ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO - RySG Membership Meeting
Tuesday, 23 October 2018 at 12:30 CEST

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

Paul Diaz:	Okay folks, do we have recording going already? Thank you, Sue. Okay, we've got to get started because we do still have a – not still, we have a very full afternoon agenda. Want to make sure we get through the issues, give them appropriate time. So just jump right to that, I'm sorry, for the record it's Paul Diaz, Chair of the stakeholder group.

So let's begin with item Number 2 up there, the spec 11-3(b) audit, and Sheri, you wanted to raise some points?

Sheri Falcon:	Yes, Sheri Falcon, Minds+Machines. I guess I just wanted to mention it because we're all going to be audited pretty much Monday when we get back home and we're going to have 15 business days I think to respond. And the thing I wanted to mention is it's a very narrow focus on the audit, I just checked in Maguy and she confirmed that it's just going to be a few questions. I think ICANN is actually going to give a webinar, so that'll be helpful.

But I just wanted to see if there was a sensibility around it or anybody want to discuss anything around and particularly wanted to note the hard work that went into the framework that was a voluntary framework that a lot of the community created together. But it wasn't mean to be a baseline standard for measurement of the spec 11 3(b) matters, so I kind of wanted to caution us as we're going through this audit process to perhaps not to start to think of

the framework as a baseline because that would sort of be counterintuitive to the process.

So that was really a small point but I'm happy to have any thoughts about any of it or thought about any of it just wanted to raise it to see if anybody had anything to say.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Sheri. Questions. I should note the ExComms – joint ExComms met with ICANN senior staff on Saturday evening and we asked Jamie Hedlund to be there, the Registrars had more explicit issues to raise or concerns. But on this audit, this forthcoming audit, it is a unique one in that they're auditing every single registry at the same time. What you've already noted, Sheri, he told us that it will be very lightweight. The communications initially probably were not the best. What went out previously was sort of a pre-announcement. He said that the formal announcement will come out on the 30th when we're back next week.

And the timeframe that we have to respond if you have – if you've been told 15 days he was – he couldn't remember, I didn't – the very short turnaround time and that's 15 business days, so it's three weeks, it takes us to the middle of November. He said that he would entertain extensions if there was a need from the community so that's something. As we get underway we will have biweekly calls in between or use the list. If you find your registry is kind of struggling to respond whatever the questions ultimately are, you know, we can ask for more time.

Importantly we asked who's driving this? Why this particular issue and what not? And it's basically coming out of the David Conrad's group so the ongoing effort to collect more data around quote unquote abuse and they want some data. Again, I don't know what the questions are and how insidious that may be or not, we'll have to wait to see. This afternoon I don't believe Jamie will join us, there might be somebody from Compliance the joint Cyrus team, feel

free to ask follow up questions then or we can do something more formal once we see the announcement that will come out next week. Okay?

Crystal.

Crystal Ondo: I just had a follow up question. So unless I just am totally misremembering our Registry Agreement, there's no obligation to hold data for a certain period so I'm trying to figure out if they're going to ask us for our abuse numbers going back to inception, whether it makes sense for the registries to push back because when I talked to Maguy yesterday she said that they were going to do that.

And they haven't – they have historically asked for that in audits, give us all of your reported abuse, what you did with it, what types they were going back now five years. So I would love if we took a position that was like you get it for the last year or last two years and we stuck to that as registries together as opposed to each of us fighting that fight on our own.

Sheri Falcon: Yes, Sheri here. I'm looking at the language of spec 11 and it says registry operator will maintain these reports for the term of the agreement unless a shorter period is required by law or approved by ICANN and will provide them to ICANN upon request. But that is actually the reason I wanted to raise this issue is instead of each one of us sort of fighting whatever battles we might think to fight individually, since we'll all be affected by this at the exact same time and I'd like for it to be a conversation that we're collectively engaged in.

Crystal Ondo: I totally agree. And just because we have to maintain the reports doesn't mean we have to give it to them.

Sheri Falcon: I'll follow your lead on that, Crystal.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. Kristine, Amazon Registry. I echo all of that and also the – as we're going through and responding to our reports and when we see what the actual request is, I think we should also be mindful much like Crystal says that we're aligning on if they're asking for more information than is within the scope of the contract. So we have to monitor for phishing, pharming, malware and botnets. If they come and want us to provide data for other sorts of issues or problems or things that they have deemed to be abuse under their magical system, I think it would be also useful to have a united front on how we're going to respond to those types of complaints as well. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Kristine. And everybody, please remember, name and affiliation for the transcript. Okay, then let's absolutely continue to communicate once we see exactly what comes out on Tuesday. Right, is that the right date? Tuesday, Wednesday next week. Remember also that we will have a biweekly call I think we might have originally scheduled it for the 31st but it will be the 7th of November, all right, we're not going to do it four days after we leave here.

                  But if we only have 15 business days to respond we're into it so don't wait; if you see things you don't like, start a thread on the list and certainly we can figure out how to collectively pool our resources.

Crystal Ondo: And Crystal Ondo, Donuts. One option might be to ask to have a conversation with Jan before we submit our responses, otherwise we get in a position where ICANN issues deficiencies and then you're forced to go back and forth and argue; if we got together with him ahead of time, said hey, this is how we see this audit it would avoid that deficiencies notice.

Paul Diaz: Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. Also I suggest you mark your information, you supply to ICANN as confidential. It will lessen your pain. You can mark it like not to be released without a prior written agreement to any third party. That's it, it will do.

Crystal Ondo: Can I jump in? Crystal Ondo again. The problem is that they're going to use it against what they're seeing in DAR which is internal to ICANN so we can't force Compliance to keep it within the Compliance framework is my understanding. So they're going to look what they're seeing in DAR against what we report and that I think is going to be the concern that we're coming out with it.

Maxim Alzoba: Short answer. DAR doesn't have any kind of evidence in it. And existing of some magic tool is not written in our contracts. We asked for – to have access to DAR a few times. One of the guys behind it decided to quit, maybe because he wanted to avoid such kind of unpleasant favor. So a reference to DAR doesn't work; it's not in our contract so bye-bye.

