

Revision A

**ICANN Transcription - Marrakech  
RySG Session 1**

**Tuesday, 8 March 2016 08:00 UTC**

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.

Also found on page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Cherie Stubbs: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you for attending the Registry Stakeholder Group today, Tuesday, March 8. And as it has been noted this call will be recorded and a transcript will - as well as audio will be forthcoming.

Reg Levy: Please remember that you need to state your name and your affiliation before you speak for the transcript. Thank you.

Samantha Demetriou: So thanks everyone, for joining us, at this lovely early hour. Reg and I are going to, I guess, co-chair for a little bit until Paul arrives. So just to start off we want to say welcome to all of our existing and to our new members. So to begin can we just say hello to our Fellows, (Alejandro Romero Estavez) and (Wen Zhai). I'm not sure I'm saying that right. Welcome.

And we have some new members from the last time we were all together in Dublin. Welcome to (Alstrom), (Asia Green IT), Beijing Teleinfo, CNNIC, dotHealth, Hamburg TLD, KPMG International, (Senca Seluisa) and Vienna Insurance. Thanks for joining us this time, guys.

So Cherie is informing me, just for a numbers' overview, we currently have 90 Registry Stakeholder Group members, 78 of which are voting members. And the way that breaks down geographically is 42 from North America, 33 from Europe, 12 from Asia Pacific, 2 from Latin America and 1 from Africa. And given the board's focus this week on diversity I think those are some pretty good looking numbers so great job, everyone.

All right so everyone can see the agenda for today that's posted up. Cherie has also kindly shared it on the email list. I'll just ask at this point if anyone has any additions that they would like to make to the agenda for today, anything that's not covered on our list that people would like to discuss.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes. The - I sent an email to Paul on this but Barbara Knight had sent a message to the list a few days ago. I resent it I think last night, it could have been this morning, about the implementation of the IRTP-C policy recommendation changes for the Registrar Transfer Policy.

It would be good - and Paul indicated that would be fine. He had a point in the agenda, I don't remember what that was, but we just need - she hasn't got any responses and needs some feedback from us so that she can reply on that since she's been representing us on those PDPs.

Samantha Demetriou: All right, thanks Chuck. And once Paul gets settled I'll let him chime in on where on the agenda we'd like to put that in.

Reg Levy: I'm just logging into the Adobe chat now but if anyone can see if there's a hand. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Reg Levy: Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks. something that's - Jonathan might be able to speak to this as well. something that came up yesterday during the staff kind of implementation plan for the CWG on IANA Transition, we have until the 13th of August, probably a few weeks before that, to get a process together as to how we select nominees for Customer Standing Committee, which is part of the CWG IANA Transition proposal.

And I don't think it's just the process, I think we actually have to be - have to have those people in place by then. I'm just not 100% sure. But we don't have a process and we need to get one. So I'll take the lead on that I guess.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Donna, refresh - I know we'll talk about it later but that's primarily RySG members and ccNSO, correct?

Donna Austin: Yeah, so there's a minimum of two from the gTLD registries, two from ccTLD registries and then the option for someone from that category that isn't a C or a G.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Donna Austin: So that's the minimum requirement. So we could actually, you know, put two or three or four if we wanted to. But, I want to keep it to a minimum.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, and I'll talk - Chuck again - and I'll talk about this some more when we get to that on the agenda. But one of the ccNSO members talked to me about that last night so they're looking at that as well. And we probably want to do some coordination with them like in terms of leadership and stuff like that.

Donna Austin: It came up during the ccNSO GNSO Council discussion yesterday so we've kind of made that connection with Katrina I think it is, the vice chair of the ccNSO.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I was in the SLE session at that time so I missed that.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Jonathan. Just while you guys are finding your place just, I mean, I think that fits into a bigger picture of a whole variety of implementation issues. And one of the things that happened yesterday was it seemed that staff had slightly run away with, you know, that picked up the ball and run with it as far as implementation is concerned. I think we're going to get it back on track but this - we'll need a checklist of items. But it's great.

Donna, if you can - if you are willing to pick that up and run with that particular part that'll be helpful. And then from a CWG perspective we've got a whole lot of - a whole list of laundry list of items which will include that, members of PTI board, there's a whole bunch of issues that need to be sorted out. And we may need to take interim measures to get the thing off the ground and then go through in one annual cycle and take more sort of permanent or established steps to get things in place.

