

ICANN
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad
GNSO – Registries Stakeholder Group Membership Meeting
Sunday, 06 November 2016 at 13:00 IST

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

Cherie Stubbs: This is the afternoon session of the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting in Hyderabad. Welcome to those who are participating remotely. I believe we have, Sue, do you know who's on...

Sue Schuler: (Unintelligible) some of them are in the room so Alan...

Cherie Stubbs: Alan Woods will be dialing in.

((Crosstalk))

Cherie Stubbs: And Wim Degezelle and Ken Stubbs will be joining in. And I just wanted to remind everyone this session is being recorded and transcribed so purposes of the recording if you would please announce your name prior to speaking it would be extremely helpful and for the benefit of everyone in the room as well as the remote participants. And be sure and help yourself to lunch if you haven't already. With that I'll turn it over to our chair, Paul Diaz.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Cherie. Like to welcome Jonathan Zuck from CCT RT and Eleeza from staff who is assisting and Jordyn of course is our rep to the Review Team. We're going to lead the afternoon with a quick update and a request of the members so turn it over, Jonathan or Jordyn.

Jonathan Zuck: Hi, everyone. Thanks for having me. My name is Jonathan Zuck, for those of you who don't know me, and I'm the chair of the Affirmation of Commitments mandated review on the new gTLD program's effect on competition, consumer choice and consumer trust.

And one of the things that we're trying to do is evaluate the application and evaluation process and what went well, what didn't there, etcetera. In some instances we're looking at the effect it had on a third world but in other places we're trying to just figure out what kind of – where improvements could be made in that process.

And as such, we feel that a survey via Nielsen Research of applicants to share their experiences with the application and evaluation process. Of the 1900 applications we reduced that down to 512 actual applicants. And so far we have 45 respondents to the survey, which is almost a big enough sample when talking about large global numbers around satisfaction or rounds or some of those other types of questions. But as soon as we try to do any parsing, the numbers becomes too small to be statistically significant.

So my reason for being here today is to get your help in filling out these surveys and telling your friends. And so many of you are applicants know who applied, etcetera. And so we need to get folks to fill out this survey. It's still open. If you look in your email it's around November 17, the most recent reminder.

We've tried to reach out in every way that we know how and so we were given the option to come and talk to you here today. But we really need people to participate on the survey so that we have good data from the applicant pool about how that process went.

Eleeza has little slips of paper with unique URLs if you would like to just take one of those and fill out the survey directly. We could even take time right now to do the survey, or you can find it in your email. But we really want to

get those numbers up, those respondents – surveys. As I say we have 45 of 512.

Jordyn, do you want to add anything?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, thanks, Jonathan. You know, one of the interesting things about the CCT RT is that we are trying to be data-driven. And as opposed to just sort of injecting opinions of the review team members into how we think the process is going or how it went we're actually trying to use some numbers to back things up.

And in particular although it's strange, all you guys may think like why is the Competition and Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust Team taking a look at the application process? The AOC actually does mandate that one of the things that the CCT RT looks at is to evaluate the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process itself .

That means the CCT will be both evaluating that and making recommendations which will be then reviewed by the Board and presumably could have downstream effects on things like the subsequent procedures PDP. But importantly this will be actual data that can inform those processes, and so it's really, really important that we get feedback from registry applicants to understand what their experiences were like. And that will directly inform where we can make improvements in the process next time around.

And it's doubly important if you're part of a small cohort, right? If you are a Geo TLD applicant, if you are a community applicant, there's not as many of you as the other one and so if we only get one or two responses from those cohorts it'll be very, very hard to make, as Jonathan said, statistically important inferences. So please fill out the survey no matter who you are, but if you think that you have a unique point of view, if you don't fill out the survey probably no one else is going to and it's not going to be heard.

And similarly, I would say, you know, there's no obviously 500 applicants in this room but I look around, I see a lot of people who are consultants to applicants, a lot of people who are backend providers to a bunch of applicants. You can please help reach out to the community of applicants that aren't present at ICANN meetings, make sure aware of the survey and make sure they're responding, I think the only way we'll get effective evaluation and recommendations from the CCT RT on this topic is if people actually provide us the data that we need in order to meaningful respond.

And if we don't get it and we can't make useful recommendations then, you know, I guess we'll know who's to blame. Thanks, everyone. I think Eleeza may just want to help give us some guidance on if – how you can fill out the survey if you haven't done so yet.

Eleeza Agopian: So thank you. This is Eleeza speaking. So I do have little pieces of paper with really long unique URLs on it, which I'm happy to hand to you. I'm also happy to email it to you if you'd prefer. My email address of course, first.lastname@icann.org. You can see my name up there on the screen. So please do reach out.

One other thing I wanted to note, the survey responses are of course anonymous but we do have at the end of the survey an option to fill in your name and contact information if you're willing to participate in a follow on interview. We've asked Nielsen to do in dept interviews with as many of the respondents as possible to get a little bit more in depth detail on some of the answers that you give.

There are open-ended questions in the survey, quite a few of them actually, but this will give the team some more details information about your experiences. But again, even if you choose to participate in the interview, that will also be – can certainly be anonymous if you choose. So I think that's it. Thank you very much for letting us join you for a few minutes today.

Paul Diaz: Certainly. Thank you all. And just to be clear the date that we should look for the email, it got picked up by spam, was it 17 October?

Eleeza Agopian: It was the week – there were a couple of emails that were sent the first week of October, I think the last reminder was probably sent around the 21st of October.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Very good. Any other questions about this from the group? No? Thank you, Jonathan, Jordyn, Eleeza.

Jordyn Buchanan: And sorry, I would just add, the thing to search for if you're looking in your email is not – it's not coming from ICANN, it's coming from Nielsen. And in particular it comes from research@hpolsurveys.com.

((Crosstalk))

Jordyn Buchanan: The week of October 20, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jordyn Buchanan: You probably won't have a lot of emails from this particular address so it's probably the right one if you find it.

Paul Diaz: Okay then. No other questions, let's move through our agenda. Up on the screens for you all. First on the list, looks much like our biweekly agenda, the accountability issues. Not sure if Becky is with us. Keith. Oh, Becky please.

Becky Burr: So we had a face to face meeting this week and each of the work streams, diversity, human rights, jurisdiction. SO/AC accountability, staff accountability, transparency, ombudsman, CEP and good faith conduct, so that's like nine of them, all met. They all provided reports about the work, the number of

meetings that they had, the number of telephone calls they had had, the number of person-hours per call.

And provided estimates of the amount of work but percentage of the work they had gotten done. And it was sort of between 10% and 40%. The current schedule calls for wrapping this up in June of 2017.

A couple of highlights, I think in the human rights group there's quite a – there's been quite a lot of discussion but the group is having a – some hard time reaching any consensus as is not surprising to people. So they've basically been doing sort of predatory work for documentation of the context and review of relevant principles.

In the jurisdiction group, although there is still resistance to focusing on jurisdictional issues other than where ICANN is incorporated and headquartered, the group is quite focused on looking at sort of jurisdiction in the contractual sense as opposed to where the headquarters is and the like.

The ombudsman, there is an ATRT 3 review of the ombudsman that came out of the ATRT 2 and so the group has decided rather that duplicating that work they're going to sort of serve as a committee with input into the process. The one thing that did happen is that the group reached consensus on a new set of supplementary procedures for the IRP for independent review. That – those things can be adopted without public consultation but we're going to put them up for 40 days' worth of consultation. That was the committee that I chaired and I have stepped down from that and David McAuley will be stepping into my place. So I think we'll be well served on that.

The Board is looking at some of these issues as well. And had a little bit of a briefing on some of the basic human rights frameworks and talked about what other organizations are doing in this regard. So that's – it's moving along. It's moving pretty slowly. There are a lot less volunteers. And a lot – the work is a lot slower. None of that is surprising to anybody.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Becky. Questions for Becky about these work streams and some of the changes?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. Thank you, Becky, to you and Keith and everyone else from the stakeholder group whose been active in this work stream. Has the date of publication for the draft supplemental IRP rules been set? And if so do you know what it is?

Becky Burr: It'll be as quickly as I can get them – get the final cover memo done, which it is almost done. So I think they will be up at the latest by next week. But just to be clear, the standard of review, you know, goes into – has to go – the bylaws creates a standard of review effective October 1.

Kristina Rosette: Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you both. Anyone else? Keith?

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks Paul. Keith Drazek. I don't want to add anything substantively but I do want to note that we owe Becky a gratitude and thanks for all of her work and the heavy lifting done particularly in the IRP area associated with the whole accountability process, but even really broadly during that whole ICANN accountability effort. She was instrumental in delivering, you know, a real solid work product and helping that entire group keep focused and make sure that we were focused on ICANN's narrow mission and protecting that.

And with Becky going to the Board, and as she noted, stepping down from chairing that IRP sub team and Work Stream 2, and continuing to finish the Work Stream 1 work, I think now is an appropriate time to say to Becky.

Becky Burr: Can I just add one other thing that I forgot to add? This is not on – it's not on accountability but I do want to draw everybody's attention to the IRP declaration in dotPersianGulf that was published at the end of last week. It is

going to present some really – it's a very bad decision and interpret sort of applies a definition of GAC advice that is extraordinarily broad. I think the Board is going to have a hard time figuring out what to do with this one.

I guess I don't know, I don't want to prejudge what the Board will do about it, but it is a very important decision that bears some attention.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you, Becky. (Jian).

Jian Zhang: Jian Zhang for (unintelligible). One question for Becky. I didn't follow the CCWG Work Stream 2 closely so I note that there are many discussion about human rights. But personally I believe that human rights does not fit into ICANN's like technical coordination role. So I'm wondering are they just going to produce a general statement that ICANN will follow up or will recognize human rights or are they have some specific action – actions that ICANN has to follow?

