ICANN 58 Copenhagen

Joint Registries Stakeholder Group and Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting

14:00, Tuesday, 14 March 2017

TRANSCRIPT

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.

Man: Our recording has started.

Man: Are we good, Chair?

Woman: Hello.

Cherie Stubbs: Good afternoon. Has the recording started, please?

Woman: Yes.

Cherie Stubbs: Good to go.

Paul Diaz: Great, okay. Great, thank you everybody. Again for the record, Paul Diaz, Chair of the Register Stakeholder Group.

                 This is our afternoon session at the Joint Session with the Registrars. We're going to begin with a recognition ceremony for registry and registrar members. Let me turn it over to our guests.

Matthew Rubin: Good afternoon, everybody. My name's Matthew Rubin and I'm joined here by my colleague Mike Isles. We're here on behalf of the Alliance for Safe

Online Pharmacies or ASOP Global. We're an organization based in Washington, D.C.

And I'd first like to take an opportunity to thank (Zoe) and (Sue) and (Sheri) for giving us the opportunity to give this award out this morning- or this afternoon.

The Alliance for Safe Online Pharmacies is a coalition of about 75 different organizations spanning patient and provider groups, pharmaceutical manufacturers, distributors, Internet commerce companies, payment providers and a handful of other different organizations. We have operations in the EU, U.S., Asia, all of which is centered around the ability to improve patient safety online.

And so given that introduction, I'd like to turn it over to Mike.

Mike Isles: Thank you very much indeed. I'm going to step out the front if you don't mind so you can see me a little bit better. And I apologize for reading from my notes but I've got some statistics that are quite important that I think people ought to know about.

I'm sure many of you are aware the issue of illegal online drug sellers is a serious one that places patients' lives at risk. However, it is good to note in about the last three years the number of illegally operating Web sites have reduced from about 45,000 down to 30,000. So the direction of travel is good.

However, more than 96% of online pharmacies are operating illegally and they fail to comply with applicable laws and safety standards. And nearly 10% of these sites illegally sell controlled substances. Now 90% of these illegal

online pharmacies do not require a prescription. So if you want to buy a serious medicine, you don't require a prescription. Thank you.

And very importantly, any products sold by illegal online pharmacies can contain, wait for it, wax, mercury, concrete, chalk, boric acid, road tar, paint thinner, antifreeze and other potentially deadly poisonous substances.

And of course in the majority of situations they are often manufactured in unsafe conditions and they may contain no active ingredient, some active ingredient or too much active ingredient.

Now of course buying medicines from illegal online pharmacies increases your risk of credit card fraud and identity theft. And at least one statistic and one last statistic is that nearly one in four adult Internet consumers in the U.S. and one in five in Europe have actually purchased a prescription medicine online.

And of those in the U.S. nearly one in five did not use a Web site associated with a local pharmacy or health insurance plan.

I think that demonstrates the magnitude of the issue.

So now, moving swiftly on, turning to the award itself and the process, nominations were open to registrars, registries, advertising providers, payment processors, shippers, other e-commerce companies, organizations or individuals who evidenced a commitment to improving patient safety online.

ASOP Global received multiple nominations. And so how was the winner decided? The Award Committee included members of the ASOP Global board and members representing a diversity of jurisdictions and disciplines.

Award winners were chosen based upon their positive impacts on patient safety including corporate policies and practices, responsiveness to illicit online drug sellers, prevention of domain name use for illegal online drug sales, proactive programs to monitor registrant compliance, cross-industry collaboration, current rate of rogue registrants utilizing the platform and, last but not least, public and consumer awareness efforts.

So at this point I'd like to hand back to Matt and he will announce the winners. Thank you.

Matthew Rubin: Thanks, Mike. So at this point what we would like to do is bring up both of our winners.

We're pleased to announce that we will be giving out two awards today, one of which will be going to Realtime Register and we have Theo Geurts here to accept the award on their behalf as well as Rightside which will be represented by Statton Hammock. So I'd like to ask both of them to come up now.

So both organizations have shown a really dedicated effort to improving patient safety online and addressing the issue of illegal online drug sellers.

Both Realtime and Rightside have over a million domain names between each of them and for which the rate of illegal online drug sellers is extremely low, if not about zero. So both organizations respond pretty proactively to any reports of abuse, often within 24 hours.

So I'd like to formally round of applause for both of our winners and present them with their awards. And I'd invite either Theo or Statton to give a few words.

Theo Geurts: Just a few quick words. I would like to thank all of you who are members of ASOP for the award. Also would like to point out that I find it very important that you guys are here and sort of turning the medal to the other side, showing us that we are most of all responsible companies trying to do business. Thanks.

Statton Hammock: Thank you all very much for this award, Matt and Mike. Five years ago when my company -- Demand Media at the time -- first sort of undertook this effort, we had no idea of the scope of this problem and the devastating health effects it can cause.

And our involvement with not just other registrars but as Matt mentioned, the cross-industries, we've been able to be really successful in moving a lot of these illegal drug sellers off to shipping off our platforms and reducing the amount of rogue pharmacy sites we're able to see. So thank you both.

Sue Schuler: Can I get one of you on this side? Thank you. There you go. Okay, thank you. There you go. Look at the camera. Thank you. Perfect. Thank you.