Samantha Demetriou: All right, thank you both, Chuck and Donna. I think what we're going to try to do is add those two items to the 11 o'clock time zone - time slot so we have staff at 9 o'clock until 10:45 and then we'll add that into the Registry Stakeholder Group business at 11:00. And it might go over into our lunch discussion for those two things so thank you for your additions.

Paul Diaz: Okay everybody, good morning. It's Paul Diaz. Sorry I'm running late. I think there's - well I'm sure there was confusion with the scheduling. I appreciate that you all were here promptly at 8:00. The reason I was late is I was talking to a bunch of members in the dining hall who thought yeah, somewhere near 9:00. I'm okay oh come on, guys.

So, you know, but thank you to my colleagues for getting the meeting underway. I will catch up whatever else was discussed. Chuck, your issue, we just said, we'll work in. There are other issues, two character, a little bit

deeper dive, perhaps a little bit more discussion about Spec 11 as well. We will be - we have them on the agenda to talk with staff. But our colleagues who have been really focused on that want to spend a little more time to bring everybody up to speed on where we stand or what our next steps might be.

We've also - we're going to add that into the anytime between 11:00 and 1:00, our own working session time. Were there other issues as well or was there - Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Paul. Donna Austin. So the other issue is Meeting B. So and we need to have a discussion around that I think in the context of the GDD summit if that makes sense.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, we will do update where we stand with the summit right now. And take a call for inputs. I'll provide an update where we are but we're absolutely at a formative stage so whatever the members want it's a good time to speak up because we're still crafting - we don't even have a draft yet. We will very soon. But those inputs are welcome.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, Paul, is that Meeting B or GDD?

Paul Diaz: GDD. But if you want to talk about B we can as well. Yeah. Sam makes a good point. The Meeting B is - maybe something worth using this time that we have before we launch into the official or the full day, a good topic for discussion. There's a lot of confusion around what Meeting B is all about. Just in case anybody has recently arrived and has not heard, we will be meeting in Helsinki Finland in June. It's the same dates.

But ICANN announced when we arrived here that Helsinki was selected, I guess no Zika virus in Helsinki. But the Meeting B, the concept behind it is really very, very different than what we're used to as far as traditional ICANN meetings go. It's envisioned as merely a four-day ICANN. And as currently

laid out there are no gatherings like this, there are no GNSO Council meetings.

It's a radically different view on how to conduct an ICANN community get together. The focus is really supposed to be on policy work and cross community communications. Sounds nice. It's kind of hard to wrap your head around even when you look at the graphics that ICANN is producing about when the sessions will occur, how they'll work out, a lot of unease.

It was made clear to staff in a Friday afternoon meeting between community leaders and senior staff. And I think more details will be forthcoming in terms of how ICANN intends to run the sessions. Not least of which one of the most important things maybe they may add a fifth day. For logistical reasons though, the day would be added at the beginning. They're constrained with the venue. They can't add it - a Friday, rather they would add a Sunday which, you know, great. Those of us with families and things outside of the ICANN, you know, there goes your weekend.

But more details, as far as ICANN is concerned, logistical details will be forthcoming. But for us, you know, it's going to be - the request is to let's give this a chance, let's try to be open minded about it, see how one goes and then we'll, you know, adapt thereafter.

Start seeing hands. I had Chuck, Jeff and then Jonathan, Kristina.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Thanks, Paul.

Paul Diaz: Edmon.

Chuck Gomes: If we're going to discuss this now I'd like to request that Donna share what she shared in the GNSO working sessions over the weekend for those who weren't there because it's just one aspect of that meeting. But I really think

she suggested something that would be - that fits the bill really well. And it works for us in the GNSO as well.

Paul Diaz: Donna or Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I'll yield to Donna first and then I'll jump in.

Donna Austin: Thanks. So the - Paul and I were both in the Meeting Strategy Working Group. And the idea with the policy - the middle meeting - which I think we should kind of not call Meeting B anymore but just call it policy summit or put a framework on it, put a title on it - is that it be an opportunity for the community to be in the one room to discuss policy issues.

