ICANN
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
GNSO Registries Stakeholder Group Session III
Tuesday,14 March 2017 at 12:15 CET

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Paul Diaz:　　　　Yes, thank you, everybody. Welcome back. This is the second session for the Registry Stakeholder Group face to face of 14 March. I'm going to turn it over to Stephane to take us through our public comments.

Stephane Van Gelder:　　　Thanks, Paul. Stephane Van Gelder speaking. Well let me first start by introducing you all to (Vim) who's sitting next to me. And this is the first time many of you have met him or he's met many of you so please do introduce yourselves to him in the breaks that we have or if you want to talk to him.

But at least now you have a face against the name. And as you all - I'm sure all agree, we're very happy to have him back to work with us and that we've been able to make that happen.

So (Vim), thanks. Do you want to say a few words?

(Vim):　　　　Sure. Thank you. Well first enjoy your lunch. No, I think I'm very happy too that the meeting is in Europe so that I was able to join because it's great to

put a face on the name. I think we all know that it's way more pleasant to exchange e-mails after you have been able to shake hands to - with a person. That's the first point.

The second point I wanted to make is the importance to have your inputs and your cooperation. I think the project I'm there to help and put together your views and put them in a comment, it's very easy - or it's easier if I know what those views are. So it's important that I get your input there.

Secondly I'm always happy to hear input on practical things, how the work could be done easier, more effective. The project is there to help the Stakeholder Group to be more productive and more efficient in producing comments. So input there is always welcome.

It's great to hear people say - come up and say you have - are doing a good job. If people come and say you're doing a good job and - but did you think of doing it in this or that way to make it go smoother, then it's great and it's useful. So that's the two points I wanted to make.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, (Vim). So for those of you who are in Adobe, the latest version of the matrix is there now. And I apologize for sending two versions this morning but the first one had one comment missed out. And it's up on the screen.

Just to draw your attention to a few things. The recommendations to improve ICANN's transparency, there's been a draft compiled by them that you have a link in the comment matrix for. Please review that so that we can look to finalize that. The deadline is April the 10.

There's also - (Vim's) also done a draft for the use of country and territory names at top-level domains. The link is also in the matrix. I've not sent them to the list. They're in the matrix so you can get them there. Please review that

one as well as - at your convenience so that we can look to finalize that one which is - has a deadline of April the 21.

This matrix also has four new comment periods that have just come out whilst we were - I believe they've come out this week during the Copenhagen week.

Enhancing accountability guidelines for good faith, that's the first one. Deadline is April the 24.

Competition consumer trust and consumer choice review of recommendations for new GTLDs, deadlined April the 27. And that's - I'm sure that's one we'll want to take a close look at.

We've already discussed the FY18 operating plan and budget. That's the third comment. And we've already taken a note that we might want in our response to that comment to address the issue of travel slots.

And also the last one is a draft study on the African domain name system market.

So that - those are the four comments that we've added. We will work together with (Vim) to try and get input from the SG so that we can formulate initial drafts.

But as (Vim) has just said, we really do need input from the SG to formulate these drafts, whether they be official or unofficial, in that I mean whether you send them to the list or just contact (Vim) and myself directly. But the idea is not to formulate comments in a vacuum but to get inspiration from the group.

With that, I'll turn over to questions. Jeff and Donna I believe I saw.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Not on this list yet and not officially out for public comment will be what we call Community Comment 2 from the

Subsequent Procedures Working Group. It's a pretty extensive questionnaire, probably about 20 pages worth of questions. And that'll be due likely around May 1.

So I would temporarily put a placeholder in there with a link and start thinking about getting together the smaller team that worked on some of the proposals. I forgot what we called that smaller team that were working on new GTLD issues. But we should probably shortly after this ICANN meeting get that group together to start working on answers to those questions.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks for the heads up, Jeff. That's useful. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Stephane. Donna Austin. So I support Jeff. I think it's something that we probably do need that working group to reconvene and actually schedule some sessions so that we can work through and get some answers to those questions soon, that there's quite a lot of them.

Just on the country and territory names -- and apologies that I haven't actually read the comment that's up there yesterday -- but just a general comment to this group is that this is a working group that's been going on for three years. Predominantly the membership is from the CTNSO.

And so - and I - my understanding from Heather Forrest who is the Co-chair of this working group -- I think, Maxim, you've been on this working group as well -- is that they've come to a bit of an impasse.

And I think that there's a - the CCNSOs want to protect country and territory names in three character codes at the top level and I suspect because it will impact or have a competitive impact on them.

So I think it's something that we do need to take a look at and make sure we have a pretty strong stance if we're uncomfortable with the way it's going. Thanks, Stephane.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Donna. And that's also very useful for us. Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. That small addition about the particular group, basically it's a dead lock because half of community thinks that yes, we need those three letters and the other half of community thinks no, no way. And it's not for the small GAC work group to decide basically.

And it's I think third month or second month of trying to release the final letter of, yes, particularly what went wrong. That's it. So we might expect in some not so distant future the paper describing what was done, what's the major topic everybody's fighting around and, yes, that's it and basically recommendation to finish this group.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Max. And I can guess or hazard a guess -- I've got you, Chuck -- I can hazard a guess where this half of the community might lean towards.