Crystal Ondo: Sorry, last time, Crystal Ondo. Except they're publishing DAR results and the community sees it, so we can't just say goodbye and ignore it, that's something that everyone will see.

Paul Diaz: Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks. Kristine, Amazon Registry. And the other thing is is that I think what they're trying to do here is baseline DAR. One of the things that we've been trying to say is there's no sort of like guarantee that DAR is accurate, we don't know what – how it compares, we don't know what we're being compared to, we don't know what we're being benchmarked against. One way to benchmark DAR is to have all of us collectively and at the same time submit our abuse information. They will then pull their system and compare the two on the backside.

The next technical report that they issue will say we've done a comparison. They're not going to publish maybe your results or my results, I don't know. But they will do that comparison and they will use our data to legitimize the use of their tool and say see, the results are the roughly the same or we've made fixes or whatever. So I think it's more about legitimizing the millions of dollars and man hours they've spent on this than it is about using any specific registry's data against them in the specific audit right now.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Excellent points and again let's make sure that we keep in touch with one another because this one does feel like it's drifting sideways. Okay in the interest – still need time or you're good? Okay then we'll stick to the schedule. Do the EPDP update and I guess Kristina, you lead?

Kristine Dorrain: Sue, can you pull up – have they come through, Purpose A and Purpose B? If you – no? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Kristine Dorrain: Oh yes, yes, yes, sorry.

Paul Diaz: Sorry, the version I have is obviously out of date. Then while you get that ready, please, let's do CSC update.

Elaine Pruis: So, hello, everybody. I'll Elaine Pruis. I'm your member of the Customer Standing Committee. I'm going to give you our annual review, talk to you about who we are, what we do and what's coming up. So you have two members appointed, myself and Guarav is our new member. He's replacing Kal. We have two ccTLD members, the new one is Brett Carr, he's replacing Jay and several liaisons, most of the liaisons are from the last two years, we have a couple of new ones.

Next slide. So what we do, our core responsibility is to monitor and report on PTI compliance against the service level metrics that we created way back

during the CWG design teams. Next slide. So since October the overall performance have been 95%-100% and most of the metric misses are from SLAs where we're suggesting they be updated. That's because when we first created SLAs we maybe didn't have enough data to create a reasonable SLA.

So we monitor that and then we also provide a qualitative score, excellent, satisfactory or needs improvement. And our overall assessment for the year is that the PTI function has been excellent. Next slide.

This is where I'd like your input. So our charter demands that we provide to you on an annual basis a report and have a consultation with the community, the functions operator and ask you if you have any feedback or input or any concerns about the PTI performance, so now is your chance and then after this and whenever you want to talk to me. Does anybody have any concerns or questions about the PTI performance?

Great, okay, next slide.

Paul Diaz: Elaine, let me just ask you I was going to wait until the end but – because I thought it dovetailed maybe I'd ask it here, ICANN has scheduled a IANA function review and it feels like a tremendous overlap in the work that you all have been doing. Not very clear. And we have a bit of a challenge, the two candidates that we put forward, they came back to us and said oh well you can't be from the same geographic region so now we're scrambling. We may have found a solution but one of the questions is, how much time will be spent as PTI and if you have any sense from the work you've done on CSC that might help people who are considering applying.

Elaine Pruis: Yes, so Donna – is Donna in the room still?

Paul Diaz: She had to step out.

Elaine Pruis: Oh darn. She can answer that question much better than I can. So part of the transition required IANA functions review as well as a CSC effectiveness review. We're currently in the CSC effectiveness review and most of that is the information is based on the charter review that just took place.

So I've been deeply involved in that both the charter review and the effectiveness review. But the IANA functions review is much more complex, much – many more members, requiring diversification so our work itself is just to look at PTI's monthly function and I think the function review is meant to take a look at overall how is this change washing out and you know, is IANA overall functioning in the way it's supposed to?

You know, unfortunately when the transition happened these things were created not knowing what it would look like when we were done. And it may be excessive and it may be overlap and hopefully that can be sorted out through that process and maybe minimized going forward. But Donna's really your best source for that.

Paul Diaz: Okay. That helps. Thank you.

Elaine Pruis: Okay, so next slide. Just want to remind everybody that we're monitoring PTI's performance as the Customer Standing Committee and it's outside of our remit to actually take individual complaints from operators and action them. If you want to tell us about something that's happening we'll redirect you to the PTI compliant process.

However, we do keep an eye on those individual complaints that come in to make sure that there's no systematic performance problems. So, you know, if we keep hearing again and again from individual operators that PTI is falling down in this specific area then we will take some action because there's some indication that it's a big problem and not just a problem for a single operator.

So during 2017 PTI received two escalations which is essentially registry operator requested some action and PTI couldn't fulfill it in the way that they wanted resolved. And so those complaints were escalated within the PTI's complaint process. And generally they weren't failure on the PTI's part, it was that the customer wanted PTI to do something that's just – they can't do, it's outside of their purview.

Okay, next slide. So in the last year we did create remedial action procedure so that was something that was in our charter that we should create these procedures for when we do have escalations. And if the CSC notices there is a problem how do we bring that to PTI's attention and if PTI doesn't action it in a way that they're supposed to how do we elevate that problem.

So we did create these remedial action procedures. There's a three level escalation; first to the PTI Board, then the ICANN CEO, and then the ICANN Board. And these remedial action procedures are published on the CSC website. Next slide.

So not only do we provide oversight, we also consult and inform with the community. There is a PTI dashboard so you can go to their website and look at these metrics, see how they're performing. We also publish monthly reports. We give presentations to the community about their work and we have a meeting once a month usually on the 15th to look at their performance from the previous months, discuss if it's satisfactory, address any issues and then publish that for the community.