So rather than operating in silos that the bulk of the meeting be focused on people - everybody being in the same room to discuss the same topic. And the GNSO, as most of you will know, have recently kicked off two big policy development processes. And if we approve the charter here in Marrakesh for the RPMs UDRP one then that's another substantive one that will be kicking off around the same time.

So the idea is that, you know, certainly what's in my head is that for the two days in the middle that they be set aside for that discussion to happen. And I think the GAC is on board to some extent, but Thomas Schneider is talking about a half day where the GAC identifies some topics and people get in the room to discuss that so I think kind of on the same page but we need to stretch it out a bit.

The Council is likely to write to the other SOs and ACs and request - and identify the topics that we want to discuss so basically the PDPs. And put a little bit of context around that in how we think that should happen and ask the other SOs and ACs to identify their topics as well so that we can - so rather than doing this on a constituency basis that we identify the topics and then work out a way that we can have substantive discussions around those.

So develop the agenda in such a way that you have good chunks of time that you can discuss issues. So I think the -Marika spoke to me yesterday about the GNSO writing to the other SOs and ACs and trying to get some agreement around that concept. So - and I also spoke to Nick Tomasso yesterday and I think he's leaning more towards it will be four days; it will not be five days.

The first day was identified as outreach but because it's in Helsinki though it's probably not as important as it would have been had we gone to Panama. So the first day, which was supposed to be primarily outreach will be repurposes or refocused in some way. So my understanding from Nick is that he's going to push back on that fifth day request. But it will be a four day meeting.  
Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Donna. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. And I agree completely with Donna on that. The other thing - and I brought this up in front of the board if you look at the timing of the June meeting it's right in the heart of implementation of all this CCWG and CWG, all of that IANA stuff. That's a technical term, by the way. And what I asked him is to make sure that none of that interferes with the agenda for the meeting.

The problem is we set aside four - it's four days but it's supposed to be heavily policy-focused. So all of the CCWG and the CWG and IANA transition stuff that needs to be completely outside that meeting. And maybe that's what the extra day is for if that's what happens. But we need to make sure that the board is not focused on that during the meeting but that they're focused on the policy stuff.

And if I understand that's what policy - or that's what Meeting B was supposed to be about is. And my fear is that it's going to be captured again,

like every other meeting since 2013, has been captured by accountability and by this transition. And I know it's important. I'm not downplaying it. But at some point we have to cut it off and say no. Because if we are not able to do what Donna said and to really discuss the policies and make progress moving forward then it's just a, you know, we're not going to make that progress until the end of the year and that's just I think unacceptable.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Jeff. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll try and be coherent I think because - many of my points sort of link into others. I suppose the Council, which Donna has been talking about, has taken a good lead on all of this and thought about this long in advance. What seems to have happened is that there seems to be somewhat disrupted by others coming into the party and to the mix of it and what the board is going to do. I think Jeff's got a very good point whether or not the board actually does what was intended, as Donna described, back from when the meeting strategy working group set this up.

My sense was from the GNSO Council discussion with the board that the board was - they did reiterate that actually they were - contrary to the schedule that appeared to have published that their intention was to mix it up with the community and participate in the policy discussions and so on. So I guess we just go through - that might be something to even raise again in our meeting with the board and just check whether their thinking is on that if it's moved on.

I suppose from the Registry Stakeholder Group's point of view we're going to have had the GDD summit relatively shortly before so in a sense maybe we can all of our registry-related business or a significant part of it into that. I mean, at least we have to think about how those two correlate. And what the Registry Stakeholder Group tries to get out of this as opposed to the GNSO led policy development work. So we just need to think about how those three, you know, what our - as Jeff said or others have said - I mean - or Paul, you

said I think in your introduction, the Registry Stakeholder Group doesn't have a - this kind of meeting planned for that.

On implementation I actually think that's a really good idea, Jeff. Because when - I mean, we heard last night I think Becky and myself were the only people from this group here. But essentially we looked at - there was a meeting held last night to talk about bylaws development. And the timelines for that are extraordinarily tight. And so we're going to have to go back to CWG and CCWG and talk about that.