Becky Burr: So the outcome of Work Stream 1 is that there is a sort of general nod to human rights in the mission, commitments and core values. But it doesn't go into effect the framework has been decided as part of Work Stream 2. Lots of people, including Keith and I, have the same concern that you have about, you know, with respect to ICANN's mission, clearly content regulation is something that ICANN cannot engage in but how you make a broader human rights framework apply in this context.

Lots of corporations have sort of codes of ethics in which they commit, make soft commitments to abide by sort of generally accepted human rights. But in the case of ICANN because it's in the bylaws, there's this problem about creating liability because and in particular for our group we want to be very sure that we're not creating lots of opportunities for mischief to complain about something to bring an IRP on the basis of ICANN violated human rights.

So it's being looked at very, very carefully. I mean, obviously ICANN has to behave ethically and consistent with human rights. But the structure is very awkward.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Becky. Okay, not seeing any other hands, next on the list, Statton, please.

Statton Hammock: Thanks, Paul. It's Statton Hammock with Rightside. So I'm going to report out on our discussion group, discussion team. But I'd like to spend a moment to give everybody some context of where this group came from, why it was formed and what we're really aiming to do, for those of you who are unfamiliar with it, and in light of the fact that I was jumped all over yesterday by some NCUC folks who thought this group was doing more than what it was actually doing.

So this group was born – it's just an informal discussion group, it's not a working group, it's not a policy group. It's an informal group of representatives from our group, the Registry Stakeholder Group, and members of the Intellectual Property Constituency.

In Helsinki when we met, we met because the IPC had made some – we met as two full stakeholder groups to talk about concerns that IPC was raising particularly around Specification 11b.3 and what our – what that really meant and what the obligations were, Specification 3.b, right? Or 3.a? Yes.

And it was Jordyn and Jon I believe a few other members of our Registry Stakeholder Group invited the IPC to get together and members of their group to get together offline and talk about these concerns and get some clarity on how we were implementing some of our contractual commitments with respects to rights protection mechanisms and work on some other concerns.

So we did that. We raised our hands as volunteers from both sides of the group. And I was – I raised my hand to cochair it on our side and Bradley Silver was put forward as the IPC counterpart. And together we've been trying to come up with a list of concerns that the IPC has had, specific concerns. Ones that we can actually talk about and address, not just oh we don't think, you know, registries are doing this enough – well enough or whatever like specific concerns.

So we've come up with, in the short term, a – three specific things to focus on. One is to prepare for them a brief explanation of how we handle complaints at the registry level, because they don't have really any insight into what happens if they submit a complaint to ICANN or submit a complaint to the registry and the compliance teams, you know, do all these things and then respond, or maybe they feel like they don't respond.

We're just going to come up with some high level explanation of what happens behind the scene. And we made some progress on that. We started with a basic draft that had been circulating in connection with another document that the registries produced related to the security framework and we're going to just tweak that a little bit so we'll be able to push that out to our IPC counterparts. I think in pretty short order.

It's a, you know, it's a one page document say when the Registries get this we look at this and, you know, it's a pretty simple one. It's already been laid out. The second thing we're looking at is what concerns we might both have with respect to ICANN Compliance reporting. You know, as registries we look at – we go to ICANN Compliance sessions and see the reports and we go hey, how did that – how did that number get to change so dramatically? Or why – what do you mean by this thing?

And it seems clear to us, you know, when we look at these reports that there really could – we could use a little more analysis, not just the data thrown at us but a little more analysis behind it. So, you know, that's the kind of thing

that IPC members also agree would be great to see and they also have their own list of things such as hey, could the resolution codes be more specific? Could they – could we have more resolution codes that would, you know, sort of give us a little bit more insight as to why the decision to take action or not action from the compliance side, you know, happened. So we're putting together that list.

And then the third and last thing we're going to look at right now is go through some concerns that were expressed in a letter that INTA members had sent to Allen Grogan a year ago but they mention a number of concerns around reserve lists for names and that sort of thing, which I'm, quite honestly, a little wary about going too deep in or willing to, you know, really contribute much to that because as we know, we all have different business models and ways we value names that we reserve and for whatever reason.

So that one will be a little bit more delicate to handle. But I think, you know, going through some of those listed concerns might help us at least learn for the next round or else, you know, we might be able to provide some insight as to how we do pre-registration, sunrise and some other things like that.

So that's where we are. And again, you know, despite what some people in the ICANN community feel is happening, it's not a backroom negotiation. It's not a policy negotiation. These are simply coming together, a meeting of the minds on some ways to improve the reporting that we're seeing and to get a better understanding of each other's work. So that's why it's informal. There's no transcript, although we do have a scribe every meeting that kind of keeps track of what we've done so that we can pick up where we left off.

But if anybody has any concerns or questions or input you're always welcome to ping me and let me know. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you very much, Statton. I see Pam, go ahead.

Pam Little: Thanks, Statton. Pam Little from Zodiac. Statton, I have a question about the two documents you're working on for the IPC. Will we as a group be able to see them before you finalize them and send them to IPC? Thank you.

Statton Hammock: This is Statton. Absolutely. Yes, I made the promise to the whole Registry group that we wouldn't send anything back without at least socializing it. I think what we will produce won't require a whole lot of conversation, you know, substantive conversation. It'll be pretty straightforward stuff. But absolutely, before anything goes back to the IPC it'll be posted to the list for any additional comments.

Pam Little: Thank you. Thank you for that update. And just very quickly with a follow up question, have they come up with any specific issues from their side? Because I believe I'll recall this was actually an effort, they reach out to us in the beginning, so have they come up with any particular issues from their side, what problems they are seeing or have been seeing? Thank you.

Statton Hammock: Yes and no. I think – we've been pushing from the very beginning and placed the burden on the IPC folks to be the ones that are generating the topics of discussion, you know. I mention, you know, resolution codes as being one. That was one thing they put up, you know, which is really not something we do but it's something that they're looking for ICANN staff to do.

And then the INTA letter that I mentioned, you know, that – those are, again, like four or five specific things. Some is misleading marketing, as I mentioned, reserve name lists. They had pricing of, you know, these premium or platinum names. And I was clear that we weren't going to get into pricing issues around why TLDs are priced the way they are.

So they have come up with some specific items. And we're, you know, kind of – you know, whittling through those or seeing which ones seem appropriate for us to address and which ones we won't address. And so that's ongoing. There's still probably more things that'll be fleshed out but we're taking this off

in little bite sized chunks rather than coming up with a whole entire laundry list of everything and trying to figure out from there.

Pam Little: Thank you very much. That's all. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you again, Statton, for the continued time and leadership. And to the other members in the group, was what up to seven each? So it's a small discussion group.

Statton Hammock: Yes, Jordyn, Kristine Dorrain, Samantha, Cherie Falco, myself, Jon, who else? Oh Maxim, thanks. Yes, thank you. So thank you all colleagues on the group. Everybody has contribute. I have to say be quite proud of the Registry side, we all show up in force on the call and I can't say the same for the IPC folks, but the ones that are on the call to their credit, have been contributing greatly so.

Paul Diaz: Cool. Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry. This is not necessarily related to this particular group but I do think that there might be an opportunity here for us to kind of educate and correct some basic misunderstandings that the folks in the IPC and the CSG more broadly have about kid of registries, what our agreement says, what it doesn't say and the like. I mean, I can tell you having crossed over recently from the other house, there were some fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of the business, what ICANN can require, what it cannot.

And it seems to me that this group might be a good segue into doing something like that. You know, obviously we would want to keep it very high level, but I think the long run benefit – the long term benefit of doing something like that could be fairly significant.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Kristina. Statton.

Statton Hammock: Thanks for that, Kristina, because as I said, we're biting off little bite-size chunks so those were the first three bite-size chunks. But that suggestion to address that issue and set of issues is on our sort of roadmap. We are going to get to talking about, you know, explanation as to how we see – how we review and interpret our agreements and get clarity on that.

In fact, that was really the discussion that throughout the group to begin with, I mean, that started the group to begin with when we met in Helsinki. So we're going to get to that.

Kristina Rosette: I guess what I'm saying is because participation in the group is restricted on the IPC side in terms of numerically that having a broader presentation on that I think would avoid a situation in which information is going to get communicated from the participating IPC members to the rest of the IPC which just naturally lends itself to, you know, not intention but distortion.

Statton Hammock: Yes, that makes sense actually. So what we could do is when we get to that issue among the discussion group make sure that, you know, some of those discussions then become shared. We convene maybe both stakeholder groups entirely and have the discussion group lead the entire stakeholder groups in that conversation at some point.

Paul Diaz: Yes, that's exactly where I was going to with it, Statton. If the discussion team has reached a point where they've begun a sort of education effort maybe we come back together as we did in Helsinki, in Copenhagen, you know, we schedule an hour joint group session and walk through that so it's open to the full memberships.

Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, thanks. It's Jordyn Buchanan. I think the other thing that will be helpful and we're already heading in this direction, is by creating documents that

preserve the – or that memorialize the discussion and then we can make sure that gets circulated back to the IPC so that it's not just a matter of having the reps represent the words back to the group but actually have documents that we're crafting that provide clarity around where we think the contractual obligations and responsibilities lie as well.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Next on our list is updates from the working groups, the internal working groups, looking at new TLD concerns or next round concerns, I should say. Cherie is going to put up a graphic just to help remind everybody of the four work teams and hopefully somebody in the room is prepared to provide kind of high level overview. Uploading.

Jordyn Buchanan: So, Paul, this is Jordyn. I'm happy to provide some voiceover at least while we...

Paul Diaz: Yes, why don't we keep going, Jordyn, and hopefully we'll get this thing up on the screen.