Just a question on that. Has there been talk in the group of -- I mean, over the three years it's been going on I'm sure it has -- but if this is just new GTLDs. It's not looking at what exists already. Is that correct? Incumbent TLDs.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes because yes, partially because Comoro Islands didn't have dotcom so historically examples don't work well for the ideas that were shown there. So they will be at least of why no, why yes, who wants yes and who wants no basically in a more or less readable format. Yes, that's it.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Maxim and Donna, for bringing that to our attention. Let's hope -- I've got you Edmon as well -- let's hope that the group can rally around and take a close look at the work we'll be doing in that comment. Chuck and then Edmon.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. And I just want to remind all of us -- I don't - you probably don't need it but -- and the impasse is not necessarily a failure. It may be that we just need to let market forces work. So oftentimes we think a working group failed if they can't reach a consensus position but I disagree with that if people think that's a failure.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Chuck. Edmon and then back to Donna. Donna, you want to go first and then we'll go back to Edmon.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks. I've got a mouth full of food. Chuck, just to respond to what - to your comment, one of the, you know, ongoing discussion I've been having with Heather about this is this is a CCWG. And the - my understanding is that the CCNSO is being reluctant to push this into the new GLTD's PDP Working Group because they don't want this to - I guess they're concerned about where it might go.

So there's a little bit of friction with this too in that it - as a CCWG output it has no - it's got nowhere to go anyway even if it did have a resolution, I suppose, except into the new GTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. And I think there was a reluctance of those CCs to put it into that effort. But I don't see that it's got anywhere else to go.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Donna. Got Edmon and Jeff.

Edmon Chung: I'm - I wanted to bring up another…

Stephane Van Gelder: So Jeff, follow-up on this, I guess.

Jeff Neuman: As I have food in my mouth, thank you. Yes, Jeff Neuman. On this issue, it's in the PDP right now, and in the Subsequent Procedures PDP.

And again one of the important ways of making sure that happens is to - is that we're organizing this face to face in Johannesburg and we've already got commitments from the GAC and others in the community to participate, including the CCNSO.

So I think we should respond to this in a way that indicates that we support it being within the GNSO policy development process because it does relate to generic top-level domains. And so I think it's very important and we're taking the issue anyway.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. Any further comments on this one or can I turn to Edmon? Go ahead, Edmon, please.

Edmon Chung: Yes, Maxim wants to say something.

Stephane Van Gelder: Maxim was…

Maxim Alzoba: Small item to add on the top. Actually GAC had the subcommittee called Country and Territory Names and they are not particularly happy with each other, the, yes, cross-community group and the GAC's subcommittee. So it doesn't end with the final letter from Cross-community Work Group. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So I wanted to bring your attention to the IDN Implementation Guideline public comment period. The reason is in fact that is - that document is in all of your contracts. So the changes through there impacts your registry contract directly.

So I'd - you know, I think it's important for all the registries to take a look at, well all the registries that do offer IDNs -- I should moderate that a little bit -- because this is the interim report. And we're trying to get feedback on whether the items are correct.

So this is one of the documents -- I think when we talked about the RA amendments -- this is now - you know, this kind of overrides everything that we do about IDNs. So I'd urge people to take a look at it and for this - for the RSOG to actually come out with comments.

I kind of co-chair it with another chair from the CCNSO because this is one of the very few documents that actually overs both GTLDs and CCTLDs. So again because I co-chair, probably not the best for me to try to draft any comments on this but I'm happy to be part of any drafting team.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much, Edmon. Back to Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Edmon. Sorry, Jeff Neuman. Thanks, Edmon, for bringing that to our attention. What would be helpful since most of us are not IDN experts, it may be helpful for you to describe -- not now but maybe in an e-mail to the group -- exactly how it impacts us. What are the changes that are going to happen as a result? Because most of us are not those kinds of experts.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Jeff.

Edmon Chung: Can I? Yes, I think absolutely but just quickly on it, this version of the IDN Implementation Guidelines is quite different from the last version because we've gained so much experience on it and also the team behind it is pushing for a lot of more close to legalist kind of language in there, lots of musts, should, may. It's defined in kind of the RC format and made to be more "enforceable." So I think that's the key impact on registries.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. I can't see any more hands. So just to close and say that this kind of discussion is really useful for us. It's exactly what we need to try and supplement our comments and make the draft comments that we send you as useful to the group as possible. So thank you for engaging in it. Oh I have...

(Kristine):   Sorry, (Kristine) from Amazon. I just have a question because I was asking internally about this, this IDN topic. I understand there's some historical comments that the Registry Stakeholder Group has made once upon a time basically saying that ICANN has - it's not within ICANN's remit to establish IDN tables. And I'm wondering if that's relevant and if anybody in the room has that historical background.

Stephane Van Gelder: I certainly don't have it but every ICANN topic has history. So I guess there must be someone. (Jordan)?

(Jordan):   So I guess two things. First is I think our previous stance has been that ICANN - it's not in ICANN's remit to create binding registry tables and that it's fine for them to create - you know, like if you want to do language X creating an LGR that would help a registry figure out what to do if they don't have particular language expertise seems like a reasonable thing to do and might actually be quite helpful for a number of registries.