But Jeff's broader point about the pressure we're all going to feel on implementation it could very easily take over that meeting. So I haven't heard anyone with that idea that you talked about, Jeff, using that Sunday as possibly CWG, CCWG related, you know, IANA transition implementation work. So that I think is something really worth thinking about. So thanks for that.

Paul Diaz: Want to follow up, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, just to follow up on that. I think, you know, what came out of the last GDD summit was that we wanted to use that time to focus more on the commercial operational issues. So I would not advise us moving policy things into that because we're not supposed to be doing policy development at those meetings. So to the extent we can avoid that and stick to the commercial operational discussions I think that's much more beneficial. So we should stick to that.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, for the record I didn't mean to suggest that it was more Registry Stakeholder Group or Registry-related business. You know, so thanks.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, thank you, Jonathan. That's the way I heard it, Jeff. And I totally agree with you, if B is supposed to be a policy let's really talk policy. If we have the opportunity to meet with staff much like we will later today, the sort of, let's

call it administrative, let's keep it out of the real work of the B meeting, but if we're availed the opportunity take it or try to address everything in Amsterdam in mid-May.

Edmon, you were next.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, just a couple of simple points actually. One is if we are bringing back up to the board again and I think, you know, it's a - last time around there's I sense a little bit of defensiveness already. I think we need to make very clear now we're not renegeing, we are going - we think it's a good idea to and we're willing to try. And but there are some logistical items and focus on that, you know, before they take it the wrong way.

The other thing is more of a logistical thing. I think the staff has kind of thought that it would be a smaller meeting but for the - if GNSO or the working groups or RySG is to meet the rooms shouldn't be smaller. The big room, the opening room could be smaller but the working rooms shouldn't be smaller. That's something that I think hopefully the staff keep in mind because for those - the working community there's probably the same amount of people or, you know, no less would actually go to the B meeting so that needs to be - if, you know, that should be brought up to the staff again.

Paul Diaz: Yes, thank you, Edmon. In fact that was raised the Friday afternoon leaders' meeting with senior staff when Nick talked - briefed us on the switch and what it meant. It was understood that a grand welcome ceremony hall was not necessary but rooms, because necessarily they want more interaction, you're going to have more people in a room. The rooms have to be substantial.

I think they have a venue in mind that does meet that requirement. We'll make sure as we continue the dialogue that the point is underscored. It's a good point.

Kristina, you're next.

Kristina Rosette: I'm going to yield. I don't have anything new to say that hasn't been said.

Paul Diaz: Thank you. Okay. Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the transcript. Just to remind people that B meeting is also about outreach, even though there is no need to outreach in Finland. ICANN probably tried that model anyways to see how they could outreach when the B meeting actually goes to Africa, South America, Central America and so forth. So there are conflicting requirements for the B meeting, one is policy and the other is outreach.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, and I think they do want to try and bring them together but right now they do feel more conflicting than not. For our group in particular by the B meeting we should have some clarity about some of our travel slots to support. So in the interest of outreach who we may be able to share travel support with is an issue and we can walk our own talk. We want to bring others in. It's something that we might do to show that. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Paul, this is probably a really obvious question but just to clarify, as I understand it at this stage, the Registry Stakeholder Group does not have a proposal or a plan for Meeting B. It's taking share as we speak and we don't have anything like, for example, the GNSO Council has prepared something for GNSO related work or we don't have a proposed schedule or anything on the table at this stage, is that correct?

Paul Diaz: That's correct because the understanding is we will not be meeting like this. Reg.

Reg Levy: Is there an official definition for outreach? Because I think even in Internet developed countries there is a real need for ICANN-related outreach. Nobody knows that we exist. And my friends refer to me as a member of Internet cabal because like a bunch of us just get together in rooms three times a year

and run the Internet. So there is room for outreach that isn't necessarily bringing Internet access to the masses but that is actually getting people who use the Internet and who should be involved in this sort of thing involved.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, fair point, Reg. And I think the outreach debate goes on forever. At least for what we do, since it's registries, the requirements of somebody sign the agreement we can ideally use some of our thoughts to bring members who typically aren't here as a form of outreach with a focus on geographic diversity first and foremost.