Jordyn Buchanan: In any case, to remind folks about the efforts on the registry-focused efforts on the Subsequent Procedures. Back in Helsinki, we had kicked off a – oh, okay. Looks terrifying. So are we just talking to...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: To your work streams. Your work streams.

((Crosstalk))

Jordyn Buchanan: I would like I can talk about all this. I look very confusing. So in any case, back in Helsinki we had kicked off a conversation amongst the interested Registry Stakeholder Group members to talk about whether we thought there was a path to streamline - a path to streamline the efforts around defining what a next generation of new gTLD processes could look like. And I think we

got enough traction in those conversations in Helsinki that we decided it makes sense to kick off a formal effort around this.

And have had a series of calls, first of all starting off talking about identifying what we believe, as Registries at least, are the critical issues that needed to be resolved prior to the release of additional gTLDs. And then subsequently having identified that set of issues that we think are critical.

We've done two things. Number one, as folks will probably recall, we put together in response to the Board, a letter outlining the issues that we thought needed ongoing policy work as well as potential areas where there was ongoing implementation work required as well.

And then further we've now, within the working group, we have subdivided into four sub teams focused on individual tracks of work where we think implementation is likely - implementation improvements or changes are likely going to be required as compared to what we saw in the 2012 round.

And so those four sub teams are, a team focused on application process, which Samantha is leading; a team focused on objections, which Stephanie is leading; a team focused on a string of related issues, specifically string similarity and string objection, Ray Fassett is leading that; and then a fourth team focused on community issues, community objections and community priority evaluation, which I am leading.

Three of those four groups I think are making quite good progress. I think both the strings and objections group are close to having substantive recommendations that we think we can forward back onto the stakeholder group as a whole for consideration before we decide how we're going to transmit those. These are the new PDP process or elsewhere.

And then I think Samantha's group has worked through a bunch of issues around the application process. And then there's this big outstanding issue

around whether there should be some sort of registry accreditation process or something to help the technical evaluation portion of the process be more streamlined, that is just about to get picked up by think.

I will note there is also a parallel path of work happening this week where ICANN is driving a process on Registry services, provider, either accreditation or batch processing or something like that.

And then we have one more group I'm chairing, which I'm apparently terrible act chairing because we've made very little progress even identifying the key issues on the community topic. So I'm hoping we can perhaps make a little bit of progress here.

We're hoping to get the group as a whole together to take stock of our work but are having problems finding a specific time here. Our goal was initially to exit Hyderabad with an overall set of recommendations to move forward. I don't think we will quite get there but I'm certainly hoping that we will be there within a few weeks of the close of this meeting.

And at that point hopefully rounds down this effort and see how it overlays onto the work either happening in implementation strings or the new gTLD PDP.

And I don't know if people want to talk about - people want any color on the specific sub teams recommendations, I imagine the chairs could provide that, or we can just do not off-line if we don't have time for that here.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Jordyn. And I'm sorry for the confusion. I jumped on the list, the GNSO working group overview without very, very busy graphic, but thank you for this. Thank you to the other sub teams leaders.

Just to think about the calendar a couple weeks hopefully we have kind of wrap up the final positions and what not. Anything to be shared in that interim

period, post-Hyderabad are next scheduled called, we retained the biweekly schedule so next Wednesday the 16th is still on the schedule. I think everybody is probably going to be jetlagged and sort of ICANN'd-out, so it's unlikely we will have that called. We will keep it as a placeholder just in case.

But that means the next time we gather is 30 November so there is a couple of weeks. Hopefully these efforts kind of wrap up as you say. Anything to present to the group, please post it to the list. We can discuss it further then.

And just as a reminder, Jordyn touched on it, tomorrow mid-afternoon, 3:15, there will be the session on Francisco Arias is leading. We circulated his slides on the list, this question originally started, the registry service providers certification program. It's actually a broader set of questions than that.

We come out of it, many others registry operators, come at it from the perspective of seeking efficiencies. ICANN has got some other issues that we all need to take into consideration. Folks are encouraged to attend. And as I said, I posted on the list, you can see the slides, questions that Francisco intended to address. Anybody has additional things to be done to me or directly to Francisco and we can get that baked into the presentation were certainly a least addressed there.

Okay, other questions on this one? Let's do this, we have a couple of colleagues who have dialed in to provide updates. If I stick with the schedule lets jump to Alan, Alan Woods, provide update on the security framework initiative.

Alan Woods: Hi, Paul. Can you hear me?

Paul Diaz: Perfect. Thank you Alan.

Alan Woods: Excellent, thank you. It's Alan Woods here from (unintelligible) Registry, just so to give you a quick update on where the security framework is, when last I

talked to you, the Registry Stakeholder Group and after I sent through the summary document to you, we had met a bump or two in the road on the security framework where we'd come almost to an impasse. But we got (unintelligible). I had a meeting with the (PSWG), with Bobby Flain and we've just discussed through the issues and we said, okay, let's go to Hyderabad, let's push through the issues that are there. And let's get to a place where the document could actually be moving forward and to get it to the public comments.

So we have four meetings scheduled for the Hyderabad meeting of which the Registries already had two. We have Friday morning. We have a closed security framework meeting which was everybody together. We had a good conversation. We talked through some compromise wordings (unintelligible) from VeriSign had put together, which has now been inserted into the document.

There were still a few outstanding discussion issues (unintelligible) some really good discussion that occurred during the meeting. And at the end of that we then went to our own closed kind of briefing sessions so the Registries had another meeting just the Registry only groups. And we had some very good discussion again there where we actually came up with the – I posed four points in which we said, you know, let's give the (PSWG) an indication of, you know, our outstanding issues with the document before they had their closed session so that they could talk about.

So a group of us put together I suppose a rough consensus email just to then to give them the guidance of what we were going to be – what we were thinking at the time. And so things such as we were wanting to know – there was a question over what exactly a response is. The entire framework is about responding to security threats. So there was at the original meeting there was a good comment by the (PSWG)s where they just accepted that a response is simply acknowledgement as well.

So we're more than happy to get on board saying if we can respond to – in a simple acknowledgement, then we're more than happy for (unintelligible) categorization of security incidents, but in high priority incidents, 24 hours is probably okay in that instance, if we're just talking about an acknowledgement.

So again, that was – I think it was a milestone as far as we're concerned because it cleared up some of the fear that, you know, some registries wouldn't be able to do that because the ask wasn't (unintelligible) it was merely acknowledgement of the security threat. So that was very, very good for us.

The next thing was the categorization itself of security incidents where instead of having the (PSWG) has proposed three different categorizations which were threat to life and limb, infrastructure, threats to infrastructure, Internet infrastructure and critical infrastructure. And then there was a third bucket which was everything else. And there was an awful lot of worry again about this third bucket in particular that it was so large and so broad and a huge catch-all.

So in our discussions (unintelligible) we have suggested that we bring that then to two categories again, high priority categories and then any other incident, as long as it is related to technical abuse of the DNS. Again, bringing it right then to what the core issue was for the security framework.

I mean, there just the two key points of where we're kind of moving forward on that. We've sent email too to the (PSWG). We hope they had gotten it and (unintelligible) their meeting, and we have our final open session where we would encourage people to attend if they wish on I believe it is Tuesday. And that would be another open session where we would have got – be able to bring the impasse to an end and move forward on these points.

So much movement, it's been very positive. And I just want to also thank at this moment (Brian Symbolic) and Frieda Talon who – they're not actually in Hyderabad, they have stood – stepped up to the plate and they've been (unintelligible) in bring these discussions to the table. You know, so I'm indebted to them and they've done an excellent job so thank you very much.

So we're moving forward. I think the bumps have been dealt with and we'll just see where we go from here.

Paul Diaz: Thank you very much, Alan. Question for you or colleagues in the room. Next steps in terms of a timeline? What's the expectation? Will there be – is anybody calling for public input on this draft? Will the draft be circulated first internally here? Just trying to get my head around what we should expect as a stakeholder group.

Alan Woods: Yes, absolutely. So the – once we have agreed on the wording of the document, now there was – we had hoped to have the wording completed before Hyderabad and put it to public comments, which ICANN have said parts of this process there will be a public comment on this. I mean, I think we can – once we get over this issue with the regards to timely response, I think we're probably at a point where we can actually easily provide it to the Registry Stakeholder Group for input at that point.

It probably would make sense to see where we are. But the next step is public comments. I think on Tuesday we will be where we're at (unintelligible) new compromise wording. And a new timeline will likely be set down at that. We are very close to the end of the document. It was just there are these issues that came up unfortunately in the last two months. So we will see – I can't give you an exact timeline but basically at the end of Tuesday we'll be able to give much more certainty on that.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Alan. Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, we got out of Bobby Flain wording that they intentionally, yes, that they intentionally was to add content regulation there like the (NCA), when we asked him directly. Do you mean content related crime too? He told us, yes. So we should be aware that it was an attempt to add something which is not in our role to the document. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: All the more kudos then to those working on it. Sorry, Alan.

Alan Woods: Sorry, no I just want to say yes, absolutely. And that is I thought one of the reasons behind us sending that email as well where we specifically – we're linking it to DNS abuse security threats only. So, you know, that is one of the areas that we are very, very conscious of and we have to be very sure that we're not straying into copyright I believe he said, that, you know, copyright is illegal as well. And we have to follow them right back in the email saying, no, no, no it says DNS abuse only, a security and stability.

Paul Diaz: Understood, thank you. And a reminder to everybody at the end of the day today the last high interest session is on content. Okay looking around, no other questions. Alan, thank you very much for dialing in, for continued leadership on this issue and everybody that's been a part of it. Much appreciated. We'll look forward to next steps.