On the other hand, having ICANN assume that it knows best even over registries that do have language expertise and have given considerable thought to their language tables probably isn't the right route.

And so the - and I think ICANN has agreed with that stance and said that the tables that they're producing going forward are intended to be advisory as opposed to binding.

The stuff - the implementation guidelines that Edmon is talking about are a little different. Those are general guidelines. And those are incorporated by reference into our contracts.

So regardless of whether we think it's ICANN's remit to establish such guidelines, we've all signed the contract that says that they can and they will.

So I think, as Edmon points out, it makes - it pays to pay attention to that particular document.

(Kristina): Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. And this fits in nicely with the discussion we've been having over the past few weeks on the Japanese LGRs and whether we wanted to respond to that or not and thinking about responding that they - whatever comes out of that, it shouldn't be more than an ICANN advisory. Back to Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here. Just adding to what (Jordan) was saying. Actually inside the implementation guidelines, this particular topic is covered as well. I am hoping that the language in there is in line with the obviously OSG position but please help me make sure that it is because it is going to, you know, contracts.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I don't need to say much -- this is Chuck Gomes -- because I was going to do the same thing and reinforce the distinction that (Jordan) was making because it's really important between the guidelines and the LGRs, two different things obviously related because they're both for IDNs. But I need - I don't think I need to say anymore.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. I see no further hands. So once again thank you for engaging in this discussion. Let's continue that trend on the list. And once again please use the comment matrix which is available to all members through the Members Only section of our Web site to keep tabs on where we are on comments. And you may want to respond or engage in discussing them.

Thanks very much. I'll hand it back to Paul now.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Stephane. All right. So we've largely caught up to top of the hour. We will need to break, have a hard stop in 45 minutes. They've got to switch over the recordings and what not for the Head of Registrars coming in.

So in the 45 minutes that remains, we have three items, broadly policy issues, admin issues and then a brief update from our colleagues who are on the CSC. Does anybody have a preference? We don't have a list of potential policy or admin. We've touched on a lot of things throughout the day so far and the idea is we can go back to it.

(Elaine), (Cal), if you guys are ready, we might jump to you so that we're sure we get the briefing in. And keep it quick, gives people a chance to think of other issues and then we'll circle back.

(Cal): Thank you. So the intention here was to actually have a Q&A rather than just really a passthrough of these slides. So hopefully you've all had a chance to read it and pore through the collected wisdom of the CSC.

Just a quick summary and then as many questions as possible in the few minutes that we have would be great.

(Elaine) and I, your representatives from the ROSG, we've got (Jay) and (Byron) from the CC side of things, the four of us together create or form the CSC.

We're supported by liaisons who are non-voting participants but from all other aspects they can participate. They can assist with the work and obviously provide some very useful advice and context.

We have released four reports which - the distribution of which have - has improved I think over the last few reports. Initially it was a very narrow distribution and as feedback's come in, we've managed to distribute that

much wider. So you may well be receiving these reports from several sources if you're on multiple lists.

The scope of the CSC is restricted to measuring the SLEs that we're agreed on. I think there's about 60-odd SLEs. We assess those each month.

And depending on the outcome from PTI and that they are the ones that supply those results, we will provide one of three assessments. One is Excellent for everything was passed, Satisfactory if a couple of SLEs were missed but we didn't consider them particularly material and Poor Performing if there was a particularly ongoing issue.

Woman 1:   (Unintelligible).

(Cal):   Sure. The intention wasn't to actually go through all of these slides one by one. So hopefully I can now open it to the Q&A actually. Otherwise, we'll waste time just listening to me.

Paul Diaz: Anybody have any immediate questions? (Jonathan)?

(Jonathan):   (Cal), maybe I should know the answer to this so forgive me if I don't. But what options are there to you to - if the SLEs need to be modified and developed in future, what are the options to deal with that rather than just, you know, taking what you were given and working with those? Thanks.

(Cal):   Yes, that's a good question. And it's actually something that we're about to exercise for the first time. It's - we don't ourselves modify those SLEs. We will go back to our sponsoring organizations and there is potentially a complex process to update it. We're hoping not.

                We're having a brief from ICANN staff -- I think it's due for our May meeting -- where they will clarify the exact process.

And the first SLE for your records will be the technical retest which I think currently sits at five minutes. We'll be asking for it to change to ten minutes. That sounds generally quite trivial. We're all very comfortable with that particular test. It's a good one to pass through that process for the first time.

So there is a formal process. I can't give you a full rundown except that it must go back to the GNSO at the very least to validate. And we'll exercise that in the very near future actually.

(Jonathan): Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Others? Chuck, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. And I'm not going to ask a question. I'm going to repeat what some of you heard over the weekend at the GNSO working sessions. I certainly complemented (Elaine) then and I want to do the same thing to (Cal) and the whole CSC because I think they're doing a really good job. And I appreciate them spending the time it takes to review the PTI reports and to report back on them. I find the reports very helpful.

And not to embarrass you again, Donna, but thanks for leading that Design Team in the transition effort, the transition CWG, and setting up the CSC because I think it's proving to be very valuable.

Certainly in my role as part of a registry makes it - it's really reassuring to know that we have this body that's overseeing this and they give us reports that make it really easy to track what's going on and what's meeting the SLEs, what's not. And they've been doing really well so far. So thanks to all of you.