But for the rest of the community your guess is as good as mine and it's certainly a very political question. I saw Chuck and Donna. Chuck, you were first.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, following up on Donna's suggestions, and I haven't talked about Jeff - with - which Jeff about this. But he and I both chair working groups that are of I think high interest to the broad community. And I, for one, would really like to have a significant time for the RDS PDP Working Group to meet without conflicts so that we could have - and we could actually design the meeting for that so that members of the communities that aren't participating in the working group could join us.

We could get input from them. We could even direct it so that we can get input from them. We can also bring them up to date as to where we're at. We could have GAC there. We could have board there. We could have a lot of you who aren't participating in those working groups there. I think that would be a fabulous way to use time there. And it obviously is policy so that's why I really jumped on your idea, Donna, because I think it really has some huge value to be able to do that.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Chuck. Donna, just before I come to you so the RDS working group are there other policy themes that we want to make sure get on the agenda? Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, the subsequent procedures one which I agree completely with Chuck. And that was what I understood Donna's proposal to essentially be was to have time with no conflicts for work on the PDPs. So absolutely.

Paul Diaz: Thank you. Other issues, you know, it's good to have - maybe we'll post it to the list, keep a running tab but I think in very short order our opportunity to help craft what the Monday through Thursday looks like come up and want to make sure that we get our issues on the agenda. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Very briefly. It's Jonathan. Just in support of that. And Chuck's point, I mean, suddenly it strikes me that, for example, we may be able to get the charter in shape for the CWG auctions. And again, that's something that could be - so it would be very useful if we can put together a list of what we think are the highest priority topics to be discussed in that open type forum. We can always then take a top three or top five and suggest that those are on the agenda and work for those. So I like that idea.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I know it's early so if the ideas come to folks later in the day, you know, I'll start a thread on the list just asking for other issues that we want to make sure get there and add to it. But please don't hesitate if the ideas pop up let me know throughout the day.

Sam.

Samantha Demetriou: One of the ones that I think Donna mentioned earlier was the PDP on reviewing rights protection mechanisms in all TLDs. If the charter gets approved at this meeting I'm sure that'll be a hot topic for June.

Paul Diaz: Certainly. Thank you. Okay work through the queue. Nothing else. Fair enough. We have about 20 minutes. For any of the issues that we've added to our agenda for our session - the slots between 11:00 and 1:00 - 11:00 and

1:30, do any of themselves perhaps to using the 20 minutes now that's quick so that we can have as much time as possible later in the day. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I think there's several we could probably deal with now although we have a lot of people missing. We've been trying to get a vote on the RDAP comments and it kind of stalls at about 33 people and 30 of those supported it, and three abstained, and must that's changed. It hasn't changed, Cherie, thanks.

It would be really good if we can at least get a simple majority to support that. But if we don't I think we should still craft a message that says, you know, we had 33 -- if it stayed away right now, we have 33 people that actively participated in those comments and 30 of those support those. I mean if that's the route we have to go I think it's disappointing if we can't get more participation are not for something that impacts all of us as registries very directly.

If it comes to that I would say we just proceed that way. But let's try today to get - in fact it might be good right now if we can poll the room and see if there are those who haven't responded that can commit to this week so that we can get that done. It's been hanging out there a long time.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Chuck. Yeah, it really has hung out there for a long time. Once we finally move through this one and the vote is done want to come back to the group, the request for a vote on this particular one, the mechanism by which we actually take a vote as opposed to what has been our traditional or at least recently traditional form of just communicating, sharing as long as there's no objection it goes forward as opposed to a formal vote. I think we want to take a look at that as a group and perhaps establish certain criteria, at least a threshold why we are voting on things.

Voting is important. Look, this is the most important fundamental right of being a member. It's how you express your views. And Keith reminded in the

current vote on the RDAP comments there's no opposition. So, you know, we just need a couple more people to get to the simple majority, make it official, and get our comments in.

Anybody in the room, if you have not or if you are in doubt please reach out to me or Cherie and we are very very pleased to log your position, make it official. It's really important. Cherie, did you want to add?

Cherie Stubbs: No, no thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And Chuck, to your point should we at least Marrakesh still not have the requisite number, the ExComm has discussed another way of moving forward that's truly not optimal. Our charter leave some wiggle room in terms of how we can interpret a vote that doesn't muster the simple majority but there was no active opposition. So we can move forward but it's not pretty and it seems kind of disappointing that we come this far and then we stall right at the end.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. And this is one of the times where we had plenty of time. We haven't been pushed by the clock.