With that then let's move on to the Spec 11.3b workgroup update. Unfortunately Crystal is not with us here in Hyderabad but it's a pretty simple update. The redline was provided. Thanks to Crystal and Yasmin and others. ICANN staff has been looking at it. For a variety of reasons they could not schedule a follow up with the drafters. So shortly after Hyderabad there will be a conference between our colleagues who worked on the redline and key staff.

From our ExComm session with GDD staff last week or, yes, on Thursday, and they were – they claim to have been taken aback by the level and scope of our edits. And this sort of just is a great example of the disconnect that we discussed with the Board. And will be a great test case right off the bat with – to see whether or not they are really genuine about wanting to work with us in a very collaborative fashion. So we'll look forward to further updates once the call has been held. We can move forward from there.

Okay, so we've already done the subgroup updates. Not trying to rush the schedule but in the same way, the first Hi – first high intensity session – or high interest session, sorry, at 3:15, some colleagues have already agreed to participate. Becky's one of them. They would love – Jonathan as well? Wonderful, thank you. And this is probably of more interest, Maxim, more interest to many than you might expect so if we can wrap up earlier that's a great thing on multiple levels.

So just going to keep rolling through. Next on our list is the RDAP, the consistent labeling and display issues. As everybody's aware, we had filed a draft request for reconsideration. ICANN staff reached out. Over the course of many weeks we've been negotiating many of the key concerns that we raised, what drove our request for reconsideration, have since been accepted by staff and there is a current public comment period underway.

Stephanie has – is holding the pen. She has drafted and created a Google doc with initial thoughts on a response. The concerns about the RDAP profile remain. And a big part of the draft comment is about RDAP. Encourage people to look at it. If you don't have the tech background or not quite sure on the issues please share with colleagues in your organizations who do. It's an opportunity to weigh in here.

And once again, see if staff is really genuinely committed to interacting, fully taking on board inputs or if we're going to just drive forward, if they want to drive forward with the RDAP profile implementation as currently envisioned.

Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, just small addition to that. I have impression that Francisco Arias is going to push for who is behind this RDAP profile thing. Is – has impression that all what changed is just the date of implementation of the same RDAP profile we were not happy with and about which was huge disagreement in (unintelligible) group. Thanks. So I think they have – might have impression that nothing changed, but we got delayed. So we need to take care about it before it take cares about us.

Paul Diaz: Understood. In the same way, if we don't like what we see requests for reconsideration is still an option available to us. Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks, Paul. It's Jordyn Buchanan. So I agree, fundamentally it doesn't seem like staff has changed their perspective on the notion that the operational profile is – will be a requirement for registries to implement. I think on the – on a positive note, they have conceded that it was inappropriate to include that requirement in the CL&D consensus policy, which means that it doesn't – that requirement doesn't – is not going to form a binding requirement in our contracts through the policy development sort of envelope.

They may try to force us to implement it as part of the standalone requirement in the Registry Agreement indicating that we're obliged to implement RDAP upon notice from ICANN. I think at that point we get down to a matter of contractual interpretation as to whether we read the contract as allowing them to do that or not.

Once again, we could initiate a new RFR there or there's various other mechanisms that we could use including the contractual provisions around mediation or arbitration, although that might have to be done registry by registry as opposed to – sorry – through the group.

But in any case I think it's important that we've moved that terrain because I think we should all have been concerned about stuff being smuggled into the PDP, the PDP, you know, from a principle perspective ought – we should be very concerned about ICANN's attempt to smuggle stuff into that. I think Rubens was the one that first came up with the notion of them being smugglers.

But I agree, we have to remain vigilant. And I think this gets to the discussion we had with the Board earlier today like it's still not clear to me and I think anyone that I've spoken to why Francisco and others on staff thinks that they need to do this. We would I think the consistent feedback from the community has been that it would actually allow us to learn a lot more about RDAP if registries were given more flexibility.

And we ought to continue to engage I think with high level staff, not just with Francisco and Krista but with Akram and Göran to sort of say what the heck is going on here? It seems like this is an example of staff circumventing or imposing their own goals on top of the process that really should be driven by the community.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Jordyn. Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Just like to point out that Francisco Arias is also playing PR campaign on us blaming us for not implementing something that communities would like. So we might have that – not only from contractual aspects but also from public relations perspective perhaps taking the first step in saying, hey, if ICANN allow this we would have already implemented RDAP. It was ICANN that forbid us of doing so. So then we could put them on the defensive on the PR angle. So like to look at that angle as well.

Paul Diaz: Jordyn. Keith, sorry.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Paul. So building on what's been already said, following the session with the ICANN Board, the CPH session that we just concluded, which as an aside I thought was an excellent session and kudos to everybody that participated in all of that.

That I had a conversation with a Board member following that, and I sort of said hey, I thought this was a really good session, really constructive. And the response was, hmm, you know. And I asked for a little bit more detail, what do you see was the problem? And it came back to this question of RDAP and the peRSEption, apparently, is that we have the Registries were fighting the inclusion of RDAP in this profile because it was not in our financial interest to do so. And it was a question of, you know, carrots and sticks and incentives and all of that. And I corrected this Board member to say, that's not it at all.

So I think there is some education that needs to be done. And I don't know if this was, you know, a response to something that this Board member had been hearing or have been told or if it was just the person's own peRSEption. But, you know, I think there is some may be further education that we need to do.

Paul Diaz: Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks. That's really helpful insight from both Rubens and – God, whatever, that VeriSign guy – Keith. Sorry. It's clearly been a long week already. I think that it is important that we address that, that peRSEption. I think if anything I think the registries want the flexibility to do RDAP sooner rather than later. That's certainly the case for us.

You know, I've been telling Francisco for a year that we want to be able to launch an RDAP implementation, we just open source some registry related code that includes a working RDAP implementation. Would love to be able to run that for our registries.

And, you know, we're at the point where actually and maybe this would help with the PR battle. We're considering filing an RSEP to allow us to run RDAP because ICANN does not yet provide any mechanism to do it. So I think, you know, at some point we need to really shine a light on the fact that the only reason why a lot of registries aren't implementing RDAP today is because it's not allowed in our contracts. ICANN is not making any effort.

And even in the initial CL&D policy that included the RDAP requirement, they had a totally bizarre, not implement before date, which I've never seen included. You know, usually it's implemented by, but they said you're not allowed to turn on RDAP for six months as opposed to you must implement within six months. So it's a very bizarre that they are actually - they're not making any effort to allow us to implement RDAP and then making - and then trying to point the finger at us for being the reason why it's not done. And I think it's like we should really push back strongly on that.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, Maxim Alzoba for the record. I also had like chance to talk to one of the Board members. And my personal on the same in that they don't really understood the structure what was added to what. I suggest we add short presentation like the level of you expected at third class in school, that it was a side (unintelligible) which was which had nothing to do with the idea discussed in the policy.

Because currently, as I understood, they see it like an implementation by the ICANN staff. So it's usually policy versus implementation instead of overreach of the like role where they design team, they have huge disagreement in (unintelligible) group like flame of 80 letters something during the one day.

Then quite public comments which they accepted quite formally. And then they see there's a checkbox like confirmation that we had public comment,

confirmation that we had like discussion. Yes, so we might need next time some better preparation and might be some graphical work maybe pen paper, something.

Paul Diaz: Okay. All good points. Let's make sure in particular around these PR-related things that those – our thoughts are articulated in the public comment, in the response, doesn't just have to be on the profile proper but the broader picture as well because they will be public comments, right, be on record.

All right, we good with this one? That comment period ends in mid-December so, you know, we need to make sure that we're comfortable with it, people are encouraged to look at it. It's a Google doc so it's easy to edit. Have any issues accessing the Google doc for some reason please reach out to Stephanie, myself, Jordyn, we'll make sure that your inputs are included.

All right, next on our agenda then, David is not here with us right now but the GNSO bylaws implementation. This is what was mentioned in the session with the Registrars. There's a motion to accept – move forward on the recommendations of this drafting team. There's a separate motion I guess to radically overhaul it.

When we come to the GNSO Council review, maybe a little bit further discussion, but for now at least at this point in our agenda we're just waiting for the next steps.

And next steps on Registry Agreement, Jon.

Jon Nevett: All right. Yes, exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Jon Nevett: Registry Agreement amendments, this will be the same report you've heard the last five times.

((Crosstalk))

Jon Nevett: We're still working on it, exactly. So we are very close. We had a...

((Crosstalk))

Jon Nevett: We had a meeting this week, we're down to one issue that Edmon and Jordyn are hopefully working out and if not we're just going to chuck it out and go on and save it for the next round I guess. But we're at the point now where hopefully we're able to reach some kind of accommodation on this IDN and how – it's the – essentially the IDN issue that we've been talking about is how does the contract, the IDN guidelines, and an RSEP process all interact and which controls over which.

And can we figure it out up front or do we have to wait until one of these things happens or something. And so Edmon, thank you, Jordyn, thank you for trying to work that out with Francisco and ICANN and hopefully we could do that.

I sent around the amendments that everyone hopefully saw, has, and if anyone has any questions about that. One question came up from Keith that I responded to. If there's more discussion on that point happy to have it. And then the next steps are once we finalized that document, we will – ICANN will publish a report taking into the public comments into account and come up with an analysis report they're calling it.

There's one – we'll get to see it before it goes out so if there are any issues, for example, there's one issue about there were a lot of public comments about the lack of – what perceived transparency into this process and so they might want to address some of those points. And so we need to see that language and then comment on that.

But once that analysis report is published the ICANN Board will, for lack of a better term, sign off or approve the vote to go to a registry vote. And then ICANN will publish an FAQ, a voting process. I've asked for a webinar so folks – this is all applicable registries, so this is not RySG but applicable registries who are bound by this provision in their registry agreements.

And we would have a webinar, we'd have a – up to 60 day vote. And a third party will handle the vote just kind of like a public company would have a – some kind of a third party that does their shareholder vote, that kind of thing is that they're thinking about.