PTI also completes on their own behalf a survey, so as a registry operator if you've used PTI services you should have received a request to participate in the survey. This is where I'd like everybody to listen just for a second. If you get this request please complete the survey. They've had a very low participation like 7% and that's really bad. It's hard to know if you're doing a good job if only 7% are responding to the survey. So when you do get this,

next year, please respond to the survey and just let them know how they're doing.

So next slide. You may have noticed that in one of the first slides we talked about their performance being in the 95%-100% range. So the areas where they have failed have been consistently in the technical check retest, technical check supplement and ccTLD creation and transfer. So the first two are actually because of the way their system is built, they can't take requests in parallel; they stack up and when they stack up like if Donuts sends in 230 – 241 technical contact update requests, they may not be able to fulfill those within the, you know, 5 second SLA that they have so they will fail in that regard.

You can break them. So it's actually – it's not a failure on their part to perform, it's a failure of their processing system which they are addressing but we also see that we could be a bit more generous in the actual SLA because it doesn't – it doesn't really have an impact on anybody's work.

The third one, ccTLD creation and transfer, if you have any experience in the ccTLD realm you know that when a ccTLD is changing hands it can be quite contentious and there may not be cooperation so a 60-day SLA for completing that process is quite unreasonable in some circumstances; in others where there's a ccTLD transfer and it's friendly then that can be done in, you know, a week or two weeks.

So we didn't have enough data on ccTLD transfers when we first created the 60-day SLA and now we have a bit more so we feel like we should be able to update that SLA.

Unfortunately, changing these SLAs isn't just a matter of updating a document; it requires amending the IANA functions contract, which is complicated and requires legal. So we're going through that process. ICANN Legal has pinpointed exactly where the language needs to be changed. We

will keep the actual numbers of the SLAs out of the IFR contract and publish them on our website so they're a little bit easier to change going forward, but this first initial change of the SLAs is complicated and is taking a long time. Good news is, it's been a collaborative effort.

So the next slide indicates that we have to develop and implement the change mechanism so how do we actually make those amendments, and then go ahead and make those changes once they're agreed upon. Next slide.

So as I said, we need to amend the contract, the SLAs are going to be on the website, not within the contract, and we're going to figure out the mechanism and just to reassure everyone, by moving the SLAs out of the contract it doesn't dilute their legal validity. Next slide.

SLA changes, next steps, so these are the final things we need to do to get these SLA changes in place. We have to finalize wording, we have to figure out our process. We're going to have a mock up of the website changes that will help us understand what those changes are, bring this information to you, consult with you and then when it's ready for approval we'll bring it to you and ask for you to review it and approve and hopefully we'll have this done in Kobe next year.

Next slide. So as I mentioned before about the charter review, there was a team that took a look at our actual charter which tells us how we are to do our work and what our scope is limited to. There was a very involved review, took us several months and there were some updates to the charter to just sort of more align it with the way the world actually works instead of what we thought would happen.

You guys have seen that you've approved that change and the next review that's coming is the effectiveness review, that's actually in play right now, Deb

Monahan from the ccNSO and Donna Austin and some liaisons are working on that.

Luckily they're able to use a lot of the work of the charter review to inform their effectiveness review. And I'm very happy to report that we have been very effective, we've been successful in our work. We have a great working relationship with PTI. And I think as said before, it's the best group I've ever worked in – within ICANN because we have a single purpose which is to make sure that PTI does their job well and everybody's on board with that.

And as Paul mentioned, there's an IANA function review coming up. It was kicked off the beginning of October. And we have James Gannon is our liaison to that function review. Next slide.

So in summary, the PTI performance is really good. They've missed some minor metrics but we're not concerned about those, they're not actually failing to do their work well; it's a matter of the SLAs needing to be adjusted. We're almost done developing our procedures so just the SLA piece is the last thing. And overall we all agree that this process is working very well. It's fantastic to have a working group that is fulfilling its function so well.

Any questions?

Paul Diaz: I do have one. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. Thanks, Elaine. It's a good update and I was also involved at the very beginning in helping initially with the SLAs and I think we should be accommodating as Elaine said; it was kind of a little bit of guessing at first because it was something that was very new. But in the same token I want us to just remember how accommodating we're being to them on these SLAs and just take that and try to let them know that when they're talking to us about SLAs for RDAP because we're being very flexible and accommodating and we should be and it's reasonable.

It would be nice to get in return for our SLAs for things – for RDAP to get that same level of accommodation and reasonableness because things should be working kind of a two-way street. Thanks.

Elaine Pruis: Yes, that's a really good point and my advice there would be when you're talking to them about the SLAs for RDAP build in a review like a three month review or six month review where you can see where there is significant gap or failure and so those SLAs can be adjusted and absolutely point to PTI SLAs as a model for being reasonable when it comes to that thing.

Paul Diaz: Okay any other questions? Thank you, Elaine. Excellent brief and thank you for your continued leadership on this. And you've got another year, right? That's what…

Elaine Pruis: Yes, thank you. So when we first started we had two members as three-year appointees and two as two-year appointees so there could be some overlap with the incoming members, so I've got one more year and I was just elected as vice chair and Guarav is just starting his two-year term. Thanks. Thanks for your time everybody.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you again. All right then I want to make sure I have 12 minutes, so maybe we move EPDP to after the break? Can we squeeze in update on the RSEP? Okay. Brian, you'll do it? Thank you.

Brian Cimbolic: Thanks, Paul. Brian Cimbolic with PIR. First forgive my voice. If you need me to repeat anything let me know. So there's – I'm here to talk about the update to the RSEP implementation. Staff has come up with a proposed pilot program to fix some of the challenges and uncertainties that we've been dealing with in RSEP in the current implementation of RSEP.

What this pilot program does, it really takes away two of the biggest problems with the current implementation of RSEP. And, yes, Sue, if you could scroll

down to the one that that's the language with the ripcord at the top of the screen, I think it's Page 3, there we go. So the pilot program implementation really cures two of the biggest problems with today's RSEP and that is the overabundance and ease of public comment and Board involvement.