(Cal): Thank you, Chuck. I know (Elaine) and I appreciate it. I'd also like to take this opportunity to mention that, as should be reflected through our monthly

reports, we're generally very satisfied with PTI and their engagement with us, their willingness to work with us and clarify certain issues.

So for now I think the collaboration -- and I should really emphasize that it is a collaborative effort between the CSC members, liaisons and PTI -- has been quite successful. And if there is any direct feedback to us, then I would always appreciate it.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the record. There is one thing that still bothers me a bit. In some items that we don't have SLEs, we don't have - also we don't have such level monitoring. So even though that is - there are no expectations for specific activities, one that always comes to mind is IDN table management.

We still should have some level monitoring and say oh this is taking three months. So then we can further down the road and say oh, this is not acceptable. We should have an SLE for that. So even those items without SLE we could have monitoring and then decide oh we need SLE, we don't, so forth.

And if you collect specifically the IDN tables processing for registries, that seems to be still something ongoing, something unresolved for now. I know that this is not as much important as delegation and re-delegation which is far more important but still we do have some contractual obligations regarding that. Thank you.

(Cal): So I should clarify that the CSC is strictly focused on the naming function only, not the protocol management. And here I'm getting into my - into a little bit more speculative area. There is another observation or group associated with that, not the CSC. We are not responsible for protocol management.

Rubens Kuhl: This is actually a main function. I even asked a liaison during this weekend if this was considered to be a naming functions or a protocol parent function. This is a naming function.

(Cal):   Okay. That's news to me. It's not part of our SLEs. I'll need to follow that up. So thank you for bringing that to my attention.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thank you all. Anything else? I think - Donna, do you want to introduce it, just a quick update?

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, Paul. Donna Austin. So, you know, my thanks again to (Cal) and (Elaine) on the work that they're doing in the CSC as a whole. I think it's terrific that you, you know, got a really good team that kicked this off.

                  So I think there's a requirement to review the charter up to 12 months of the CSC working. And I think one of the changes that we should recommend is that you two stay in perpetuity, that there be no rotation out.

                  So but just on that, so Paul and I had a conversation with (Katrina) from the CCNSO this week. And just to put it in front of everybody here is that the Registry Stakeholder Group and the CCNSO are required to put together a review committee after 12 months of the CSC operating to review the charter.

                  And that's something that's - you know, Paul and I are aware of. And at some point in the near future we will be calling for volunteers to do that. I think what we agreed with (Katrina) is that it be a committee of six, so three from each side of the whatever we are. And ultimately that review will probably be pretty lightweight.

                  And I expect that we will have a decent amount of engagement with the CSC itself just to see how the charter's operating and where you need some more flexibility or changes to help you with your work.

                  And then ultimately any changes need to be approved by the CCNSO and the GNSO. But we'll be kicking that off in the next couple of months I think.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Donna. And just to underscore there's time to do this. It's not like we have to jump on it right after but we don't want to let it slide either. And a CCNSO colleague made it clear that, you know, we shouldn't just work around ICANN meetings but do all the stuff in between as well.

All right. With that… Another one. (Elaine)?

(Elaine):   Thanks. So the INSO has asked me to pass along two requests. One is that people would respond to their annual PTI survey. It's an opportunity to let them know how they're providing services for things like the IDN tables.

And also, you know, as members of the CSC, we've gotten requests from people just asking us hey, can you get IANA to do this or do that and, as (Cal) said, that's outside our remit. But they would like anybody who has a request of IANA to send an e-mail to their IANA@IANA.org and that way they can deal with it internally. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Great. Thank you. All right. Then why don't we switch back to the agenda? For the block of time that remains, a good half-hour we had just aside for policy, administrative issues.

Looking at the chat, Kristine Dorrain had raised a question/concern so let's… There you are. Why don't you raise it? Don't have to read it for you. I thought you were out of the room.

Kristine Dorrain: Well I was - I kind of threw it in the chat so that people could kind of take a look at it and decide what they thought. And they know (Allen) kind of brought this up to the Cross-community Working Group yesterday but - and I did actually circulate sort of some talking points via e-mail last week to the list.

But, you know, we talked to Compliance today about sort of this idea of them tracking, you know, registries and maybe creating a report card and doing things with that information.

But there is another component to it. So if you look at the (Havir) letter, the letter to the GAC, it's in two sections. So there's one section that's just about Spec 11-3B and security and one section about compliance.

So we dealt with the compliance team this morning. What we haven't dealt with yet is this idea that the Board, or at least that the staff addressed the doc, seemed to believe that one, spam is a security threat. Two, that ICANN has some sort of obligation to monitor spam and other security threats.

And then ICANN has an obligation to let the registries know their findings and create some sort of a scorecard or report card or metric by which they can judge us after, you know, looking at these feeds.

And it's interesting because the only feeds they've indicated that they are signed on to so far are Servo and Spamhaus. So they haven't even listed any non-spam feeds.

So are we interested in seeing if the registrars are aligned with us, you know, any concerns that we might have? Is this something we're ready to bring to the board? Or do we need to sort of nuance it more internally before we, you know, take some more formal action? Just throwing it out there for discussion. I'm just not sure of the temperature in the room I guess.