And then should the proposed amendment be approved, an approval, as you know, is 50% of the registries by number and 2/3 of the registries by how much you pay to ICANN, applicable registries. And if that happens then it goes back to the Board for final approval. And once that happens there's a 60-day effective period where they send it out and say these changes are effective in 60 days. So we're still looking, you know, mid-2017 for these to become effective. So that's where we are. Any questions?

Paul Diaz: Maxim, go ahead.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Do we have an actual plan how to let's say have votes because I'm not sure that most registries will do so.

Jon Nevett: Yes, that's a great question and a concern that we talked about yesterday about knowing the RySG voting history, what happens if people don't vote, you know, if there's an apathetic electorate and it essentially is kind of like coming from the US. I use a constitutional amendment in the United States, has to get a certain number of states to approve it, ratify it. And if they don't it dies. So that's what'll happen.

You know, we've asked for the ability perhaps if we need it to extend that 60-day period. I'm hoping we don't need it but if we do we will we could ask for

another 60-day period perhaps and we'll just have to encourage people to vote and then eventually if they don't vote there'll be a waste of 2.5 years of our lives, especially my life. But I won't be bitter.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jon. I really – I don't want you to throw away these 2.5 years. Did like ICANN say anything that they're specifically planning to do to reach out? I mean, is it just going to be these like emails to the primary contacts and that kind of song and dance?

Jon Nevett: Yes, they didn't – we didn't talk about a communications plan other than the third party vote, you know, process or whatever sending that out. But we did talk about a webinar and so ICANN would hopefully encourage people to come out for the webinar, ask any questions that they have in that process, encourage folks to vote. I mean, if you support it, great; if you don't support it, great. Just vote. I mean, that's the, you know, that'll be the message point I think.

Paul Diaz: Anything else? Thank you, Jon. And the voting period more likely than not is not going to be until Q1? Oh sorry, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. So, Jon prompted me twice to raise the issue. No, I raised the question on the list. This is something that was raised back in Helsinki regarding the dotless domain language in Exhibit A I think it was. And I appreciate Jon's response to me on the list. And we had a follow up conversation about this question. You know, VeriSign's position has long been that dotless domains are bad and they have in fact been prohibited in the current Registry Agreement under Exhibit A.

In Helsinki there was quite a bit of discussion highlighted by SSAC and a few other stakeholder groups and constituencies suggesting that that language should be moved into the base agreement rather than in an appendix. And one of the concerns was that even though it is prohibited in the – in the

language in the appendix, it also allows for the possibility of a future RSEP to potentially undo that.

And the view from SSAC and others, and frankly VeriSign, is that it would be better to be fully prohibited and not allow for amendment under an RSEP, ever. So the – I guess the question is – the question I posed to the list was, you know, why would we not – if it's not material, if it's not a material change, why wouldn't we just say okay let's move it into the base agreement. If the language was already there then what's wrong with moving it into the base agreement?

And the response that we got was there was not consensus to do that. And so I guess the follow up question might be, well, who opposed that and why? But we are where we are. I see some other hands up right now. So I guess I'll just close by saying reserve the right to continue this discussion. Thanks.

Jon Nevett: Let me just give a factual response and then I know other people want to chime in. There was never a discussion of moving it from the base – from Exhibit A to the base. It's no different, they're both – it's part of the contract. Exhibit A is part of the contract. So that was never discussed. The question – the substantive question was there's a provision that in Exhibit A talking about dotless that prohibits it but has a little carve out that says it could be subject to an RSEP. And so that was the issue.

And this came up after we closed the – all the issues that we were going to deal with in this round so that was – there's a process point that it's in the current agreement, the public comment period, which was when this came up, dealt with changes to the proposed – the proposed changes to the contract which this one wasn't; this is in there now and it's not being proposed to change.

So as a process point we didn't want to open ourselves up in a future public comment period to say, well, if people in the community want to change and

they wanted to bring it in the public comment but we're not, in this process it's a mutual agreement with ICANN and the Registry Stakeholder Group or the working group, we didn't want to open it up to, you know, every other group putting in their pet projects coming in. And so that was a process point.

And then in the substance point, which I guess Jeff probably and others will talk about that why we didn't have consensus, I'll defer to those guys. But it was clear when we raised it after VeriSign raised in Helsinki that there wasn't consensus of the working group to slip this one in because there were concerns with the proposed change.

Paul Diaz: Jeff, you've been waiting. Keith, let me come back.

Jon Nevett: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. On the substance of the matter, I don't think there should ever be language prohibiting anything from going to an RSEP. If anyone wants to go to an RSEP to try to prove why they should be able to do anything they should have that ability, kind of like wild-carding, right? Wild-carding is not – it is prohibited by the agreement. But it's not prohibited to take it...

Woman: Going to go ahead and start...

Jeff Neuman: To an RSEP if you find a special use case where you think is appropriate. And in fact the special use case was found with the name collision. I just fundamentally oppose the right of any registry to take advantage of the RSEP process. So on a substance it just doesn't make any sense. And, you know, so if people if the community wanted it can come up with the next negotiation. It's not in the legacy agreements so I'm not sure why it needs to be in the new TLD agreements. So those are the substantive points.

Paul Diaz: Okay thanks Jeff. And we can agree to disagree on that. I just wanted to circle back to the comment that Jon made about it was never proposed to move it into the base agreement. And that was actually specifically what SSAC suggested or requested but I take your point.

Jeff Neuman: Yes it's a proposal without a effect though because it's in the agreement. It doesn't really matter where. Do you think it it does more of fact in the base versus the exhibit? I don't, legally it doesn't so I - that's why I - maybe I missed that because it didn't make sense but it would be the first time.

Paul Diaz: Okay and Rubens and Jordyn.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. I'd like to remind that this only came about due to a clerical error that added that to the red line because there was no change to agreement so it shouldn't be part of the red line in the first place. One of the reasons that is we are not discussing it because nobody proposed it. This process started with as the Stakeholder Group making requests to amend the contracts. ICANN staff made requests or made the contract and none of those two parties suggested changing any language about that place. So that's why it's not there because nobody suggested it.

And the only parts that could have suggested it were Registry Stakeholder Group and ICANN staff not any other stakeholder organization or advisory body. I may also comment that what is currently there in (.letter) domains is also what you are looking to make IDN language look like which is you should follow these but if you file an RSEP and prevail and demonstrating to the community that this is not a problem than you got it. So it's equivalent language of what you are pursuing in other areas.

Paul Diaz: Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes thanks, two points. First I think just to get to the process question that Jon and Rubens was hinting at. I guess Keith I'm surprised regardless of

what you think about the merits of this case like I think it should be extremely troubling to everyone in the stakeholder group the notion that we can engage in a bilateral negotiation with ICANN and when that results of that bilateral negotiation are held out for public comment the third parties can then request random the other changes that have nothing to do with that bilateral negotiation be thrown into the agreement.

Like I think if we allow that precedent to be set we're in a world of hurt if we ever try to invoke this mechanism again because every, you know, the IPCs, the non-commercials, the GAC will all pile on with their wish list of activities they would like to see in the agreement and if there's enough support of public comments then ICANN will try to like fold them in to any future amendment process. And I think just from a process perspective that's extremely dangerous and one that we should push back on regardless of what we think about the merits.

As for the merits I guess I in order to believe that this - that you would want to somehow single out .list in this respect as to be somehow uniquely unchangeable through RSEP you would have to believe that allowing .list domains was more dangerous than allowing registrars for example to violate the security and stability, the general security and stability principles in the registry agreement. You would have to believe that registries ought to be able to, you know, ought not to be able to like the .list prohibition's more important than the RFC language that's incorporated in the agreement and so on.

All these other things are subject to amendment by the agreement why should we be allowed to, you know, go through a RSEP and change which RFCs we need to adhere to but not be allowed to .list. It just doesn't make sense to single this one issue out. Fundamentally we rely on the RSEP process to perform a technical analysis and to determine whether or not on the merits the - there's security and stability issues that would make the RSEP dangerous for the Internet community.

And I have confidence in that process. I used to serve on the - as an RSEP panelist. I think there's a bunch of really smart people there. I don't think they've ever made a faulty decision in any of the occasions in which it's been invoked and I think it makes a lot more sense to rely on that panel of experts than to choose, pick and choose specific technical issues that we just decide in advance there's no way that they should ever be allowed in the future. So I think this amendment is sort of misguided from the outset but it's also extremely, extremely troubling from a process perspective and I think we should strongly continue to push back on it.

Paul Diaz: Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Yes just two points from bureaucrat point of view. First of all we should underline when that the documents posted for the public comments only the red line is subject to comments not the text for file contract because we shouldn't discuss the rest of the contract during this phase, only the revisions. And the third thing it will simplify our life actually a lot.

And the third - the second thing is we have to consider and we might consider recommendations not to be feasible. That's it. We don't have to follow recommendations. We have to consider something, that's it. So even if we have extremely unpleasant outlook of the process we may always say yes that's sad, extremely sad maybe next time. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Keith? Old one? Okay. Nothing more Jon?

Jon Nevett: No. Thank you everyone and again thanks for everyone who worked on this process for so long.

Paul Diaz: Okay who is next? Comments on public, public comments and any dots? Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Hi everyone. This is Stephane. So let me just warn them that we are moving to the comments section. And let me ask Cherie and Sue to put up the comment matrix. So as you all know this is a relatively new time for us in terms of the way we do our comments because we now have the help of them to act as drafting assistant for a set period of time. It's a test program that we're running. It's a pilot. And the idea of the pilot program is to see if we can work in a more effective way through the documents and drafts that we do in response to ICANN public comment periods.