So currently if any proposed service, quote, could affect third party interests, or is in any way a new service, then staff can put it to public comment. And that is not consistent with the policy and similarly they can just ask Board for input or advice. The pilot program would get rid of that and bring public comment much more closely in line with the language of the actual policy where the only time public comment is actually supposed to happen is in the event there is a stability or security concern.

So there's some additional positives. The staff has been pretty contentious in adding a fast track for known services so things like DTAP, registry lock and protected marks. If you used a preapproved template amendment you can kind of just go right through the security, stability or competition review. There are a couple negatives that I want to point to but the important thing to keep in mind is that these negatives aren't unique to the proposed implementation; they exist currently. The new implementation just doesn't fix them.

The biggest one is that the RSEP, as you guys might know, says that after 15 days of the security, stability, competition review after 15 days the registry operator shall be free to deploy. Staff has made it clear that that's just not something – they cannot implement this policy as written. So that's something that we are stuck with admittedly under both implementations.

The other thing that's stayed that currently exists is that there is a public comment if any – if a proposed service has been referred for a competition issue. That also remains. The last thing I want to point out is that the documentation of the proposed service, so the amendment or whatever free to deploy letter gets done ahead of time, that happens in the completeness check stage of this – of the new proposed process.

Now that could be problematic, we don't want, you know, the negotiation of the underlying instrument to hold up the rest of the process so we've built in this notion of a ripcord where at any time during the completeness check if a contracted party feels that the negotiations have stalled, they can unilaterally elect to push the proposed service to the security, stability and competition review. The only check on that is that it has to be done in good faith. So a registry operator can't just submit and then immediately pull to the security, stability or competition review; there needs to be at least some sort of back and forth.

We are now at a point – this has been going on for two years, the discussion group to try and streamline and improve the implementation for RSEP. It's been going on for about two years and staff has signaled that we are at a binary yes or no on this, that it's not worth their or our time to continue to negotiate on this, that we need to signal whether or not we support moving forward with one year pilot program or if we declare an impasse and staff goes to the GNSO to potentially trigger a review of the RSEP consensus policy.

So the discussion group met this weekend and we've – we support moving forward with this but obviously it's something that the Registry Stakeholder Group would need to sign off on. Now, again obviously this implementation, the proposed pilot program isn't perfect but it's better; it is objectively better than what we currently have, you know, I'd say honestly we went from around a D to a B- on this, so it's not perfect but I think we should take progress where we can get it. So I look to Crystal who's been participating in this quite a bit too if she has anything to add or if anyone has any questions.

Crystal Ondo: Thanks, Brian. That was a great summary. It's Crystal Ondo, Donuts. I think it's been going on a long time, we've been dealing with staff a very long time on this and they've come a long way from their original stance. I think that it would be – it would hurt the RySG for us to come back and say this isn't good

enough at this point. They've taken a lot of steps, their fast tracks will be publishing in the next few months so the registries can see them and know them.

One of the problems they have and the reason the (SDOC) is put up front is that registries don't often answer all the questions they're required to in their RSEP submission so you are asked to provide the contract language you want in your authorization document and people aren't doing that. So that's one of the requirements now in the completeness check that you actually have to give us the language that you want for the registry to – for the – for ICANN to start considering it at the beginning. I think it's definitely the right way to go so thank you, Brian.

Brian Cimbolic: I just want to echo something that Crystal added. This is Brian Cimbolic again. That I think we – super kudos to Karla and Russ from staff. Like I said we didn't end up in a perfect place but the place where we ended up, which is pretty good in my opinion, was really – they went to bat for us on many of the pluses that we got in this proposed implementation, so however this ends up, we should just keep that in mind that this was a real, real positive example of staff engagement to try and get to a win-win for us.

Samantha Demetriou: Just to add onto to what Brian was saying, sorry, this is Sam for the record. To add onto what Brian was saying, staff has also expressed that they're very much willing to continue to work with us on this so as part of the fast track Crystal said they're going to be updating the questionnaires, they're going to be working with the discussion group to review those questionnaires so we'll have the chance to have input on those.

And then just a reminder that when we talk about rolling this out, it is a pilot and staff is committed to having regular check-ins with discussion group to, you know, continue to iterate whether they can be additional improvements or if something isn't working that we can go back and take a look at that.

Crystal Ondo: Thanks, Sam. Crystal Ondo. I remembered what I was going to say. Just historically ICANN has changed the implementation of this policy four times since it's been a policy. So they've done it unilaterally in the past and just published it on their website. This time they took two years to discuss it with us and come to a place where hopefully the registries and ICANN are happy and signed off. I have heard that ICANN senior staff has signed off on this so it shouldn't be a hard push to get it implemented and rolled out.

We have Karla and Russ coming later today to talk about it and she has the timeline to propose to us as well. But I want to recognize that ICANN has changed the way that they look at this instead of unilaterally making changes they have come to us and that should be something we are appreciative about.

Paul Diaz: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. Just a question and thank you for all the work you guys have done. I know it definitely has come a long way and pretty far. So when you – when they say they're going to roll it out as a pilot program, are they – what I hope they don't do I guess is just update the website to now have all this new stuff on there and then all of the consensus policies that we have and just point to that quote, pilot, because then that indirectly becomes the policy, right? So how are they logistically going to – have you talked about how they're logistically going to implement that? In the new TLD agreements, right, it just points to a link and that link points to what they call the policy; it's not really the policy but, yes thanks.

Crystal Ondo: Crystal Ondo. So currently if you go to the RSEP page it is the policy; the policy is not changing. One of the links on the policy page however is a infographic much like this and it's been that way for years now since before we stared signing our Registry Agreements that ICANN consistently updates like every few years they change the way, they try to find efficiencies, so this

isn't a deviation from how that's been and it's not a change to the policy so much as a change to the way they explain how they implement it internally.

Brian Cimbolic: And, Jeff, the link won't point to this; the link will continue to point to the actual, you know, consensus policy.

Crystal Ondo: And sorry, one more thing, they plan on publishing a blog about this to update the community about the changes but there are no other outreaches planned.