Paul Diaz: Indeed. Extended deadlines on everything else. All right, we should have about 15 minutes before staff joins us. Other issues? Donna.

Donna Austin: Just on the voting issue, Cherie has a - if she can tell us who has voted then we can put pressure on those that haven't maybe while they're here.

Paul Diaz: Let's put you on the spot, Cherie. Do you have the vote roster available? Could you at least call out who has voted? And obviously if you don't hear your organization's name please click on the link, it takes all of 15 seconds.

Cherie Stubbs: Hi, this is Cherie. I currently have just a list of 31 of those 33 that have voted. I can pull up survey for the others. But, those who have voted are

dotAnalytics, dotBentley, dotClubdomains, dotGlobal, dotPost, dotSky, Afilias, Amazon, Boston Ivy, DNS Belgium, Donuts, dotBerlin, Employ Media, Fair Winds, ICM, Japan Registry Services Company, Minds+Machines, dotPharmacy, Neustar, NIC BR, Nokia, OP3FT, PIR, Punkt.Wein, Safety Registry Services, (SITA), Smart Internet Foundation, Starting (doc), Top Level Design, VeriSign and Zodiac.

I can quickly go into Survey Monkey or report back. There were two more that came in I think last night or yesterday.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Cherie.

Cherie Stubbs: You're welcome.

Paul Diaz: And we're not trying to shame anybody, we're just trying to get that little bit of an extra boost all right. So there is plenty. There's what 70 - how many 77 voting members now so obviously we've got the majority of us not having cast a ballot yet. But please hop on board. It just takes a few moments and it's meaningful. Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Can I go back to the nine o'clock session question?

Paul Diaz: Whatever you want, sure.

Kristina Rosette: I, for a variety of reasons, was taking a look at how many TLDs have yet to be delegated and I think at this point we're looking at about 350 to 370 which is a delegation rate that is far far higher than IANA has ever had to deal with in the next 4.5 months before people start running afoul of contractual obligations. Is this something that anyone has raised with IANA to say hello, you guys ready for this?

Paul Diaz: That's a fair question, Kristina, that we should ask staff when they're here to bring it to them. The anticipated volume is there. There was a session

Monday evening with Xavier going over the proposed fiscal '17 budget. They recognize that there will be a big crunch in July, the first month of their fiscal year. It's built into the plan. They're expecting the revenue that comes from it but getting the work done is a different question. And if there's a disconnect the right hand is looking - outreach for the money, left hand isn't even on the lever to turn them on, you know, that's going to be a problem. So let's raise it with staff.

Keith, go ahead.

Keith Drazek: Hi everybody. Keith Drazek for the transcript. So, Kristina, that's a great point and a great question. I'm curious, has there been any evidence so far based on the current introduction rate that there's any creakiness in the system or any problems that anyone is experiencing? I recognize that, you know, the crunch has yet to come and it's worth raising but I'm just wondering if anybody has experienced any problems so far.

Kristina Rosette: With the caveat that I am not a statistician. And the fact that the IANA metrics reports are, you know, a month to six weeks behind. It looks like the delegation rate has been slowing since the beginning of December in terms of how long it takes. Let me clarify that. The length of time it takes for them to process a new delegation request have been increasing.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks for the clarification, that's probably worth citing as we lead into that question to say look, you know, this is what we're seeing, don't know what it's related to but that's why we're concerned.

Paul Diaz: Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. There is a session going on right now with the people that are doing the route stability studies. It started 8:00 or 8:05 so - but I went through the presentation and it seemed they have already instrumented for following up this so they will be very closely knowing whether this has any effect or not.

So this will probably be very interesting for expanding the delegation rate because what we currently have is a guess that say oh, 20 a week in average looks fine.

But if we have to run that many delegations right now that would be a really good stress test for the system. And no, no, I'm pretty sure that's really no problem in delegating 100 a week or 1000 a week. The DNS server system is much more resilient than people used to think. And it's good that we have this kind of testing now.