The brief that them has received from us is to try and come in with an initial draft for those comment periods that we want to respond to so that we alleviate the pressure on the Stakeholder Group volunteers to come up with that initial impetus which has proved difficult in the past because as you can see from the comment matrix that's on the screen in front of you at the moment or in the Adobe room if you're there there are a lot of comment periods open. And we are all short of time back to the issue of volunteer burnout that we discussed with the board earlier on but we're all feeling the strain so this help is very welcome.

As for those of you who attended the previous RYSG teleconference before Hyderabad you know that I outlined the work plan to be a few days for them to really get acquainted with the views of the RYSG and understand them in order to be able to produce initial drafts. Wim has now worked very fast with that and he's now produced at least one initial draft which I communicated to the list this morning. So obviously once again this is coming in at a time when we're all very busy and you may not have had time to look at it yet but it's an important first step so I would urge you to have a look at that.

And we will continue - I asked Wim to work on four of the initial comment periods. He's on the phone with us now so I'll be turning over to him in a minute so that he can talk us through that initial work. But I do want to draw your attention to the fact that this doesn't absolve us from following the work or responding to it. Wim is there to facilitate and initiate. He's not there to

complete. That remains our job as volunteers and it does mean that we have to provide our own views and to say whether we're okay with the input that he's providing. That really is important that we don't lose sight of that and that we continue to oversee the whole process.

So my role as Vice Chair of Policy will continue in terms of structuring the matrix and the comments and making sure that we initiate our responses and that we post them. Your work will continue to make sure that we give our opinions and Wim will help with the drafting. So having said that I don't want to go through the matrix. There are no comment periods right now that we have any volunteers for which makes sense because as I've just said we're now attempting to do the initial step through Wim. So I'll pass the mic over to him. Wim if you're online?

Woman: He is (unintelligible).

Stephane Van Gelder: He is a line but Wim can you hear me?

Wim Degezelle: Hello. Can you hear me?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes we can. Please go ahead.

Wim Degezelle: Well all good afternoon. I'm happy I mean this is my first time on this meeting so welcome to all. First of all to give a quick follow-up on what Stephane was saying I think it's very important for me to that you will understand this (unintelligible) and that to get them in line with what (unintelligible) was thinking or (unintelligible) application that are in your head on your mind (unintelligible). It is yes, a new process, a new way of working so I think (unintelligible) looking on how we can organize (unintelligible) easy and (unintelligible). So for this I think (unintelligible). But the idea is that I come up with some first draft ideas where possible and (unintelligible). As you can see on the drafting board from (unintelligible) before I came up with (unintelligible).

I was focused on the (unintelligible) assessments of the (unintelligible) of the new gTLD process (unintelligible) sorry. These days to assessments comes up (unintelligible) attempt with ICANN or (unintelligible) to really look what and if there is an effective (unintelligible) of this new gTLD.

As I expressed on the (unintelligible) they are facing too many conclusions of the report (unintelligible) there is not yet significant but there are a couple of (unintelligible). That might be (unintelligible) what could be considered as (unintelligible). If you look at the draft I came up with (unintelligible) here coming from there are only Google documents. I think one is that one question I really want to address is the (unintelligible). And the in the document there are no next steps or no (unintelligible).

It difficult for me to assess whether not you see this as a (unintelligible) documents. So this question I (unintelligible) whether or not (unintelligible) should be qualified (unintelligible). So just I wrote some comments in the (unintelligible) that the Stakeholder Group would like to (unintelligible) support next year (unintelligible) two or three years there are more (unintelligible). The other comment we and...

Stephane Van Gelder: So Wim Degezelle, sorry this is Stephane. Perhaps I can just stop you there to see if anyone wants to talk to the question you just asked and to this comment period which is important to the SG I would expect. Let me just look around the room if anyone wants to chime in and if not we'll let you continue. Yes it appears that it's a bit too soon so question noted. Please continue.

Wim Degezelle: The other suggestion for (unintelligible) more in the line of modeling the idea that (unintelligible) study of the way to study looks in the market looking at one complete model. After some (unintelligible) some comments (unintelligible) to really compare gTLDs within their (unintelligible). Other groups smaller groups compare the effects new gTLDs have on them other

gTLDs which can (unintelligible) basically comparing TLDs that (unintelligible) that probably are not (unintelligible).

I made a detailed comment on the group, a group by the name of (unintelligible) gTLDs really focusing on specific - the groups where they're for example compared (unintelligible) that had that are linked (unintelligible).

As noted that they are also in terms of the TLDs in English is transferred in German (unintelligible). If you look within (unintelligible) where the language is and probably you could ask the question if, you know, if you're substitute the possible, substitute the (unintelligible). If you looked on a global scale (unintelligible) out of that (unintelligible) it is probably less or it will happen less (unintelligible).

And other comments I make was okay the (unintelligible) legacy TLDs. And there was no real attention or mention made in the documents on what happened with the ccTLDs market. And I think if you especially if you start to look at gTLDs or new gTLDs that are focused on a specific area or a specific geographic (unintelligible) or language or (unintelligible) ccTLD then it could be good to also (unintelligible) ccTLDs or at least make reference (unintelligible) what is happened in the ccTLD world compared to gTLD because at this moment they're completely not mentioned in (unintelligible).

And I think this is a quick overview of all the suggestions I made for (unintelligible). I don't know if there are any immediate reactions or questions?

Paul Diaz: Thanks Wim. So I have Chuck that's putting his hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. I'm not going to talk about the suggestions and comments that Wim made but rather the process we're going through right now. I don't know if it's just my jet lag and middle of the afternoon but it's very hard to actively participate in this discussion without

seeing some stuff and following it. If I'm alone on that that's fine. But I would suggest when we do this in the future that a brief outline of what we're talking about and the context and so forth would make it a lot easier to participate in the discussion especially not having seen anything before this. So just a process point.

Paul Diaz: And Chuck it's Paul. I'll jump in and just say I feel exactly the same way. We appreciate Wim's draft but it literally came in this morning. I didn't have - I don't think anybody has had the opportunity to review it much less do exactly what you said, put it up on the board or up on the screen. So we live and learn and next time we won't go through such a detailed overview of what's in there if nobody's had a chance to read it yet.

And Wim we'll come back to you on the list with suggestions and edits and all the rest. Certainly appreciate the effort. Just please understand given time zone differences and other priorities nobody's at a chance to get to it yet.
Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks Paul. Yes I like Chuck I think I'm just going to make a process suggestion which is that in addition to, you know, some advanced ability to look at something I think the stakeholder group as a whole is probably not quite the right group to be looking at this as a general, not even this particular issue but as a general concept of reviewing the drafts. Presumably there's some subset of us or some people that don't regulate attend the stakeholder group potentially even that would be interested in a particular topic. So what I would suggest is, you know, get the first draft submitted out to the group and then set up a follow-up call, a standalone call just assuming the people that want to participate on that particular comment to talk through the issues as opposed to necessarily using the stakeholder group time.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes so just this is Stephane again. Just to address both of your points and to concur with what Paul said the initial plan if you remember was not for Wim to submit anything for this meeting. So he's worked faster than

we'd initially plan because we knew it would be short time and we just wanted him to get climatized with the RYSG way of thinking. So I appreciate your comments. I think we have to be fair to Wim that he's worked hard and fast to get involved.

On your specific comment Jordyn in the past we've called for volunteers. They've drafted an initial draft and they've put it to the list. And that's exactly what we're proposing to do. It's just the initial step is someone is doing it for us. But once that happens we, you know, this morning I sent this to the list, we put it to the list and those that wish to get involved do.

We have an organized calls in the past sadly since I've been vice chair to work on specific drafts as a working group. So I'm not sure that we need to add an additional step. But the process itself is that, you know, you got a draft on the list, if you want to comment do. We just want to make sure that because someone else is drafting for us we do have some SG inputs so that we know that this really does represent the opinion of the SG. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Did you say that you sent something to the list on this?

Stephane Van Gelder: This morning.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I missed it I guess. I don't see it but it might...

Stephane Van Gelder: Well I'll make sure that...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Stephane Van Gelder: ...it got sent.

Jordyn Buchanan: Stephane it's Jordyn again. Yes I do think that in this new model at least since we do have someone else drafting I suggest the follow-up call just because we might want a stronger level of engagement early on than we -

you know, it's often the case that we have someone from the stakeholder group with a strong subject matter expertise who's already been involved in a significant amount of discussions on the topic before the draft takes place. Here that's often that may not be the case. And so I think just having that follow-up call to make sure that it's a little bit grounded. Now it could be you all decide after you do three or four of these that totally unnecessary and, you know, Wim's as well grounded in this as any of us but that's just more of a bootstrapping operation than anything else.

Stephane Van Gelder: It does make sense. And perhaps we can try that for this and call for a call if you will. Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes Stephanie Duchesneau with Google. I think that similar to what Jordyn is saying that it's really important that we still have registry volunteers on all of these because there's understanding of the issue itself and then there's also understanding about how it interacts with registry systems specifically, how it interacts with our products that those of us who have participated in the stakeholder group directly for some time are probably best equipped to address. So I would just suggest not necessarily that we need to have other calls but that we should still go through the exercise for each of these comment periods of collecting volunteers. And maybe that is, you know, the first draft would at least for now be more of a notes and then the volunteers would be responsible for converting that input, converting any of their own input and turning that into a stakeholder position that combines both Wim's analysis and any additional perspective that folks within the stakeholder group want to layer on top.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes so that's exactly what I'd envisioned and I think Wim's on the same page. So exactly right...

Stephanie Duchesneau: And having glanced at the draft it seems like exactly what's happening.

Stephane Van Gelder: Sorry say again?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Having glanced at the draft that seems consistent with what's...

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes right.

Stephanie Duchesneau: ...happening?