Samantha Demetriou:This is Sam. That will create a record that this is a pilot program, right, there'll be a public reference to it being a pilot as opposed to a replacement.

Crystal Ondo: Sorry, Crystal Ondo. So I guess the ask is to everyone else in the room who has not been involved if you have concerns or questions please send them around to any of us, Brian, Sam or myself and we can talk about it, but I'm not sure what the next step is. This isn't something we need to vote on, I don't think. I mean, ICANN could do this themselves if they wanted to so if we wanted to start an email to the list that asks for questions or concerns for people who aren't here and then go from there.

Paul Diaz: Yes, thanks Crystal. It's Paul. I think that's the latter part is the way to go. Honestly I have no appetite for a vote on this; it's too time consuming and bureaucratic so maybe with the documentation that you reference that Karla will be sharing, we post that to the list, you know, leave it out there, let people digest again, the reason we have these working groups is that, you know, trust in your colleagues. The folks who have been actively participating in this have been doing so, putting in a lot of time for two years. They've thought it through as noted, may not be perfect but it is a significant improvement.

I'm supportive as well and I hope you would all agree. We can set a timeline with that and then, you know, get back to staff because I know like you said, they would like to not just via a blog, we could agree to that sometime in – maybe mid-November. All right. Well that's perfect timing, folks. We have to

take another one of these mandatory breaks, which is probably great, everybody grab coffee or a bio-break, what have you. Need you back in here, 10 or 15 – 15 minutes, so a quarter of. Please come back in, we still have a bunch of substantive issues before staff joins full afternoon today. Thanks, all.

Sue Schuler: We can end the recording.

Paul Diaz: Okay, folks, let's get underway. We've only about 15 minutes before GDD staff joins. Our EPDP update team, Kristina in particular has graciously agreed to bump this item down to the first part of our session after staff because it's far too substantial and an issue to try and squeeze in in just 15 minutes, so with that let's go back to what we had Item Number 6, the RPM update. Phil, if you're good to give us an update on where we stand with that?

Phil Corwin: Yes, Paul. Happy to do so. Phil Corwin for the record. The RPM Review Working Group held four meetings here at ICANN 64, two yesterday, two the day before. The working group has completed its review of all sub team and individual proposals for operational and policy modifications of Uniform Rapid Suspension. Staff has going to begin work on drafting that section of our initial report.

During – so two of our meetings, discussed that and the process for proceeding to initial report generally. The other two sessions consisted of the initial presentation by a member of the Analysis Group of the survey they conducted on rights protection mechanisms, they surveyed both actual and potential registrants of new TLDs, contracted parties and trademark owners. They presented highlights of their findings. We haven't really done the deep dive into all that data yet; we're going to start that at our first working group meeting of November 7.

And then we're going to look at – we did have sub teams on the Trademark Clearinghouse and the two related RPMs that earlier this year and which kind of consolidated and rationalized charter questions on those. It was some lack

of recollection yesterday whether those sub teams had proceeded to actually formulate recommendations but even if they had those recommendations would – if they exist will have to be reconsidered in the context of the Analysis Group survey results.

But we have a very fast track timeline for developing and considering proposals on TMCH, sunrise and claims notice with the aim of wrapping that up late this year, early next year and then proceeding to drafting the initial report which is still scheduled to be issued toward right around the time of ICANN 64 in Kobe Japan. So that's where we are, we've had good discussions here and I'm happy to take any questions.

Paul Diaz: Great. Thank you, Phil. Excellent update. Anybody have questions? Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Phil, for the update. Donna Austin. I just want to – this is a pretty pointed question, so I don't want you to take offense at it, but I've heard in the last few days that it's very – from three different sources now – that it's very unlikely that any recommendations coming out of this PDP are going to end up with consensus. And that concerns me.

And given the situation we're in now with the discussion around the curative rights PDP, and where you know, discussing whether to terminate it after we've received the final report, I'd really like some insight into where you are with the recommendations, whether or not you think consensus is possible or not, and if it's not, what's the rationale for continuing with the PDP? Because my concern is that another 12 months goes on for no result. So I'm just really interested to understand from your perspective where you think things are and what's the value in continuing.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you, Donna. I take no offense at that. I don't know who said that and I don't want to know the names. Here's my perspective, number one, I would differentiate between the sub team recommendations, which were the result of intensive review and development of data relating to the RPMs and

collaborative work by members of the working group who come from different perspectives. I believe there's a significant probability that a significant percentage of those sub team recommendations, we'll have to see what the community says will be able to gain consensus support.

I've been frank with the working group, many of the individual recommendations from individual working group members that are going out for public comment and we set a rather low bar for being included in the report and soliciting comments so we wouldn't spend weeks and weeks arguing whether a particular proposal had met a subjective standard that's very hard to measure.

I think most of those in their current form will not achieve consensus, again differentiating from the sub team recommendations. But I posed the question to staff yesterday whether in addition to asking for public comment for or against proposals we could ask the public specifically to suggest modifications to proposals compromises identifying proposals that related to each other that could be put together in a way to gather more consensus. I was told that this could be done; there was very strong support within the working group for doing that.

So I think members of the working group are aware that many of these individual proposals as initially formulated are not likely to gain consensus support and we'll readily see that when we get to the public comment. But we're going to be asking both working group members and the community to suggest modifications that would make them more amenable to getting consensus support.

So we recognize the challenges; we have a very diverse group and, you know, the co-chairs can only encourage the working group members to be reasonable and seek common ground and compromise; we can't put a gun to their head and force them to do so. But we are trying to steer things in that direction.

I think overall we had productive and constructive discussions here in Barcelona, so this is not a working group that's having constant battles within itself and there are sharp differences of opinion on policy issues but the actual process with some exceptions is working pretty smoothly and we found – let me say – I don't want to go on too long but one that the use of sub teams bringing together members with different perspectives and forcing them to look at data and develop proposals based on the data was very productive and eased the way for those recommendations through the working group and – what's the other thing I wish to say here? I just lost my train of thought.