(Paul):   Thank you Kristine. Thoughts? I mean we did just begin the discussions this morning. And at the very least we have an action item of pulling together group volunteers to go back to compliance. But if we can get a better sense of the temperature in the room let's go. I see Rubens and (Michael).

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the transcript. I'd just like to correct one thing. Although Spamhaus and Servo started in the (sprung) – (mandatory sprung 5) team, they also track specific (tracks).

So I'm looking here at Servo. They have an abuse (leaf). They have at least a phishing site, malware site and (crack it) site. So part of their content is aligned with what we call security trends and part is not.

So although those organizations come from a spam background, they are not only spam. So the thing is what we look at their data. So if you look at this spam studies because then we are looking at spam. But they are not only spam.

(Michael): Rubens stole my thunder there. I was going to say the exact same thing. But I guess I wanted to kind of ask for more clarification. Did they say specifically that they were only monitoring for spam? Or did they – it was more so abroad abuse, security threats I'm assuming?

(Paul): Alan.

(Alan): (I don't know if it's the right side). Actually jumped into their session there, but unfortunately we were all kind of kicked out of the back and put into the remote participation so I came back here.

I took one picture of one of the slides. And they said that the goal of it is comprehensive statistical comparison of rates of DNS abuse in new and legacy gTLDs – spam, phishing, malware and (bomet).

(Paul): Okay so beyond the traditional abusive things that we would all deal with, spam keeps coming up. And I think for most registry operators, that is not necessarily a technical abuse issue. It's something different content related – Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes just to think of this conversation in a slightly different direction. The CCT has separately commissioned a DNS abuse study, which I think aims to do similar things, which is to take a look at the concentration of abuse levels and

see if there's a correlation to sort of A, the baseline in new gTLDs versus legacy gTLDs to see if there's a difference in behavior.

And then try to see if there's patterns that emerge amongst the new gTLDs as well. I don't understand the extent to which the work that David Conrad's team is doing as at all correlated with this.

And, you know, to the point I made earlier today, I don't think it's a bad thing to try to have a methodologically sound approach to sort of thinking about and reporting on this to the extent we can agree on a definition of what security threats and/or DNS abuse look like.

So I think it would make sense for us to continue to just engage some combination of compliance with David Conrad. And then also think about the CCT report that the CCT also recommends doing on a regular basis. And making sure this is all happening as one thing.

To reflect back on our budget discussion earlier today, one behavior I've been noticing at ICANN lately is there's a lot of very, very similar looking parallel efforts going on within ICANN. And one way that ICANN could probably save a bunch of money is to consolidate parallel efforts into single efforts where there's a lot of duplication.

So I think to the extent we could look to A, be a little bit more involved in helping define what this is going to look like. And B, to make sure that it's being done in an efficient – a financially efficient manner and time efficient manner I think would be prudent.

(Paul): Thank you Jordyn. Okay I have Maxim, (Sam) and (Christine).

Maxim Alboza: Thanks, Maxim Alboza for the record. The current version of what they have done is yet not very useful. They just have inputs. They mix it up. They strip out all the good information and we cannot basically use it.

I think if we could suggest them that the methodology should be like investigated before doing things, before spending budget on something which cannot be used, and that we might help them with ideas of what can be done. Because if we do not participation, probably we will face something horrible. Thanks.

(Paul): Thank you Maxim, (Sam).

(Sam): Thanks (Paul). This is (Sam) from (Ferrins). To go off of Maxim's point and to address something that (Christine) had raised, I definitely agree that I think there's an opportunity for us to provide input here.

I don't know if it's too soon at this point to go to the Board until we kind of collect our thoughts. So maybe instead the action item here is that we try to invite David or someone from his team to one of our upcoming calls to really get some input on what exactly it is that they're doing.

I think the conversation Alan had with them seemed like it was super helpful. And it would probably be good for the rest of us to hear some of what they have to say and also offer our suggestions on maybe how they could do it a little bit better.

(Paul): That's a neat idea (Sam). Just a quick gauge to the room. Again, we don't have our next scheduled biweekly until the 5th of April. It's a long ways off. Would the group be interested in trying to schedule sort of an off cycle call – a special call with the CTO?

I mean it allows us to drill in a little bit more and not everybody has to attend if that's not their thing. All right, we'll look into the scheduling and get back. It would probably be Wednesday in a similar timeslot. But one of the coming Wednesdays between now and April. Okay (Christine) thanks for waiting.

(Christine Agrin): Thanks, (Christine Agrin) for the transcript. So it says in the letter that what the – what ICANN is doing is the Chief Technology Officer's office is conducting a research project that works with industry experts to develop a service.

Later in the letter they call it a tool. So I'm not sure if they're mid-designing software or what they're doing. So but it appears to be a money spending adventure to consolidate DNS abuse-related feeds to generate statistics on a variety of malicious domain names per registrar and registry.

The intent of this research project is to provide an authoritative, unbiased and reproducible dataset that tracks DNS abuse-related trends over time, which to me raises a couple of questions.

We're contractually obligated to do this. Why are they doing it? Is their report going to override our contractual report? And are they going to compare their data to ours and tell us later that we're failing?

I think Maxim or someone pointed out earlier that, you know, there's some data feeds that are better than others. And so you're going to – and the off thing is that we get context.