Mike Isles: So thank you very much. So just to conclude, we will be running this award again. So please do make your nominations. We hope this will happen in Spain in Barcelona - in ICANN in Spain in Barcelona.

So it just remains for me to thank you all for your time. And congratulations again to the winners. Thank you very much.

Graeme Bunton: Hi all. This is Graeme Bunton from 2000, the Registrar Stakeholder Group. First, thank you to the registries for having us in your room. It's always nice to see the friendly faces and get together and chat.

The biggest thing on your agenda we have today right now is to sort out our session with the board which is coming up immediately after this.

And we've - they meet about a number of different topics and I'm hoping we have something we can put on the screen so we can do some prioritization and figure out who's going to tackle what.

Man 1:   (Unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Great. So we can see that the board has presented two questions to us, those top two, first one regarding Accountability Work Stream 2.

And then the second -- which is maybe slightly more difficult -- is what policy advice issues are top priorities for your group. That second is maybe a bit tricky because we might have different ones between the registrars and registries.

I personally am not super dialed in to Accountability Work Stream 2. So I'm hoping that someone in the room has - is dialed in to that particular piece of work and maybe has a coherent answer that we can present to the board. Anybody want to throw up their hand and have something for that? Don't all rush to the mic at once.

Woman: Raise your hand if you're participating in Work Stream 2?

Woman: Jeff Neuman and Pam Little.

Graeme Bunton: Jeff and Pam? Do - Jeff, have you seen this question?

Jeff Neuman: About a minute ago.

Graeme Bunton: Great. Do you feel like you're in a good place that you could speak briefly to this to the board?

Jeff Neuman: Sure, why not?

Paul Diaz: Just make it up, Jeff.

Graeme Bunton: Great, thank you. Pam, did you want to jump in on that too? Nope, great. Jeff, thank you for being volun-told that you are going to tackle that topic.

Question Two: What policy advice issues are top priorities for your group? So I'm not sure how nuts and boltsy we want to make this, probably not too detailed. And the question is do we tackle this separately or we try and roll this into the rest of the questions that we have below that at the same time. And can we answer that question from the board with our questions back?

Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Graeme. It's Jonathan. I just wanted to - I mean, I'm sort of wondering what the purpose of this question is. Is this to try and understand the priorities of our different groups? Or is this - the - what is the board going to do with this? Are they going to then - because my understanding is once they get policy output from us, they have a process.

So I'm just wondering whether this means they're going to prioritize their work in some way. So it would be quite good to have a clarifying question up front even if we are able to then go on and say these are our top priorities to be understanding what motivated them to ask this question. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Jonathan, it's Paul. I don't want to be overly cynical but the question seems like filler to me. The same questions were presented to every single group across the community that meets with the board.

I don't think they're looking for any sort of deep, deep thinking on our part here. The suggestion is that we - if we get - offer the questions in order, we highjack the question with whatever concerns us. Sam?

Samantha Demetriou:Sam): Thanks, Paul. Also I think it was when the board was chatting with the GNSO Council they presented their list of priorities. So maybe priorities is just the word of the week this week here at ICANN 58.

But I agree, it's a pretty superficial question if it goes across to everyone. And I don't know that they'll take it to actually shape anything.

So maybe the way we turn that around -- if we do want to hook it into some other suggestions -- is we say, when we think about policy that comes out of ICANN, our big concern is the picket fence item. And then, yes, use that to kind of leap into that. And that was not my topic so I'll defer to whoever else wants to expand on that.

Paul Diaz: Okay. For picket fence, it's easy. Becky, who's on the board and she really wanted us to use this as a teachable moment for her colleagues on the board and for seniors that are there. Given things that have happened and been said over the last few months coming into Copenhagen, it's past time to remind

them of the priority of the picket fence. So we do want to get that - have those points made. Okay, I got a queue going. Stephane and then Jordyn?

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Paul. Stephane Van Gelder. I think the way Jonathan put it is very good. We - you know, even though I agree with you, Paul, that these are filler questions, they are there.

And we ought to be able to understand why - what they're planning to do with it because going back to a previous discussion we had this morning, if you - truly in the bottom-up process they shouldn't even be asking us these - this question, this specific one on the priorities. You know, these issues are, I mean, policy not advice.

Policy issues are done and handled by the community bottom up, thrown to the board and then the board handles them as and when they come in. And they shouldn't care what our priorities are.

So I'm also interested in understanding why - you know - could they just not come up with any questions and someone threw that in? So is there some ulterior motive there? Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Stephane. Jordyn, you want to respond, go to your question. Does anyone want to respond?

Jordyn Buchanan: So my comments mostly are in response to Stephane and you and Jonathan to a certain extent in any case which is that it seems like a totally reasonable question to me and I don't understand why we wouldn't just answer it.

It - Becky - speaking of Becky, one thing I've heard from her this week is that the board is trying to focus a lot more not just on process but on understanding

the substance of the issues that the community is trying to deal with. So if they understand from each group what the issues that group cares about then they will know the things that they should educate themselves about in terms of substance.

I don't know if that's their motivation or not. I don't think we need to second guess them. I think it's a totally reasonable - like who cares what they're going… If we see them using it in nefarious ways, then I guess we can push back on that.