Sorry, but I'll stop there, but I'm encouraged that we can produce an initial report that gets meaningful public comment and will lead on some of these proposals to compromise and I don't want to say horse trading but recognition that some issues are tied to other issues and if members are willing to compromise and be reasonable that we can get to some things that do gain consensus.

Oh I know what I wanted to say, to reduce – to expedite the consideration of the individual proposals we set forward, we being the co-chairs, a process that was a standard process where every individual proposal had to be stated and the particular format had to cite the data that it was based upon, had to cite a rationale. We had word limits. We gave each member for each proposal a five-minute presentation time, two minutes each for up to 20 minutes for other members to comment and then a four-minute time for the presenter to respond. So we've been using procedural tools as well to move things along and to improve the overall quality of the proposals.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Phil.

Paul Diaz: All right, again thank you, Phil. Not seeing any other questions. Jeff, we have a little bit of time if we run over it's okay, but can you give an update on SubPro, where you guys are, where you stand?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I'll try to be brief. So as everyone knows we had an initial report. Comments were taken on that. The comment period ended September 26. Thank you to Sam for leading the group. And everyone that contributed, really, it was a lot of effort. There were 70 comments in total that were submitted. And a lot of them like the – I think the Registry ones probably the most comprehensive but there were a lot of other comments that went into a lot of detail and are very good.

There's going to be a supplemental initial report that comes out next week. That supplemental initial report will be on five particular issues. The most controversial of which are dealing with the ICANN auctions essentially and private resolution of contention sets. So I'm sure that group is going to have to kick off again, sorry, Sam, so probably have to kick that group off again. She's saying it's not here this time.

Samantha Demetriou: No, I'm saying I'm not sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Oh.

Samantha Demetriou: I'm excited to get to work. I hope you guys all are.

Jeff Neuman: Awesome. I love that. That enthusiasm. So comments will be due in – I think it was somewhere around December 10. And then we'll get working on subgroups on analyzing the comments from the initial report and then a final report. What I do want to say is, you know, there were people that went up to the mic yesterday and the public forum wanting new gTLDs to get underway right away.

I'm not going to talk about those proposals but what I will say is that for those that went up to the mic and for others I would say that your voice is not being heard on the calls and on the list so I shouldn't – I'm not meaning to say that your opinions aren't, you know, we're not reading them, we're not understanding them, I'm just saying that we probably need you to voice those kinds of things on the calls and on the email lists as well and empathize those because the loudest voices are usually the ones that either want to delay or just want to talk about issues on and on and on forever. So to the extent that you want things to be resolved more quickly please participate, that's the best way to do it.

And the last thing is that the Subsequent Procedures co-chairs, myself and Cheryl Langdon-Orr, had a discussion with the Council yesterday on the possibility of trying to, once we deliver the final report to the Council, and let's just assume for now that the Council approves it and sends it to the Board, is to start implementation activities as soon as the report is delivered to the Board as opposed to waiting for the Board three to six months or longer for it to do its comment period and everything else.

So that maybe one way of gaining some efficiencies and time. If you support that kind of thing, also please make sure the councilors know that and that this is something that's – if you think it's a good idea because if we don't do things like this we do a report, we have implementation take – or the Board approve it, takes what it takes, you know, we could be looking at several years or several additional years as opposed to 2020, 2021.

I know that still sounds far away but you got to keep the ball rolling if that's what you want. And the reason I'm emphasizing this so much is because again, people go up to the mic and they say they yell at the Board basically for going to go quicker and the Board just turns it right back and says, well we're waiting for the policy and I'm turning it right back to you all to say help me help you. Wow, Jerry McGuire. So there you go. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Jeff. Great summary and very quick, thank you for doing so so succinctly. Any immediate questions? Obviously we know you say the supplemental initial report is coming. Thank you for the heads up. And Wim's probably made note of that, Sam's ready to assist. We'll get on that.

All right, well with that we're at the top of the hour and GDD staff and others have joined us so welcome to everyone. Are we going to wait, Russ, for Cyrus or just get into it?

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: Okay. With that if we have our list of items and if Russ, if you're going to lead if you want to take them in whatever order is best, go ahead.

Russ Weinstein: Sure. Thank you, everyone. This is Russ Weinstein, good to see everyone here. Thanks of having us today. Cyrus may not be able to join us; I know it is on his calendar but he's playing three calendars right now so it's a little taxing so he'll do his best to join us.

These are the items we wanted to talk about today. The order isn't that particular, some of our – my colleagues will help me with some of the topics but if there's anything else we need to add to the agenda, and remind me, how much time do we have for this discussion, about an hour?

((Crosstalk))

Russ Weinstein: Okay. So we can go onto the next one. First one, just a reminder I'm sure you all are aware but GDD Summit is going to be in May in Bangkok, we've got a beautiful venue there for the event and we've made sure – heard your feedback that to make it more than just a summit, consolidate the number of events that we do to get even more value out of the travel with these things so we've managed to do that with the number of events before and after the summit.

And what's really important is that we make the summit what is most helpful to you all, you know, this is an event that was created in response to demand from the Contracted Party House and so it's really important. And last year was a really good example I thought of how we work together to develop a really fulsome agenda that met the needs of the stakeholder group and of the registries and registrars so without your participation in planning the event it's kind of a what you put in is what you get out of it, so I know we already have a planning committee established, if you haven't joined it already and are interested please do, Paul, Donna, I'm not sure if there's anything else you want to add on that topic?

Paul Diaz: Sure, I'll jump in, Russ. It's Paul for the transcript. Sunday evening I mentioned earlier, the joint ExComms got together with staff and the summit came up in a general sense. You know, we've – this will be the fifth summit now that we've done. We had made a previous commitment to rotate the regions. So for all the North America ones or Europe we are now going to Asia Pacific. And it was agreed at the – after this summit to do a little more fulsome review about the summit. It's just as an issue, a theme, is it really working? Are we getting what we want out of it?