If we get a hundred abuse reports and 95 are false positives, we know that 5% of the domains are bad or whatever. But – or 5% of the reports are accurate. But they won't know that. They're just going to see a hundred reports.

And so how are they going to hold us to that? So those are some of the questions that I have, but I think we can just continue to ponder I guess if it's not time to raise it.

(Paul): Okay well good. All right then. If we go with this issue, what else do people want to address? Other policy concerns? Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes so this is Jordyn Buchanan for the record. I've been slow at doing something I said I would do to – a response to (Jeff), which was to revise the communication we had put together around our new gTLD working group to sort of repoint that at the PDP rather than at the Board.

And then sort of separate out a separate communication to the Board referencing that. I guess I have a couple of quick thoughts about this.

First is a question to Jeff I guess. Which is is it still helpful to send that communication standalone to the PDP? Or should we wait and mail that input into the community consultation too or whatever that thing is? So maybe I'll just pause there for a second and let Jeff respond and then make my other point.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's a good question. I'm of two minds – sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. I think you should have mailed it to the response to Community Comment Number 2. But to the extent that we're going to have meetings of the PDP working group between now – or sorry, between the end of the ICANN meeting and when those are due. I still think they can help in certain areas. So it's almost kind of a both.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sure yes. And they're not at odds. I just wanted to make sure it was still useful. So we'll do that. And the secondly, the conversation – there were several interesting conversations that took place yesterday between the new TLD – or between the review/review and the discussion with the Board in the public forum.

Which were that I think we started to trend towards a sentiment of something I had suggested in the review/review's discussion, which is it might be helpful to start to think about what Applicant Guidebook Number 2 looks like.

And to look at the places where we can just – where we've already – the – we've already roughly decided what we expect the behavior in a subsequent procedure to look like because the PDP has taken a look at the issue and sort of said yes, that works.

Or, you know, yes we already agree on a change or something like that where there's consensus around what we expect the behavior to be. And that's especially important I think for things that changed in the 2012 round where there was a divergence between what was published in the guidebook and what actually happened.

So it would be good to start writing that down. If we agree that that's what should actually happen next time to start to sort of lay out what that guidebook could look like.

But secondly is the point that I had raised to the Board the last couple of public forums is that the board made a commitment back five years ago now, back in February of 2012 not only to the general concept of another round with the language they used at the time, but also to instruct the staff to put together a work plan to get there.

And so I think it may be helpful for us to start to think about how the registries in particular and the – probably the broader GNSO community in general can start to sort of collaborate with staff to make that work plan happen.

And I think the guides of starting to pull together a new guidebook that sort of hinges off of the work that the PDP has already reached consensus on would be a really good place to start pulling both the work plan together as well as laying the groundwork for a subsequent procedure.

And I think Jonathan Zuck made a separate point which is there's a whole bunch of other areas sort of independent of what the guidebook text actually says. Just increasing like making sure ICANN has the capacity to be sort of

ready to hit the ground running as soon as the community has figured out what it wants to do.

All that work can and should be happening now. And I think we should be trying to figure out how to engage staff to make that happen. Sorry, and I say this because I actually think that's how I would frame a revised – to take that document and send the detailed document that we to the PDP.

And then create another communication to the Board and to Akram that frames this broader set of issues and said hey by the way, we have our perspective on how we can resolve a bunch of these issues. But while that's happening, you know, let's go ahead and get these other things in motion while the PDP continues its work in any case.

(Paul):   Okay thanks Jordyn. We've got a queue going. Keith you were first. You've been waiting and then Stephane and then Jeff.

Keith Drasek: Sorry, thanks (Paul). I'm talking about a separate issue. So I'll let Jeff respond.

(Paul):   Thanks we'll come back, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Jordyn. And sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. I think that's a good idea. In fact I – after I made the comments during the review session, and I'm terrible with names sometimes. I saw the gentleman that's responsible for Salesforce at ICANN.

And he had approached me – was it – Bob. Okay Bob. I saw Bob and he had approached me. And one of the things that I had talked to him about was as mundane as the application system, you know, where we actually submitted our application – (CAS) I guess they called it.

Apparently they don't have (CAS) anymore. That's completely done away. So you're clapping for (CAS), or as I said. So anyway, he approached me and said he wanted to talk to me about what I thought an application system should look like in terms of, you know, being the one that's actually typed in a bunch of applications over years at the GDD Summit.

That might be a good time to start, you know, instead of just me – it should just be. It should be a bunch of us talking about things that we can do with an application system. And how, you know, how difficult it was the last time of just ASCII characters and all that kind of stuff that we wanted to put into there.

So I think we can do a bunch of things that really are implementation that don't have anything to do with subsequent procedures. We can start that dialogue now and get them ready for it.

(Paul):   Thanks Jeff, Stephane.

Stephane: Thanks (Paul), Stephane Van Gelder. Yes, Jeff and Jordyn make very practical points. And I think these are practical approaches that we need right now.

Just to give you a supplemental bit of info that's completely unofficial grapevine info, but those are always fun. I have it on authority – on good authority that (Juren) had said this week to some people that the new G – ICANN is ready to do a second round now technically.

