. I don't know if Mike had any updates or.

Keith Drazek: Okay I think that brings us to the end of our scheduled session. I want to take this opportunity to thank ICANN staff sincerely for joining us. I think and certainly also I think this joint session of contracted party house registries and registrars and GDD's and ICANN staff, compliance and others has been I think very constructive. I think this was a great dialogue and thank you very much.

We'll go to a break and come back in approximately 15 minutes.

END