But, you know, I think it would be reasonable to figure our top two or three issues that we care about as a contracted party house and let them know.

Paul Diaz: Okay, James?

Cherie Stubbs: Here you go.

James Bladel: I just wanted to kind of echo was Jordyn was saying. I see it as a filler question as well but I don't think it's necessarily a negative thing. I think they're trying to start a conversation about this throughout the community because I think (Bjorn) is - especially is focused on setting priorities and drawing some boundaries on what we can and can't support.

I'd actually wanted to just reinforce on the next question about the picket fence, that echoes a lot of what we said during the council's interaction with the board that the PDP process is the only legitimate mechanism to create policy that make - to make it binding and enforceable and on to contracted parties and withstand any kind of challenge.

And we have a lot of concerns I think that PCWGs are starting to wade into these waters with some of their recommendations. And just continuing to hit that note from as many possible directions I think is beneficial. Thanks.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: I will.

Paul Diaz: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Michele for the record. In common with Jordyn and others, why not just answer the question, that we've really ended up in this kind of black helicopter of space where we need to be start thinking that there's deep nefarious motivation behind a simple straightforward question?

Now to actually answer the question, speaking as a registrar, I think one of the bigger issues we're facing at the moment is the RDS PDP that's going to suck all the air out of the room for the next 20 years if we let it.

We've got the cross-field validation nightmare and from the conversations we've had with ICANN staff this morning, it's totally unclear who or how we actually kill that, who has the power to kill it.

I mean, we can. We have a facility within the contract to vote to say that we have found a solution that is technically and economically viable. But there doesn't seem to be any way to say that there is no way to do that definitively because it just keeps coming back, coming back, coming back. I think that's something that's a bit of an issue for us.

And obviously it affects you because hey we're - if we can't register domain names, you don't sell any. And if you don't sell any, you all go out of business maybe apart from their kind of the top realm guys who aren't impeachable there. Sorry.

Paul Diaz: I think we're circling around what the quick answer would be, what our key priorities are. Let's be sure we annunciate that before we close this out. But I've got Donna waiting. Do I have anybody down the line? Okay, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Paul. Donna Austin. I know that this describes what policy advice issues are top priorities for your group.

One thing that I'm very conscious of with - you know, the council has had - facilitated discussions this week on Red Cross and IGO acronym issues. The IGO acronym protections are supposed to be temporary reservations and they're still in place.

I understand the IRT that's working on that is not intended to finish their work until July 2018 which seems an extraordinarily long period of time. The policy for most of those IGOs is done, you know, reserve the exact name with an extension - an exception ability.

So, you know, one thing that I'm conscious of is why are these IRTs taking so long. What's - because it's basically the policy is there. Why can't we implement it quicker than what we are?

And on this particular issue, you know, I'm aware that Donuts received requests from the IOC to use IOC at the second level some time ago but the policies approved that they could do that, to release it to those that, you know,

have - actually own the acronym. So why can't we have at least a mechanism that enables that to happen?

Bentley requested AU and EU. They've got the agreement from the - you know, the relevant bodies to do that but there's no exception clause so they can't actually do that. And there's a recent - a more recent one with, you know, a certain dot add that can't release as well at the moment.

So I think, you know, why is this taking so long, why is it going to take until 2018 to get that IRT work completed and done? I mean, this should be pretty straightforward. So that's - it's - I mean, that's just one example. But I think the IRTs are a bit of an issue.

Paul Diaz: Okay so let's gather our key issues. The length of time to get our IRTs. This is not necessarily in a specific order but what things do we collectively agree rise to the top. Sebastien?

Sebastien Ducos: Hi, (Sebastien Dekos) for New Star but speaking on behalf of the GOTLD Group. The GDPR, we have one year to become compliant. It affects all of us, registries and registrars, European, non-European. Anybody that fills domain names to Europeans are affected. We're running into the wall if we don't start looking at it very quickly.

As, on top of it, a backhand registry operator, I know that I don't find solutions like that overnight. I need to have a plan between now and, let's say, Abu Dhabi. Otherwise, in May next year we won't be ready for it.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Sebastien. And both Sebastien and Donna, if we raise these and board members want to drill down, you can just say exactly the type of things you said just to get the… Thank you.

Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Paul. Stephane Van Gelder. Isn't - an obvious issue that we have on top of our priority list is Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I'm in agreement, yes. Others? I mean, do we want to call it a top three and leave it at that, easy number for them to wrap their heads around? Okay. (Mikaili?) Well, they can count to five you figure but…

Michele Neylon: It's nice to see that Paul is finally starting to get catty, excellent. We knew that diplomacy wouldn't last forever.

So what are the top three then? I mean, are we saying GDPR, which is also whois related, and I mean, the two go together. And I think from the registar side, you know, for - I don't know, where's Graeme? Oh there he is. Graeme, weigh in. You're our glorious leader.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, Michele. I think you already brought up what's going to be extremely important for registrars, which is the cross-field validation piece. It maybe gently ties to the GDPR, GRPD, whatever that is. We can maybe capture both of those around capturing information that's going to be geographically problematic.

Paul Diaz: Okay, other thoughts. I mean, we all know how these things go. It's either going to be painfully awkward because nobody's talking or it's going to be so free flowing we're going to be like whoa, time's up. So let's avoid the first one at all possible.