Which I find slightly worrying because when I listen to you guy there seems to be a disconnect between that appraisal and what the reality is. So I'm not sure how, you know, it's always difficult to know how to talk to either the Board or the ICANN management about these things.

But clearly one way of – I mean it's important to go back to the commitment that Jordyn mentions. It's important to go back to the initial guidebook and the commitment there to have a subsequent round in what was the wording? Extremely timely fashion or something ridiculous like that seeing it's been now five years and it looks like it will be a lot longer.

But really a question on how we can address expectations or the disconnect between them saying they're ready and it's up to the community to get its act together and decide when to go next and our impression that this is not the case. And that the community is ready, but ICANN isn't.

(Paul):   Thank you (Stephane). (Reg) wants to jump in. Keith please, thank you for waiting. Maxim will it be on this one or another issue? Okay then we'll come to you.

(Reg):   Thanks. Sorry (Jess), his name is Bob Schumacher. He is director of Salesforce at ICANN. And he and I have been in contact since he was hired two years ago, a year and a half, about Salesforce and the fact that registries as well as registrars that the contracted parties requires certain things of ICANN from whatever portal they're going to force us to use.

So we met – and they've reconvened the portal users working group thing, which some of you may recall. And we met recently. We have access to a beta system and we're currently trying to break it which is one of my favorite things. So that it doesn't break when it goes live with all of us.

So definitely work well – work with Bob. He's open to suggestions. He has a great history of working in Salesforce but knows nothing about our industry. So talking to him about specifics, he's going to be super receptive to that.

And I really encourage anybody with ideas for the application system to hand them off to Jeff to give to Bob. And if anybody has recommendations about

the portal system for managing your own registries, send them off to me. Thanks.

(Paul): Thank you (Reg). Very helpful. Okay Maxim and then (Adrian).

Maxim Alboza: Actually I think we have something like this from (Rod Backstrum) so that everything is ready. But sometime it's a treasure, the second time it's farce. So it's not going to be so verbal.

(Paul): (Adrian).

(Adrian Kidrist Newstar): (Adrian Kidrist Newstar). I covered this from a little bit of a practical point of view which is weird for this environment. But I believe that there needs to be a balance between both ICANN Board and staff and the community.

There's no doubt that the work has to be done by the community. However, the community left to its own devices will continue to do this work ad nauseam.

I believe that staff and Board have a roll to say you need to move by this time and to be setting deadlines. Then to push the community to complete its work by those deadlines, otherwise they go with other solutions because they have an existing one.

And so to be able to – for this group to mobilize and put pressure onto the Board to say put a line in the sand, stop allowing this work to go on ungoverned because it will continue on and on and on and on and on. That would be the best thing that the ICANN Board and staff could do in order to achieve a timely introduction of the next round of new gTLDs.

(Paul): Thank you (Adrian). Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Just in response to that. I think the community has set forth work plans on what needs to be done and when it needs to be done by. And I ask all your help to help us meet those timelines.

So there are some timelines that are already in place. There's for example we must get an initial report out on subsequent procedures, PDP by no later than the end of this year.

We must get a final report by no later than mid to or September 2018. I think we should work on deadlines after that. But help me meet those timelines. Help the ones that are doing the work meet the timelines by participating.

You can't just go and say I want this deadline; and therefore, you know, it has to be done by then. You need to participate and get the work done. And that's what I need help with. I need more registries in there. I need more registries contributing their experiences. I need more registries to stand up and say no, it's good enough the way it is and it's not happening.

And you can sit there on the sidelines and you could say I'm sorry. Again, this is a pet peeve of mine. You could write and article that says it's got to happen tomorrow. Help me help you. Thank you.

(Paul):   Thanks Jeff. Okay I've got Donna, Jordyn, (Adrian) you want to get back in there?

Donna Austin: Yes thanks (Paul), Donna Austin. So I believe you started with a com – a suggestion from Jordyn that, you know, we seek a project plan from staff. And I think we do need that.

And Jeff to your point, I mean I – we're contributing to the PDP, but the PDP is just one component of what needs to happen in order to trigger a next round. And I think that's the important piece that we need a contribution from ICANN from because they need a readiness plan.

They need something they need to work to. So I don't – we are assisting with the PDP, but I just want to make the point that's only one component of what needs to be done in order to trigger, you know, the next round.

There's still a lot of preparatory work that ICANN, the organization needs done – needs to do to enable that. So I think that's the point we're getting to. I don't think anyone's criticizing what's happening with the PDP, but it's just one component of what has to happen to enable, you know, to trigger our next round.

(Paul): Thank you Donna Okay Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes I was going to make two observations. Donna's already made one. So I'll just sort of say I actually don't think what (Adrian) is suggesting and what Jeff is saying are particularly at odds.

I think that the Board could look at the work plan that the PDP has already laid out and sort of see there's an end date of whatever – the end of next – September of next year or something like that.

And build a plan to get to a new application window around that end date. And then try to hold the community accountable to deliver according to that schedule.

And I know Jeff you're already trying to hold the community accountable to deliver that schedule, but the Board can make it clear that it has that same expectation.

And I actually think that would send a really strong signal that would help you get the help you need. I think if people really believe that new gTLDs were coming like at the end of 2018 or something like that, people would get really,

really motivated to help figure out what that policy looks like to a greater extent than they do today.