Stephane Van Gelder: I mean the draft so you've seen the draft so it did go to the list.
Okay good. So, you know, that the draft is a set of notes and that's exactly right. It - you know, I don't know if we need to do a call. I think what you say Jordyn makes sense but I'm not - I'm just conscious of time and effort. We're trying to - Wim's input is trying to simplify our work. So if we had another layer then aren't we shooting ourselves in the foot really? I don't know, I mean it's up to everyone I guess but...

Paul Diaz: So Paul I (unintelligible). I would think that a half hour call on behalf of a few interested members of the stakeholder group would still be quite a bit less effort than, you know, several hours than drafting something. So it's still an efficiency even if we add a little bit of an extra step I would imagine.

Stephane Van Gelder: So how's this for a suggestion? Can we - I mean once Wim has said the initial notes perhaps he can organize the call? I mean not - we'll organize it but host the call to get input and those who want get on the call. Those who have time get on the call. Does that work? Paul? Wim is that - presumably you're hearing this?

Wim Degezelle: Yes. Okay no that's - I think you're really on the same page because well first of all I think we launched the project I think one and a half week ago. So I normal - I would find a normal...

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay I'm just looking around. I don't see any more comments. I know Stephanie...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Not on this but I had actually put forward a draft for the Thick Whois consensus policy recommendations which isn't reflected on the spreadsheet. And that just basically calls out the improvements that we've seen since the last comment period specifically removal of the operational process but calls out some of the same procedural issues that we've discussed during this morning session. So we've gotten some good input already from Rubens, from Mark Anderson at VeriSign but I urge anyone else to look at the draft. I think we still have almost a month to submit.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes thanks a lot for doing that. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: To follow Sue with Stephanie I did review the PTI fiscal year operating plan and budget. I sent a couple questions as they requested that were supposed to be in by November 4. They were more process related or clarification in terms of how the PTI budget will fit into the overall budget and terminology things like that.

The just for the group's information my own personal assessment was it looked pretty good other than not being able to correlate some of the terms used in the ICANN budget process versus the ones that were used in this. I actually talked to Xavier before our meeting with the board today and he gets that. And I suspect they'll respond to that.

I don't know that we'll need to comment. I don't expect I don't think people shouldn't just go by my personal assessment but it's not a real long document. The budget didn't increase. In fact I think I put a comment in the chat in our meeting this morning that I think it increased overall from the fiscal year '17 budget which was a combination of IANA and the new PTI for just a little bit of time was about \$1.3 million. So it's overall about a \$10 million budget which I think most of us through the transition process and everything that's, you know, they gave us estimates of IANA costs. And that includes the shared cost, it includes everything.

So it looked pretty good to me but that's just, you know, take a look at it. It's not too hard to look at. It's not very long. Whether we want to comment or not I'm not making a recommendation one way or another but unless we - unless there is support for, you know, that it looks okay and I don't know if that's worth doing or not.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Chuck. And can I ask both you and Stephanie and any others that do make spontaneous suggestions or drafts like that if you see me not pick them up and please resend them to me directly because, you know, we're all swamped and you're not the only ones not seeing my emails. I may not see yours. So it's not intentional. I apologize. But please do them with those two please send them to me again so I can include them in the matrix.

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck again. Just for clarification I didn't send it to you so you didn't...

Stephane Van Gelder: Oh.

Chuck Gomes: ...miss anything. I was I thought I'd get the clarification first from Xavier and his team before commenting to the list.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay thanks. This has been great and it's useful for me and Wim so I think you very much and I'll hand it back to Paul because I know we're pressed for time. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you both. Thank you Wim especially dialing in. Look everyone we've got a couple things left on our agenda. The technicians that run need to take - we have a hard stop at the top of the hour, ten minutes. We were told they could probably go a few minutes more and then we'll break.

We have GNSO council remaining on the agenda and then a presentation update from GEO TLDs. My concern is that if we break are people really going to come back especially if we have one or two issues left. So are

people okay with going a few minutes past the hour? And to that end I don't want to artificially cut off GNSO council debates but we began it this morning. It feels pretty good I think where we are. You know, can we get through this in the next 20, 25 minutes max and will that be enough time for you Sebastien?

Sebastien Ducos: (Unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: Okay. All right then let's do that. Let's try and push through. For the Council from this morning's discussions Donna, Keith, Rubens, I mean are you comfortable where we stand with the two motions? Do you feel you have guidance or how would you like to continue the discussions? Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Paul. Just to let everybody know that there's been a little bit of movement. So it may be that the amendments for the drafting team will be taken off the table in favor of a new one. And CCWG IG one could also be altered as well. So the position from this morning might be a - might look a little bit different when we come out of the - we have a GNSO council prep session this evening where we'll talk through the motions in front of us. So it could be that it's going to be different by the end of this evening.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Just looking around in that event then Donna perhaps if you guys can push a quick update to the list because we won't be re-gathered on a Friday input. I mean obviously we want to work with the registrars sync up our positions if at all possible. And if you all the six of you guys councilors, you know, feel comfortable where you are update the list and go forward with it. Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: On one note that's not usually in our agendas for stakeholder group meetings that most of the times it will have been reacting to other stakeholder group motions and we seldom suggest anything. Actually there is only one thing that was suggested by a stakeholder group members which was the IGO NGO issue.

But besides that we (unintelligible) be reacted and there's possibly room to – for us to start asking (pressing) agendas on the council. So I'd like to call out our membership to suggest those things so we can push so that instead of just reacting to other people's ideas. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Rubens. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: I'm trying to remember I know it was only this morning where did we come out on the motion for or if it's a motion to have the council take on the empowered community?

Donna Austin: So that's the drafting team motion for the revised bylaws. There's still so we - I think it came out that well actually Rubens I'll let you speak to it because it's your motion.

Rubens Kuhl: Actually I just second it because so it could be discussed during the council meeting but it turned give me the privilege of accepting or not the amendment. What is coming to on the table is actually a fundamental change of what the motion was so the idea that it wouldn't pass. So what we are trying to do from a political non-adversarial perspective is trying to incorporate a few of the ideas proposed by CSG that would happen anyway like ICANN legal review or some sort so it's like the idea for now is throwing a bone but keeping same circumstances we are already pursuing. That's the plan.

Jeff Neuman: So I'll try to understand. I mean I - maybe this is already answered and maybe I'm just forgetting but our view as a stakeholder group is that the empowered community that we shouldn't add any additional structure, that it's just the council that acts the representatives to the empowered community on behalf of the GNSO. Did we - is that what our position is?

Rubens Kuhl: Exactly. But for every stakeholder group that binds counselors it's I think the end result is actually the same. It doesn't matter whether good for the

councilor or not. But the idea is to keep that in the council so that it doesn't generate precedents for other ideas of GNSO deliberations.

Jeff Neuman: So I've have a- sorry this is Jeff. I've had a discussion with some of the CSG. Obviously it's a big issue for them so they're asking a lot of people their thoughts. And they have some interesting arguments about, you know, when you put someone on the council you're putting someone on the council for a policy, you know, that has a policy background that understands more policy. But having the same people necessarily deal with the empowered community issues may not - it may not be the same. And right now the CSG is arguing that front of the board so I'm trying to like multitask to see what's going on. But are we also then insisting on the weighted voting as well or so just everything remains the same? That's the position?

Rubens Kuhl: Yes and since our counselors of RSG Registry Stakeholder Group is commensurate for the group I directed doesn't matter what was the real background of who is making the vote because, you know, just in filling them who decides that are the actual stakeholder groups (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman. Yes I do think that there's a difference. It's not I mean you don't get direction on every single thing. We trust you on a number of occasions to like when their amendments are brought up and when there's certain things. We entrust that. It's like I know that we technically direct you on certain things. But I do think it's a different skill set. I do think they have a pretty good argument. I'm just not sure why we're buckling down so hard that it has to be the council and why we're not trying to work with the CSG or others if they think that it should be a different vehicle to exercise those powers. It seems like something we could collaborate on with them as opposed to just buckling down and opposing but.

Reubens Kuhl: I compare what is available in the empowered community to the nuclear football, the nuclear launch codes for missiles. So I wouldn't expect to decide those or myself. I would really prefer relying on stakeholder group guidance

before firing such missiles or stealing the border -- things like that. It sounds that sometimes when quick reaction times are needed counselors will usually act based on their knowledge and experience but from empowered community issues that's where I would least expect to not have guidance.

Paul Diaz: All right Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I understand that. I'm just this seems like an area because I don't see the empowered community being exercised for a while hopefully let's knock on wood. But it seems to me this is an area where I don't know we may want to reach across the aisle. It doesn't seem that big of an issue to me to work with them and kind of reach across to reach a solution.

I'm not sure this is such an area where we need to buckle down and hold firm on a position. I don't know I just if I were on the council I'd be trying to recommend some sort of collaborative approach. And I mean obviously the CSG feels incredibly strong about it I'm just not sure why we're pushing so hard back.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I've got Keith, Donna and Jordyn.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Paul, Keith Drazek. So Jeff I'm going to agree with Rubens about I think the empowered community powers I think those are such significant powers that, you know, no councilor would go and make any decisions about any of that on their own. So this question of directed voting or not directed voting at the NCSG yes I - following what the CSG is suggesting, you know, coming up with a new structure relying on the chairs of the stakeholder groups and constituencies instead of the council that's not going to change how the NCSG behaves right? They're still not going to be directed so I think that's...

Jeff Neuman: That's my point. In other words if it's not a hard give is not going to change...

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: ...anything then I would just as much trust Paul if he were the representative as I would any of the councilors...

Keith Drazek: Sure.

Jeff Neuman: ...then I'm not sure why...

Keith Drazek: I'll tell you why.

Jeff Neuman: ...we're pushing back so hard. That's what I want to hear.