Kristina Rosette: To be clear, I'm not raising the issue out of concern about the ability of the system to handle it. I'm raising it more to flag it for is the staff that needs to perform the function ready for it.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, fair point Kristina. The people have always been the weak link in the delegation process. That was understood working through the guidebook and it's still a concern, definitely a concern given the volume that we know is coming and at least certain parts of staff are already anticipating in the budget. Okay I've got the queue going again, Chuck, Sam and then Jeff.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let me say first of all if you treat Keith and I nice VeriSign will do its part. It's a simple matter of let's check what they lease and just say - is it correct to assume that you guys are anticipating this little blip and are you comfortable with what's coming? A real simple thing to do. And she's here.

Paul Diaz: And even if she's not here with us coming up we understand...

Chuck Gomes: In Marrakesh.

Paul Diaz: Right. And they can bring the question to her as well. Sam.

Samantha Demetriou: So in conversations - sorry, this is Sam Demetriou for the transcript. In conversations I've had with staff, and this is something we can clear up with

them today as well, they indicated that as long as you requested the delegation by your contract deadline that you're in compliance. But I imagine that if we're getting down to that date the time to delegate is going to expand. But that's not going to be like a contractual issue for the registry operator necessarily. So you could just end up being in like limbo where it's been requested but not actually occurred for essentially a couple of weeks. So if...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Yeah...

Samantha Demetriou: But, yeah, that was like, you know, kind of private conversation so we might want to follow up with them on that while they're here.

Paul Diaz: Most definitely follow up because that's all well and good but for those members I'm left with a very uncomfortable feeling that we are the guinea pigs, you know, can they expand the rate to more than 20 a week. And very importantly, you know, they wink and nod and say well as long as you've made the request then we'll get to it when we get to it. Well what does that mean if they're ready to go and want to go in July, now they're being told to wait because capacity can't handle them. The system is not working so let's try and get some clarity when they join us.

Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, this is Jeff Neuman for the transcript. My understanding is that we will see later on today or tomorrow a preliminary report from the -- not evaluator, people looking at the root and what the effect of adding all these new TLDs has had on the root. My understanding is we're going to see that the results are going to be negligible so let's all look out for that.

I agree it's probably going to be more likely a people issue than a technical issue. And I agree with Samantha that we should just ask that compliance

and the GDD staff if that interpretation is correct and then I think we're done with the issue.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thank you Jeff. Reg.

Reg Levy: Thanks. So I have just recently delegated one more TLD. And the contract says you have to have a domain delegated in the root of the TLD. So if some staff member is saying as long as you've requested delegation from IANA you're in compliance, that is way not how it's written. And we managed to get in right under the deadline because it did, it took them a couple weeks to delegate. And we needed to have that NIC page in because that's the compliance part and not the actual delegation of the TLD.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Very good issue that certainly going to be added to the agenda, such as different departments too if it's a compliance function as well. I'm not certain which members of staff will be with us but possibly if we get Allan or Maguy put it straight to them as well.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, this is a really good time to give a little report on the meeting that happened on SLEs yesterday because it's directly related to all this. And the group that was there and including our two reps on the SLE Working Group, agreed with staff's recommendation to collected data, and they're now able to collect data with - the systems have been modified to collect data that's needed to test the new SLEs that are being proposed and come up with reasonable thresholds that need to be met.

The plan is to collect data for three months. Originally it was six but if they do six there won't be time to analyze that and finalize the SLEs before the transition happens if it happens as planned. So they're going to do three - three months of data. They will analyze the data and figure out what are some realistic thresholds, the SLEs, service-level expectations.

And then the CSC, that Donna brought up earlier, will have the opportunity to recommend adjustments to that as more data is collected and so forth. So there will be new SLEs, exactly where the cuts off are will be determined after that three months and the analysis. And then that'll be able to be adjusted through the CSC's recommendations going forward. So that's very closely related to what we're talking about right now.

Paul Diaz: Great, thank you Chuck. Anymore thoughts or input on this particular item? Okay, here come our colleagues. Cyrus, Krista, welcome. Good morning, everyone.

Cyrus Namazi: Good morning.

Paul Diaz: We saved some seats for you up front so we have some microphones for you.

((Crosstalk))

END