When as Brett pointed out eloquently at the mic yesterday, it's really unclear. You know, you can do a bunch of work now but you have no idea what the payoff looks like.

And so I think if the Board was to manage – the Board and staff were to manage to put together a work plan with milestones and an actual data at which they expected applications to be available based on the work that your PDP is doing, I would think that that would make a lot more people interested in diving into the work.

(Paul): Okay guys, I've got (Adrian) and Chuck. Keith is in waiting and we've got about five minutes before we have to take that hard break for technical stuff. So let's continue the conversations, but please let's give Keith a chance too.

(Adrian Kidrist Newstar): (Unintelligible) Keith, I'll keep this low. Yes, yes just wanted to jump on Jordyn again. And I think you just said it exactly right. I would ask this group to formally put what Jordyn is requesting, or at least the way he is stating it, to put that formally to the Board in order to get some traction because this is really good conversation.

I'm seeing a lot of head nodding when Jordyn and Jeff are talking. I think Jeff it will provide the input you need to get that input when is a kind of deadline.

So if we can get that in place and have us put a motion forward to the board to move on this that will be something that would be really positive to take out of this meeting. Thank you.

(Paul): Thank you (Adrian). Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I just want to share a little bit of a caution here. I'm not unsympathetic to the helpfulness of guidelines and targets and so forth. But if we truly believe in the bottom up multi-stakeholder process we have to be very careful.

And of course I'm speaking from a fairly bias point of view because I'm sharing the RDS and PDP working group. It would be very easy for the Board to give us a guideline, a deadline, but boy, I may not be able to achieve it.

It's – and of course I'm dealing with a very complex issue that's been haunting us for ICANN's whole history. But let's just be cautious. I understand the goals and the objectives of keeping things moving. And we should always try to do that and always speed up. But I don't think we can short circuit the multi-stakeholder process.

So I'm not saying don't do anything with what you're talking about, but let's be cautious because if you short circuit the multi-stakeholder process and policy development, that's a key fundamental element of ICANN and of our businesses as well. And that could come back and haunt us.

(Paul):   Okay thanks Chuck. Go ahead Jeff, jump in.

Jeff Neuman: Jeff Neuman. Really small point, but I think it's important for us to emphasize. On ICANN slides, the new gTLD program, it has all of the reviews, which it calls prerequisites to the next round.

On there is the RDS work, the Whois work. I think we need to make a clear statement that that should be taken off. That that is not a dependency for the next round. And we need to be very forceful.

I thought it was just a slide issue and it was an accident, but apparently this morning when talking with the GAC they had referred to that as an essential PDP that needed to be finished before the next round.

So somehow we need to send a message that RD DS's or RDS, sorry, is not a prerequisite to have another round of new TLDs.

(Paul): Okay I still see hands. We've got to give Keith a chance. He's waiting. We literally got four minutes now before the break. Are you sure? Thank you Keith. Gracious. Maxim.

Maxim Alboza: Yes just to make them sure that things aren't going to like fall apart because we don't want RDS. We might accompany it with the wording that whatever this is all registries and the registrars will have to comply because it's already in the contract. So you can change it whenever it comes. Thanks.

(Paul): All right, then Keith if I'm not seeing other hands, is it something you can address in minutes or do you want time later?

Keith Drasek: Yes, just a short update. So under the – I guess we're talking policy and implementation. Just a heads up that there is a session tomorrow at 11 on RDAP that Francisco has called.

So for anybody that's focused on the whole RDAP issue, strongly encourage attendance at that session. They're looking for feedback on their latest publication. And Marc, are you in the room here? Marc Anderson. Yes, you want to make any comments, a little bit of detail or context on that?

Marc Anderson: Yes Marc Anderson from Verisign. I'll just give a little quick context. This is related to the request for reconsideration that we filed back in August of 2016. It was our response to an ICANN-driven initiative to publish an RDAP profile dictating how we would implement RDAP.

One of the stipulations that we asked for and I believe (Cyrus) agreed to at the time was that he would engage in meaningful dialogue with the registry stakeholders about how to implement RDAP.

And, you know, unless I've missed something, I don't think that's actually happened. And what we're going to see at this session tomorrow is ICANN staff's new proposal for how to implement RDAP. So I'll be – I'll for one will be interested to see how that goes and how that impacts registries. Thank you.

Keith Drasek: Okay thanks Marc. And just one more thing on RDAP. I just sent an email to the stakeholder group list just for an update on Verisign's efforts related to RDAP.

And Verisign labs launched an experimental implementation of RDAP in January of 2016. And the link that I sent in the email gives you some information and details, some substance behind that.

So if anybody's interested in RDAP either before or after the session tomorrow, I encourage you to look at that. And I also have hard copies of the slick if anybody wants to pick up a copy. Thanks.

(Paul): All right. Thank you Keith. All right that it then. Why don't we take our break now? I request to everybody please seriously be back and ready to go at 5 minutes of, all right, so 10 minutes from now.

Registrars will be joining us momentarily. We are going to do a quick recognition ceremony at the beginning and then we'll have the balance of the hour for our time with the registrars. So a 10 minute break. Please be ready to start again at 5 of.

Woman: We can stop the recording now please.

<div align="center">END</div>