Keith Drazek: From my perspective yes. Yes so following my initial comment is that we - you noted this is something the CSG feels very strongly about. We know there's something else they feel very strongly about and that is a dislike for the current structure of the GNSO and the way the weighting and the structure and the bicameral nature of it.

I think what this is is an initial attempt to try to find some other structure that can be used as precedent to undermine what we have today in terms of the structure of the GNSO Council. So I mean I'm happy to hear others' views on that but I think that's the risk.

Jeff Neuman: I think actually it's a way to push it to push those empowered community issues and separate it from the policy issues and say fine that other empowered community could be non-weighted voting or whatever but it stays away from the policy. It's kind of I see it as something different saying okay you got what you want over there this is not changing. I...

Paul Diaz: Okay Jeff...

Jeff Neuman: ...don't know but sorry I don't mean...

Paul Diaz: We've got a lot, yes you're getting a lot...

Jeff Neuman: Right sorry thank you.

Paul Diaz: ...of airtime. Donna, Jordyn, Stephanie who else? Please go ahead?

Donna Austin: It's Donna Austin. So I just want to make the point that this is something that David Marr participated in on behalf of the Registry Stakeholder Group. He did update us on a regular basis about, you know, what was happening. So I appreciated that there might be a different point of view but I guess from our perspective we've had the conversation and we did directed David on a certain course as well so we've been fundamentally changing what we agreed to with David as a representative on that work so...

Paul Diaz: You'll get back in Jeff. Let's keep going through and get all the ideas on the table. Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes this time I remember his name. I agree pretty strongly with Keith that as Admiral Ackbar would say it's a trap. And like the only - there's no reason that the CSG would care about this other than the fact that they're trying to use it as a precedent in order to seek fundamental shifts in the power structure in the GNSO space.

And like I think it's obvious they don't like it. They made continuous attempt to change it. This is very much in that pattern and I don't think there's anything substantive to be gained by like this - the new - if we really thought that the proposal they were making like was a lot better than sure like let's have that conversation but there's no actual benefit to the proposal and there's obviously - it's obviously part of a pattern that I don't think we should be supportive of and should continue to push back on.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Jordyn, thanks Paul. Just one other comment here and procedurally, you know, I mean Donna noted that David Maher participated in the drafting team. I think the point here is the drafting team actually came out with a recommendation to use the council to maintain the status quo in a sense. If there was a minority statement allowed, you know, of course allow but included that from the IPC or from the CSG and that's fine. And so what we're seeing now is a basically a bit of an endgame or end around trying to, you know, sort of have another shot at it, a bit of a Hail Mary on this one. So I think procedurally the right thing to do here is for us to follow the input that we've been given and that we have provided to follow through and to vote yes on this motion as originally presented and basically reject the proposed amendment.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I have Stephanie, Rubens, Kristina? Jeff if you want to get back in then.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Well this is another boring pile on but I also want to agree 100% with what Keith said. And I disagree strongly that this is not a hard know or this is something that's easy to reach across the aisle for the exact reasons that he cites. Like this is extensional and if we let it get away from us this could affect every single thing that comes up in front of the GNSO going forward. So I think like this is if there's one thing we dig our heels in it's this because this is going to affect us again and again and again for the exact reasons of precedent that Keith is sighting.

Paul Diaz: Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. There was one risk that was pointed out to us by David Maher and the others participating in the drafting team that the entire community can have impact on contractor restitution. Let's say someone files an IRP and RFI and it goes for their contact (unintelligible) mechanisms and ends up in the empowered community. So we probably would want to have the ability to possibly block some decisions that could reverse this execution of our

registry (unintelligible) start going into as well. It is not just the precedent. We have some minimal but there is an existent - there is a risk of it in the process.

Paul Diaz: Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Just a couple of points. First for what it's worth during the CSG board meeting they've basically had knowledge the broader next issue is the structure question. So Keith you're absolutely right on that. But another thing that for me at least is that interesting looking just reading this transcript in the context of this discussion is that it appears the part of the problem is that the drafting in connection with the revised bylaws may not have been as tight as it could have been in terms of kind of not precise use of GNSO versus GNSO Council.

So it may be worth kind of separately independently of this motion taking a look at that and seeing is this a bigger issue that if we - if the drafting isn't corrected that could have some negative implications for us farther down the road and that if that's the issue let's fix that problem then rather than dealing with the other one.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Yes real quick on that, thanks Kristina. And of course in the bylaw drafting they couldn't say GNSO Council necessarily because the GNSO's Council own charter or articles of operation -- probably didn't get that right -- were specific to the policy development process and not - did not allow for this. So I think at some point the GNSO - GNSO's own documents will have to be updated and I think that's one of the things that we're talking about right? So I think you're right though that it needs to be more clarified and more specific in terms of the terminology. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: All right so but I want Jeff I want to come back to something that you relayed as a concern of the CSG. And that relates to the fact that we elect our councilors based on some qualification that they have policy expertise. Did I misunderstand you on that because I don't think we do that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I mean I'll let this drop but the comment was that, you know, there's a different there in theory there's a different skill set of councilors versus necessarily those that would serve on the empowered community.

Chuck Gomes: So just to follow-up Chuck speaking. My view and I could be wrong is we elect our councilors to represent us period. Now it's nice if they have policy expertise but the GNSO Council doesn't develop policy. They just oversee it and manage it. But anyway we don't need to belabor it.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you all. I mean I think as we discussed our councils have guidance for the regional motion that stands. If the shifting sands materially change that please, you know, send updates to the list, act appropriately. You have a pretty clear sense of the clear intentions of the stakeholder group.

All right then with that we already did financial update in (Eval 4) this morning so we will wrap it up with the - oh Donna sorry.

Donna Austin: Sorry this - just one more quick thing about the council and most of you might be aware of this but we are headed down a path of uncertainty on the IGO acronym issue. I have forwarded to the list and email that Thomas Schneider sent to Heather, (James) and myself last night. He is obviously very frustrated by the time that, the length of time that it has taken to resolve the issue. And apparently the GAC is come away with a sense of the result of the conversation we had with GAC yesterday they've come away with the sense that the council is using process to not make a decision on the issue. So it's obviously not the case but that's the perSEption.

So where we think we've been discussing amongst the leadership, you know, what are our options in terms of trying to resolve this issue? So we - a little bit of a rocky road ahead I think and we do understand that there's going to be some pretty strong language in the GAC communique as well so...

Paul Diaz: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: This is an area I think we absolutely need to dig our heels in. This is an essential question much more so than the individuals that serve on in empowered community. This is one where I mean I don't see us working on any kind of compromise. It's the bylaws are very clear. The board has to - the board has our consensus policies and it's now up to the board to accept or reject this whole notion of a small group is fundamentally a violation of that.

And so on this one I don't think the council should I agree, the Council should absolutely insist that follow the bylaws on this one. So I'm behind you guys 100% on that one.

Paul Diaz: Okay and Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Just like to want - make stakeholder group membership feedback on an idea of escalating the temperature of this which is somewhat aggressive. But if the membership agrees to would be to file a cooperative engagement procedure which is a prelude to an IRP on the board for the board not action on the GNSO policies because they should have acted in that in somewhat number of board meetings that they haven't so were being two years.

So we couldn't have called for an IRP there. And we couldn't - even though it would probably be going nowhere but could file on a CEP just to make them look at it. But it's pretty aggressive so is there support in the membership for that?

Paul Diaz: Given the time of the day I don't think anybody's going to give it the consideration it deserves Rubens. I would ask that we take this one offline and kick it around on the list. That is quite an ask and I think we want to think it through very clearly before we say yes or no. All right fortunately the techs are not signaling so we still have connectivity. Let me shifted over to (Geo) TLD. As I mentioned this morning they filed the paperwork. They're going to transition into an association so we're going to have two association members now but with that Sebastien has some stuff he wants to share.

Sebastien Ducos: I'm actually going to keep it very, very short. So yes as was out this morning where we're changing our status we create an association under Belgian law in September for this purpose. And so we're going to use this vehicle basically to engage the community in general in a few topics of interest for the rest of the community. We continue doing the work that we've been doing for ourselves basically sharing operational experience, marketing, et cetera, in our own gTLDs. And with the rest of the community points of interest like for example the PDP on subsequent procedures what you were just discussing via the release of the IGO names the second the - all these things are happening with the country and territory names and the possible changes there are of interest and we will engage on this.

Universal acceptance and universal awareness also important for us. We have a bit of a special position by being very close to our communities geographically. We're talking about cities and regions. We have the ability of having a ground approach to these problems and being able to engage with the community very closely which is of interest from people, Don Hollander in particular.

We're encountering a few issues. Most of our members are European. We're not a European group but there is a bit of a focus just to the fact that most of our members are European. With regards to European privacy laws and the fact that we're finding that few of our members and a growing number of our members are going to be either fail the registry agreement or local law in

Europe and we have a few things there to resolve particularly with regards to Whois.

And last but not least also use this vehicle to go and engage our friends on the ccTLD level. A lot of people - a lot of our members are also ccTLD members. The regional organizations like Center (LAC) TLD (HTLD) for sharing their experience and learning from their experience. And that's it for me.

Paul Diaz: Okay Sebastien thanks for keeping it so well focused. Everyone this is the end unless there's any additional AOB? No okay. So we're done here for today. Thank you very much. There is a high interest session on public interest. It's the one Becky had implored us to stop by. That's being held in Hall 3 where we met with the board runs now and then the end of the day one is on content regulation. Jon and (Liz) others I think are panelists on that. The that's probably one that you more likely or not should try and attend because that could easily impact us.

And then remember the reception for (Bruce) this evening will be over at the Novotel. And we're moving outdoors so it'll be out on the lawn and that begins at 6:30. So please come by wish him well and enjoy a drink. And with that we thank everybody for their time...

END