Stephane Van Gelder: Paul, sorry. Stephane again. Can I just - to your practical question about what if the board has follow-up questions on the subsequent procedures, I'd like to say that I volunteer Jeff to answer them and not me just because I brought the subject up.

Jeff Neuman: Same answer as before, sure.

Paul Diaz: And Jordyn, we might turn to you because you've already stated over the weekend and stated it well the need for timeline, repeat that for the board and for anybody who may not have heard over the weekend. I don't mean now.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, no it's fine. I'm happy to warm them up for the follow-up communication we talked about.

Paul Diaz: Yes, okay. So (Graham's) asking, so with this in mind, you know, we've got some sense of how we'll respond to the board's questions.

For our own, the bullet point in their about picket fence, we'll work that in whether it's directly addressed or just added onto another response.

Some of these questions are concerns that we had identified and shared with the board in advance. What you see up on the screen right now, I'm not exactly sure how to handle them.

If subsequent procedures and a timeline to another round gets in there, it begins to overlap with the first bullet that we put in front of the board about reconciling parallel processes and demands from other parts of the community. I mean, this can become either rich or very, very murky very quickly and.

Graeme Bunton: Paul, I - so I think bullets here one and three are more or less the same. And I'm - sorry, this is Graeme for the transcript. I'm a little bit hesitant to put that question to the board because I think if they could answer it, they would have already decided on like the IGO problem.

And I'm not sure we would get anything new or interesting out of them on this unless we feel like it's worthwhile for them to hear our frustration again.

Paul Diaz: Excellent points, Graeme. Thank you. And nothing from the chat. (Kristina's) saying, you know, with regards to these evaluating community inputs, she's suggesting that we use the opportunity to emphasize there are contracts with ICANN, not with ICANN and the community.

All right. So with what else we have up there, the very final bullet point just to put it out there, it's kind of a softball question but if you all haven't heard, looking ahead to our summit in Madrid in the second week of May, at this point about ten directors are expected to attend at least the first day.

So the thought was offer the opportunity to say hey, we're still working on our agenda. What are your interests? And can we build them in? Can we have the kind of exchange we had in Amsterdam with them? If time permits, that seems like a good one to engage in a dialogue.

And to that end, the list of topics that we have right now is quite long. So collectively, registries, registrars, we've got to prioritize our topics, you know, really need to in the next month or so so that we can have a pretty solid agenda posted and people can make travel decisions and participation decisions based on something real. Can't let it run to the two weeks before again like we did last year. So just know that that's coming.

Did we more or less cover this?

Graeme Bunton: We still need to figure out who's doing what.

Paul Diaz: So as far as - you know, (Graham's) saying figuring out who does what, you know, whether he or I are speaking and/or managing the queue, you know, we'll turn to, you know, Donna, Sebastien, Jeff as appropriate just to get the conversations going.

But please, everybody, you know how these things work. You're welcome to weigh in and strongly encouraged to do so.

I mean, the board often says after the fact they love to hear new voices from the community and, you know, explain where you're coming from if you haven't engaged previously. It shows the broad diversity and in particular from newer members that folks are getting more actively involved.

Graeme Bunton: If I - I would - sorry, Graeme for the transcript. I would really appreciate a registrar who probably is not a usual suspect to maybe take on cross-field if we're going to put that into that first piece if someone wants to volun-told for that one too. Oh, you guys.

Owen DeLong: I can try and tackle it if you want, Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Thanks, Owen.

Paul Diaz: All right then, we've got about 30 minutes left. If we're reasonably comfortable in going off to our session in a half-hour and winging it this way, I'm happy to talk about other things on our agenda if people are willing to take that flier. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, this is just for general registry, general registrar topics? Is that what you're calling for?

Paul Diaz: Let me come right back to you then.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Paul Diaz: Is everybody reasonably comfortable with how we'll head into the board session? Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: So I just had one question. And I hadn't seen the registrar view on this. I know it came up a little bit in the registry side. But we did engage the board extensively on the sort of staff dynamic last time we talked with them and sent them the letter and haven't really seen any response back.

                  I don't think I want to - we did spend a lot of time on that but I wonder if it's worth at least mentioning the fact that we're disappointed that we haven't seen any substantive response back several months after the fact after what we thought was a constructive dialogue with the board at the time and a commitment to engagement from the staff.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Jordyn. This is Graeme. Having spoken with (Bjorn) briefly, you know, they felt very strongly they couldn't respond privately. They had to do it publicly. They haven't had a ton of time since then. I'm not sure it's super constructive to be bringing that up yet.

Jordyn Buchanan: So all right. If that's the general sentiment, I guess that's fine. I find that absurd that they couldn't have prepared their response because we hadn't yet

sent them the public letter, that like they could have been working on their response independent of the channel by which we communicated with them.

Paul Diaz: Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, I agree with Jordyn on this one, shockingly. I was going - I raised my hand for the same thing. Like the very experience that we're going through not having them respond is like an example of what the problem that we're trying to talk about.

And I have absolutely no interest in like going back and having the exact same conversation as we did last time and going through the same points. But I think it's worth raising that.