You know, there's some frustrations have been expressed on our list recently about the location, the effort to get there. That's certainly a valid concern but it's kind of secondary to the general sense, are we really getting what we want out of this? Colleague made – I'm forgetting who it was, maybe Andrew – made a comment on the list about, you know, a cultural of travel, meeting for meeting sake. And perhaps the summit is at risk of falling into that trap.

So one thing that we did discuss and generally agreed to is that we will have a more meaningful review afterwards, not just the high level, you know, did you like, but or whatever sort of survey staff has traditionally done after these meetings, but drilling down a little further about, you know, do we continue doing this? I mean, honestly, the – all options will be on the table to include

canceling summits hereafter in the most extreme, not saying we're going there but I think it's high time that we have this sort of serious effort to look at what we're doing, are we doing the best we can with the resources that we have.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Paul. Donna Austin. Just a little bit of flavor about some of the possible options we could think about is – and it's too early to talk about this, we should just talk about Bangkok but some of the discussion was other events like NamesCon that we could potentially tack a day or two onto for, you know, something similar to this or are there other industry events in other locations that we could potentially tag something onto. So that's the kind of early thinking that we've had on this. Thanks.

Russ Weinstein: Great, yes. I'm glad to hear the questioning and the thought being put behind this because it's a big endeavor to put one of these summits on and like I said, this is for the benefit of our relationship and we're flexible, you know, we want to do what's right for – to help foster the relationship with the contracted parties and to help the work go smoother and better so please consider all options available.

Paul Diaz: One more follow up, Russ, just a reminder to everybody, we did circulate on the list a very basic survey trying to gauge, get a sense of likely attendance so it just asks really basic demographic data about you, where you're from, who you're with, and then, you know, one of four questions on a range, definitely attend, likely to attend, probably won't and definitely won't. And honestly if you know you're not going, please respond to the survey. It's going to help the planning committee, it's going to help inform the discussions afterwards.

                 We've had exceptional attendance the last two years, we're not really sure we're going to see those same levels so understanding before we show up and the room's half empty, please do your part, respond to that survey, it'll only take a minute. Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, Russ, we've had significant discussions on the mailing list and I guess from a practical standpoint regardless of where it is in the world nowadays, you can figure it takes roughly two days to get there and two days to get home. If it's in Vancouver and you live in Europe; if it's in Asia and you live in the United States, so you end spending four days to attending a three-day conference. I see value in something like this for people operational and technical, but to me I don't want to go a three-day party in Bangkok, this is not a big – let's try to get business from each other and stuff like this; this is a – especially when you have the Kobe meeting, you know, short period of time away.

I have no idea what your budget is for this but it's got to be a lot of money. And I haven't it seen as a line item but let's assume ICANN is spending between half a million and a million dollars for this, that's serious money. And I would want to take a look at in the future and say, one, do we possibly consider a tag-on add-on like Donna mentioned I believe, to an ICANN meeting, extra just like the GAC does a couple of days?

Or, number two, can that money be used more effectively in targeted sessions for members of the GDD? In other words, it may be more beneficial instead of doing one big meeting to take three or four of your key operational people, go to Brussels and do a deal for Europe and eastern Europe and give those guys a chance to attend at a reasonable cost. You know, I understand we're making a commitment here to geographical diversity, at the same point in time I'd be very interested in seeing in the statistics what percentage of the people attended that meeting who were members of the GDD and from that part of the world, because the whole idea behind targeting Bangkok is targeting it for GDD members who are in Asia Pacific.

And if we get 11 people who are GDD members, and I'm not talking about 50 other people from Bangkok who happen to be interested in the domain name

system, that's not what the purpose of this function is for. So for what it's worth, thanks, buddy.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thanks Ken. First I have Jeff and then Michael.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. Jeff Neuman. I would echo Donna's comment about trying to tag it along with something else that is in the industry or that people go to; I think that'll be beneficial and/or alternatively trying to place it in sometimes between ICANN meetings we have three months, sometimes it's four or five months to try to space it between one of the longer ones because this one is, you know, I know we've done it in May for the last couple of years, but, you know, look, we have a meeting in March and a meeting in June, that's like the shortest time span in general between ICANN meetings.

                  The span between our meeting now and the meeting in Kobe is like five months if I'm doing my math right. And then between the summer and this one was four or so months, so probably placing it in between a longer period is more helpful in the future. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Michael. Thanks, Jeff.

Michael Flemming: Thank you. Michael Flemming for the transcript. I just wanted to ask a little bit historic – a little history about this because I can't really remember but I think that the pre-starter for a lot of this was the road show that was done several years ago and I can't – I don't know specifically why we moved to a GDD for one summit around the world. But for me the road show – I attended the one in Tokyo and it was in Asia and it was really successful. I think we had a lot of good feedback and a lot of good development out of it.

                  So the idea about having those probably those more local areas, I'm not against that at all, I think that's a really good idea. I'm just kind of curious why we moved away from that in some aspects because I'm not going to be the one to complain living in Japan, but, you know, for me to travel all the way

here, 22 hour flight, and I do this three times a year but still having those local ones isn't exactly a bad idea.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Honestly, I don't want to spend too much time on this particular topic. We can explain that, Michael, the difference – ICANN decided to label this a summit two years ago; it used to be the intercessional the registry registrar meeting and it became a summit and kind of expanded the scope of what is discussed and who it was but it was always originally for the contracted parties to have face time with staff and in theory to dive deeper and not just have the high level policy discussions that we have the standard ICANN meetings.

It's evolved over time and those road show approach might be part of what we'll discuss afterwards going back to that model because it seems more appropriate for certain regions. All right so with that, Russ, why don't we get back to.

((Crosstalk))

Russ Weinstein: The next topic we're going to talk about is the update to CZDS and my colleague Chris Gift is going to talk about that for us. Thanks.

Chris Gift: Sure. Thank you very much. This is Chris Gift with ICANN Org. So as you can see from the text on the slide we are releasing the CZDS 2.0 in January. There are some functional updates notably the auto-approve, I think which was – people are looking forward to. Just a quick reminder, this new version will be split just so for your experience, the registry experience, will be within the NSP portal so will not be a separate experience like it is today so you'll be able to approve or CZDS users will be able to approve zone file requests from within NSP. And the end users or the requestors will have a new experience, largely the same just a little bit more modern.