I think during the last session like we didn't send the communication out unrequested. I had conversations with several of the board members where they specifically requested this communication. And then we send it out. I spent a ton of time on the draft and it just goes into a black box. And I don't want it to be a flame war but I do want it to go on the record.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Stephanie. Thanks, Jordyn. So fair enough. Maybe that's a note we can bring up in the end if we're going to bring up this GDD topic, we can say we've got a couple short things that we can stick in, in the end. Thanks. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Graham. Keith Drazek for the transcript. I don't think there's any harm in noting, as you described, sort of at the end of the conversation, noting that we are looking forward to the Board and Goran's response to the letter. I don't think we need to make it like hey, why haven't we heard from you. Let's just take the high road, keep it positive, and say we had the conversation in

Hyderabad. We've sent you a follow-up communication. We sent you another letter and we're very much looking forward to hearing your response in the very near future. Just something like that, thanks.

Graeme Bunton: We have a queue going again. Stephanie, Jordyn -- I mean tweak the words. You're absolutely in your right to raise it that way. Look, we've seen Goran's reactions. He's more likely than not to get defensive if we really go after him in the public session, but being clear for the record is still going to send the message.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Building off of Keith's suggestion, I think we could actually even go a step further. One of the things that I find difficult is that in our letter, we very explicitly stated that we recognize that this is a bilateral relationship and there's probably pain points, and they're uncomfortable on their side too. And our position was to ask them for suggestions for how they could -- what they thought we could change potentially to make the relationship better. And that's what we haven't seen. I think until we have the issues on both sides, we can't even begin the conversation.

So I would actually go a step further and say we welcome and are looking forward to your suggestions for how we can work together to improve the relationship.

Graeme Bunton: Yes, and since they've received the questions, fourth bullet there, about improved communications, go ahead and hijack it and make those exact points. Okay, I do have a queue. Jeff, and then Michele, and James.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. My comments just on general registry, registrar stuff. So if you want to keep going with this. I know we had a discussion early on that we wanted to start about council and thinking ahead

of chair position, things like that, if we have time. I don't know if the registrars thought about it or if we -- Paul, you wanted to share some of the discussion that we had.

Paul McGrady: I'm going to turn to Stephan.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, good point, Jeff. Thanks. Stephane Van Gelder for the record. So earlier on in our registry meeting, we brought up the question of the upcoming chair election at the council and suggested that we might want to think as a CPH, we might to think about being amenable to some rotation of the chair position, which has been long held by contracted party representatives. Avri was a NomCom appointee, Chuck, myself, Jonathan, James. That's a long series. So we were suggesting that perhaps it would be both politically and in terms of fairness, good to think about giving support to an NCPH candidate.

Having said that, we have obviously no idea whom that candidate might be. We think very strongly that before any question of rotations then as whatever the first criteria should be skill and whether the candidate in question has the required skillset to lead the council effectively and make sure the council does its work in an efficient manner. And we, at this stage, acknowledge that it's early days and that the potential candidates on the NCPH might not yet have declared themselves. I disclosed this morning that one has approached me asking if I thought it was a good idea that that person run, and my response was the first order of business it seems to me is to get your own house in order and make sure that you have house (unintelligible) support, which in the past does not seem to have been the case.

So that's as far as we got in the discussion and happy to hear the registrar's thoughts on this. Thanks, Paul.

Graeme Bunton: If I may, this is Graeme from the registrar stakeholder group. We have not really talked about this at all yet. So thank you for putting that on our radar. James has thrown up his hand.

James Bladel: Well, first of all, I mean I'm standing right here. You're talking about me like I'm dead. I get it and it makes perfect sense, Stephane. My only note would be that we've changed the election eligibility criteria for this next election that will be coming up in Abu Dhabi and that the eligible candidates are now in -- sorry, incoming councilors are now eligible to stand for chair where they were not before. So the NPCH candidates might not even be councilors yet.

So I think it is ahead of the game possibly even more than it has been in the past in that we don't even know who is going to be on council, let alone which of them will be standing. But I think we should try to reach some accord on rotation. It is -- the subject of rotation is coming up in other contexts on the council. It is something that I think is noble and worth pursuing so long as it doesn't tie our hands, as you said, to someone who, like myself, may be a little soft in the skills department. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, James. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks. On the thing about the rotation and the non-contract and all that, I think Stephane's hit the nail on the head. The first criterion should be whether the person is qualified and has the correct skillset and the time to do it. Because there are a lot of people who are very qualified to do things within this space, but there's only a very small number who will be able to commit the amount of time involved to do that. And having seen, well, not having seen James for the last year at all because basically, as chair, he has vanished, you can tell. The workload involved with it is massive.

So anybody taking on that role would need to be able to commit a substantial amount of time and resources to that. What I did raise my hand was in other things was to do with general registry/registrar discussions. There's been a few things that have come up within our conversations and the kind of default has been, well, we can't really talk about this here. We need to pump this to the GDE Summit and the fear I have is that if we keep pumping everything into the GDD Summit, we're not going to get them covered there and then it becomes a case of punting it to another meeting and you know where I'm going with this.

So I suppose the thing is are you guys kind of coming up with some kind of list of things you want to talk to us about specifically at GDD or are you thinking about things that you want to talk to us about within this context, apart from interactions with the board, because that seems to suck up a lot of time at these one or two hour meetings that we have together at the ICANN meetings.

Graeme Bunton: I'm not sure who has a response for you, Michele. Everybody's head is down typing away, myself included. Look, I think everything for the planning looking ahead, our intention was just let's put it out there. I don't think in the time we have today and given the timeframes that we should be trying to problem solve. This is something that we can discuss within our groups, come back and work through final positions as a joint ex-com call. But I don't know, does anybody feel differently? You can absolutely hear all the points. In some ways, I think we may have kind of jumped the gun on this one.

Michele Neylon: Well, just for example, in our meeting this morning, one of the topics that was discussed was that from the registrar side was we wanted to talk about bulk transfers, for example. Another topic that I wanted to raise personally was around prepayments if other people wanted to talk about that, but they said

they didn't want to discuss it in an ICANN context. They'd prefer to punt that to GDD. The thing is everything you raise something, they're going to punt it to GDD, my fear is, is that GDD is going to end up as this kind of catch all with nothing coming out the far end of it.

So I'm just trying to see if this some kind of list somewhere of issues that you guys want to talk about or things you don't want to talk about, or anything. I don't know if that's any way helpful for you, Paul.

Paul McGrady: It is, especially the negative. I don't know if we have anything at post select now that's inappropriate in a group context, take a hard view that it's just a one to one contractual issue. Let me go back to the group, my group and make sure that's the case. I would say that, again, all the issues that we've put -- both stakeholder groups have put on the table for potential discussion in Madrid that we are -- it is on us now to sort through and prioritize. So to your point, understanding, okay, registrars want to talk about these things. Is anybody against talking about them? And so long as it's not, it makes the list.

And again, we really should be having those conversations and prioritizing the topics in the next calendar month so that we have a final agenda or as close to final as possible ready to get posted a good month before the actual meeting, so that everybody is aware of what we're supposed to be talking about when we get in there. And if you check your email, I mean I've pushed things to the list so for registries at least, it's there. Start having at it. James?

James Bladel: I was going to raise a different topic so is that -- is this a good time?

Paul McGrady: Sure, go ahead James.

James Bladel: Okay, so I'm not really sure where this belongs. I want to raise it and (unintelligible) it a little bit with this group and see if something worthy of bringing up with the council or even introducing in conversations with the board. But some of our colleagues over on -- that are following work on the IETF have indicated that there is another special use string that's about to be following the same reservation allocation whatever blocking process that was used for dot onion. It is, I believe it's dot home net. Is anyone else familiar with this issue?

                  So okay, so I just have a concern that there's not a lot of visibility into this process. I'm not very keenly aware on what the threshold is, or eligibility, or requirements to get something through the IETF this way. I think it is concerning perhaps that we don't have a closer coordination I think between the IETF and ICANN. I know there's some individuals that play in both pools but Jeff, you're dying to tell me that this isn't -- go ahead, Jeff. I'm asking questions. I really don't know if we want to raise the alarm bell on this, or I don't believe dot home net is necessarily the kind of string that people would line up to apply for, but some day there might be a string that would be more interesting to folks in future rounds.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I actually do agree we should raise the issue. It should have been raised when dot onion came about. I would ask the board -- I believe -- well, I know that there's an MOU between the IETF and ICANN and I believe that MOU pretty much acknowledges that the right of ICANN to delegate TLDs was given to them by the IETF community. And the IETF has reserved the right in that MOU to pretty much suggest, or not suggest but to ask for these names. And I think we need to get clarification from ICANN as to what criteria they use to award -- to give them these and to what right there is for our community to object, and to what extent that these new TLDs have to go through any kind of the same types of processes we have.

So actually, I do think it is an issue. It's something we've talked about in the subsequent procedures working group and it is something we should bring up.

James Bladel: So just for clarity, I don't think this is a TLD in the traditional sense. I think it's more of a part of a protocol where it's baked in but it does use the DNS for coordination and resource resolution. And I agree, there's a liaison for the IETF on the ICANN board. Is this person keeping them up to speed on the potential strings that might be coming through this process?

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Thank you, James. All right, I've got a queue. I've got Keith and I've got Jordyn. Jordyn, was your response to this one? Okay, Keith, do you have a new issue? Okay, we'll come back. Go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yes, I was just going to say -- this is Jordyn Buchanan. This is an area in which I don't think either IETF or ICANN is particularly willing to take responsibility to get a global solution, or they haven't so far. There is just IETF draft went to final call that basically lays out that there's a problem here and I think SSAC 90 also covers this space. So I think on both the ICANN and IETF sides, well, not the formal ICANN side but at least the SSAC body within ICANN and on the IETF side, there's a recognition that we don't have a good process for coordinating between ICANN and IETF on this issue of, in the case of onion and this new string, sort of non-globally resolving strings, but the notion of the IETF being able to reserve names and take them out of the public PNS versus ICANN's role of putting names into the public VNS.

To the extent we think this is an issue, it's probably worth kicking off some discussion but we probably, to the extent there are some of us here and Google is one of the companies, I know VeriSign as well. There are companies that have people that play in the IETF space as well as the ICANN

space. It's probably incumbent on us to a certain extent to start making sure at least the people within our own organizations are talking and we could start to maybe bring some of those people into these meetings, or vice versa. Because I think there's probably a lot of education needed all around and a lot more communication needed between the two organizations.

I'm not sure the IETF liaison is probably doing too much of this right now would be my guess.

James Bladel: So my question is should we raise this with the board? Would you rather it go through the council, fodder for the public forum? What does this group -- where do we go with this. I mean, could it go through the CSC? Because ultimately, this effects IANA and their operations as well.

Jordyn Buchanan: This is Jordyn again. My opinion is that it wouldn't make sense through the CSC. The council would be a fine place but it would be -- I don't see any problem with us raising it if we think we have time on the agenda today. But I don't know whether that's true or not.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele for the record. I think we need to raise this up to a higher kind of meta issue around IETF and technical developments being kind of out of sync with what goes on within the ICANN space. Because I mean we've seen this with other things where IETF people work away, come up with a technical solution to a technical problem that is completely out of sync with the ICANN processes, and policies, and contracts, and then they're very, very frustrated with us.

And so for example, with DNS SEC, we've seen some proposals from people on the technical side of the house, which would completely ignore the contractual relationships we have, plus liability and a whole load of other

things because they've never really kind of had that backwards and forward of something.

The issue here around dot onion and the other ones, again, it needs to be raised but I'm not sure if it's just that one specific thing but kind of an ongoing lack of kind of clear communication between the two.

Paul McGrady: Okay, thanks everyone. My strong guess is that a couple board members will want to engage and would have a very good discussion. The others will be zoned out. So if we keep this to the end and if time permits. If not, maybe finding ways -- other communication would better serve us -- best serve us. Thanks for waiting. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul. Just as we prepare for the session with the Board, I understand that in the commercial stakeholder group meeting with the Board earlier today, they were again agitating a little bit around the registry agreement amendment process. No surprise but it may be that the board wants to talk about that just in case, just so we're prepared. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Okay. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Another subject that certainly has come up is -- and it's both the CCT review team as well as from some of the commercial stakeholder group is the fact that they want ICANN to be collecting more data and to be requiring registries and registrars to give ICANN more data so that ICANN can make -- I don't know -- they're not being very specific as what types of data. So we all just need to be thinking about responding to that request, thinking about if we want to provide additional data, how we provide that data, and whether that data should be made available to anyone. That's something that not only the commercial stakeholder group is thinking about, but also ICANN in its open

date initiative. So we could find ICANN easily asking for amendments to our agreements requiring data to be given to them.

Paul McGrady: Okay, that's a very important issue and it's coming at the end so let me ask, do folks think that this actually rises use of data and ICANN's request for it, how it may or may not conflict with contractual requirements, what those uses are -- is that one of the key meta issues that we want to say is on our mind when the Board asks their first question? Is this something that is front and center for folks or not so much compared to things like the IRTs taking too long, is GDPR, et cetera.

Graeme Bunton: Paul, if I may, this is Graeme. I think it's an interesting and important issue but I don't think we have the time between now and the board meeting to frame that correctly to -- my knee jerk reaction is no you can't have anything and that's probably not an effective message. So if we -- my gut feel is we need more time to craft a pretty good response to that sort of request.

Paul McGrady: Okay, just wanted to make sure.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, yes. This is Jeff Neuman. I wasn't asking for it to be raised with the Board at this point. It's just something for us to think about, maybe even for the GDD Summit.

Paul McGrady: Okay, thanks for clarifying. All right then, we are a couple minutes left. Who do we have? Please?

Emily Taylor: Hi, it's Emily Taylor. I'm probably completely out of sync with the conversation, so apologies if I'm just coming in at the right level and on the wrong subject, but on the issue of trying to make data available, there are obviously complexities and for those of us still in the European Union, we

have lots of legal obligations and contractual obligations. However, I do think
that there is an interest in trying to find a way to make information and data
available for research, which is another area that I work in and it's a constant
frustration and a constant sort of query about there is all this data that seems to
be used around and yet, it isn't available for researchers. And that's important
to all of us because if there isn't evidence based policy, if there isn't an
evidence base for the research then we end up making policy decisions based
on anecdotes, and I would like us to get away from that and into something
that was a bit more considered and evidence based.

So yes, I know it's complex and we should not spring to the position, but I'd
like to appeal for us to try to keep the door open in some way and try and
work out a way, if at least just sharing meta data at some level, sharing --
that's a charged term. I mean high-level data, some summaries of what's
going on. So this may be crashing into a conversation with a completely
different subject. So apologies if it's not on topic, but I just wanted to make
that point.

Thank you, Emily. I wish I had my glasses on. That's why I didn't recognize
you. Point is well taken and well made, but to Graeme's point, we need a
more considered response and all of those inputs will certainly be part of it.
Jeff, you're going to get the last word.

Jeff Eckhaus: Thank you very much. Jeff Eckhaus here from Right Side, and sorry, I just
walked in late so I've missed a little bit of this. And one of the questions that I
had proposed to the registrar stakeholder group did not make it to the list, so I
will read this quickly. Hopefully, there's some general feeling that people like
this to mention this to the Board. A question I would like answered or at least
discussed, it has to do with communication, and I see there's something on
communication there. But ICANN keeps collecting money from registries,

registrars, and registrants in the form of per domain ICANN fees and fees collected directly from the contracted parties.

And my question to them was does the board feel they are doing a good job with funds entrusted to ICANN and by these parties? Do they feel they have done a good job communicating their goals and plan to the internet users and contracted parties whose money they are collecting.

So I mean to put that away, I think I'm moving for the Board more away from a policy issue but more towards a management issue because at the end of the day, they are -- a board does have a management function and not only really a policy function. So give us some more thoughts about their strategy, mission, budget, use of budget to these contracted parties. Because I, myself, I've bene involved in this for whatever it is, ten plus years and I still don't feel that I have a good idea from this Board to communicating to the contracted parties that we could communicate to our registrants of what these funds are for, what are the goals, what are they striving for versus their sort of -- I actually am kind of getting nothing out of that.

So that's something I'd like to present to the Board, more of a topic for discussion with them, maybe spark some discussion versus something that's more policy oriented. And thanks for the time.

Paul McGrady: Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Paul and thanks Jeff. I think part of what you've described goes to a question of the Board's priorities and the Board's sort of plans for the year ahead. And during the GNSO Council working session over the weekend, we actually had the benefit of some very detailed conversation and a presentation from Cherine who basically -- he went through a list of sort of three major

buckets, each with four or five sub-bullets in terms of what the Board is focused on this year. You may hear him talk about that in this session as well, but his basic approach or view is that there is no one overriding issue this year for the Board or the community like we had the transition, like we had new GTLDs in the last round that was sort of dominated everything.

So they've now identified a lot of stuff that needs to be caught up. And one of those things is making sure that ICANN is efficient and operational excellence and things like that. So I think maybe that's the way to approach it and sort of tease them out so everybody has the benefit of hearing Cherine's and the Board's views on what are your priorities and what are you doing with the money, something like that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, and I think it's great that this group hears it and then if they communicate it on Saturday to the GNSO and then to others. I feel that I look at the fees and the amount that are being collected every single year, and I look at the org charts, and the number of VPs, and I just see it just growing and growing. And I'm just trying to understand, like, what is all this leading towards? What are the goals and if it was the transition then that's fine. But I think if you guys look at social media, everything, you always read what is ICANN collecting all these dues for? What are they doing? Why are we paying them? I just think better communication to the group outside of here because they could have very interesting things to say that people want to hear. But I just think sort of dies in the vine once we leave these meetings three times a year.

Paul McGrady: Okay. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Just a very brief response. I hear what Jeff is saying. I think there's some important points there. Jeff, we met with the finance people and one of the

topics that came up there was talking to them about their ability to contribute to the reserve fund and in a sense, in our terms, to start to think about making a profit and rebuilding that reserve fund.

So that same theme was tackled there. I too, like Keith, I heard that work that Cherine has done and I do think the Board -- there's a sense that the Board is getting themselves better organized. I don't know how much he has driven that personally. So I think we should encourage them on the organization and perhaps pressure them on thinking about a surplus and operational efficiency, and say that's important to us because that's the framework in which we all live and we'd like to know that they share that same view.

So I think that we can get that message across.

Jeff Neuman: As I said, this is just something I would love to be brought up and it's not a specific question. I don't necessarily need to be out there on the mic. I trust the other people that are out there if they want to bring that forward or if they want to bring this in as part of a question. But just to get that discussion going, I think, versus some of the strict policy ones we've asked in the past where people have said -- I'm going to call everyone out a little bit, like this last one is what topics are the board most interested in engaging in the GDD summit. You know their response is going to be, well, this summit is for you. What do you want to talk about? Tell us.

So I mean, I want to -- some other questions that we haven't asked that I try and really dig in of what they're doing as a Board on the management side of the business. Because I think we've lost some of that view of that's part of their function is as a management group, not only as a policy making group as well. Thanks.

Paul McGrady: Joyce?

Joyce Lin: Well, maybe management managed their ICANN is probably not that appropriate. I think that the -- maybe just the description. I think that every Board, it's either profit or nonprofit has the three major task that they face. One is the insight and then the foresight and the oversight. I think the insight being that understanding the operation of the organization. Foresight is more of the future risk in leading the organization forward and the last one is the oversight. I think oversight is very important because there are so many boards being sued by the stockholders for not doing their job in the oversight.

And what I always come back to yesterday's presentation of DNS abuses. With all these so many new GTLDs that are coming on and it seems to me that the general public has suffered a lot just because of all the malware, the phishing, the illegal pharmaceutical products and everything. So I was wondering if we can ask a Board how much oversight for -- in terms of evaluating and about this new product, new GTLDs, have they done any evaluation and come up with the metrics is how much the general public has benefit and how much damage there has been done to the whole general public. And I think that's part of the oversight job that the Board has.

Paul McGrady: Okay. We're going to have to end this now. Fortunately, we're just walking next door so it's not a long walk but bio breaks or whatnot. We're scheduled to start in ten minutes at a quarter after. Please try and be in the room. I know the Board is notorious for not starting on time, but it shouldn't be our fault. Thank you everybody for your time today. Look forward to seeing you next door and throughout.

Sue Schuler: We can stop the recording now.

END