As you can see we are migrating most all of the functionality plus a couple of new additions. We are obviously – the only key to note is that we are not migrating (unintelligible) themselves, so your users or your CZDS approvers. The principle reason was there is just some data clean up that was necessary, where you're seeing mismatch between emails and emails and names and so rather than wanting to risk any data issues or anything like that we were very concerned about that, we decided to not migrate the users; we're only going to migrate the RPC and then we're going to ask you to again send us names for CZDS users and we will load them back up into the new system and then they can have access.

You can have separated differentiated access between NSP and CZDS so if you only want people seeing CZDS that's all they will see; if you want people accessing both registry functions or requesting, you know, cases and so on as well as CZDS they can – the people can do both. Again, there will be a lot more about this in the days – or in the weeks to come. We have a series of webinars, demos, documentation that'll be sent out. We just wanted to give everybody as early a heads up as possible when we finalize the months. We'll also have more information about the exact date, we're aware of holidays and everything, and so we'll be very mindful of that when we come forward with a date. That's it as a highlight. Any questions?

Paul Diaz: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I'm almost reluctant to ask but there's not going to be any different terms and conditions, right? Awesome, thank you.

Russ Weinstein: No, no, no. Current ones are perfect, right? Thanks, Chris. Oh sorry, there's another question from Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Am I – do I understand it right that you are going to implement into portal the function of few accounts per registry because currently as I understand it, it's only one and it's a bit fishy who is

going to be – I'm urging effectively function so the GDD portal current and CZDS, am I right?

Chris Gift: The NSP portal and CZDS, so it'll be two separate views but they'll be within the same experience and you can switch between them easily. Maybe I can give you a demo to maybe – yes.

Maxim Alzoba: The short question is is it going to be the single account right, like now, or multiple accounts with different rights for access for different parts of portal as requested long time ago?

Chris Gift: Different rights for the access, so you can have a CZDS user or approver who only sees CZDS requests and that's all they see; they don't see the rest of the NSP portal.

Paul Diaz: Beth.

Beth Bacon: Thanks. This is Beth Bacon. This might not be a question for now but just to flag it, when people put their credentials into the portal and then you pass them along to the registry and you're passing along so people's personal information, what kind of disclosures are they seeing as to how you're going to use and pass on that information?

Chris Gift: So when the requestor puts it in, yes, so that is maybe something we should review with everyone. We can do that, can share. We do have some – we're mindful obviously of all the privacy laws so we do have some new disclosures that we're adding for the users themselves. But I agree, that's something we should share and discuss.

Beth Bacon: And just one follow up, I think it's something we should be thinking about with regards to the roles there and how we're – what the basis on which we process it since it goes to you and then comes to contracted parties. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Chris.

Chris Gift: Sorry, I don't want to take up too much time. And I also don't want to open a can of worms but I am mindful that you know, the – in the CZDS the agreement for the requestor and obviously the registries is between the two of you, it is not with ICANN, right? So is that something we want to revisit? I'm…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Woods: So Alan Woods from Donuts. The data however is going to be held on your system so you are a party to this and you need to be very careful of that. So it's just something we need to discuss and again to use the horrible terms, purposes and legal basis.

((Crosstalk))

Beth Bacon: This is Beth. I just – I didn't want to open the can of worms either, I just – let's flag it for a later discussion I think.

Paul Diaz: Okay, Maxim, last word.

Maxim Alzoba: Short notice, to conclude agreement between some third party and on our behalf you got to have some power of attorney letter which you won't have. So it's a bit questionable if it concluded on our behalf. So formally using your systems it's your concerns, it's your agreement. We are not part of that formally. Thanks.

Russ Weinstein: Yes, and I'm not sure we have the right staff in the room to be able to navigate this with you all. Thanks. This one, I have an update, this is a topic that data escrow, data processing agreements, I have – this is one we've owed you some updates for a while on. I have an update, I understand

there'll probably be a fair amount of questions with this and I'll do my best but I'll probably have to take those back as well and probably set up some discussions for the right folks on your team's side and our team side after the meeting.

But the basis is in the temp spec the registries and registrars are expected to ensure their data escrow agreements include data processing requirements consistent with GDPR. We had started down a path similar to the registry registrar agreements that also required an addendum similar in nature to work together as ICANN and the Contracted Party House to develop a consistent approach knowing that, you know, we have eight, nine escrow providers and 1200 registries and trying to make it as efficient as possible so that you're not – you're not all going at this alone and trying to get these things done.

From what I gather there's differing opinions between registries, registrars, data escrow providers, ICANN, and even within each of those populations about controller and processor relationships and roles and responsibilities and whether – and where these agreements are needed and how they need to be specified which has been challenging. I think we provided one option early on in the summer timeframe, got feedback that we were not aligned or not on the right path and so we've been working at it since then.

The most recent kind of development I guess or thinking right now is suggested approach that we wanted to socialize with you all here and can start getting into it more in depth is that ICANN can work with our data escrow agents that we've approved and develop template data processing agreements that you all could utilize as you feel necessary so if you believe it's necessary you can use it, if you don't you don't have to use it. And then for those that have the three way escrow agreements, some of the legacy contracts have the three way escrow agreements we could make it flexible to incorporate that aspect versus the two party version of it.

Sounds super easy, but I'm sure it's way, way harder than that. And won't underestimate the level of complexity associated with this so this is a suggested approach, maybe you could tell us if we're on the right path, if you think this could be viable and certainly like I said, we can try and set up another discussion with the right people from the registry and Contracted Party House as a whole and with our legal folks primarily.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thank you, Russ. Questions or concerns. I mean, it seems like a reasonable approach. Anybody? Beth.

Beth Bacon: This is Beth Bacon. I just want to thank you, Russ, a whole bunch and to confirm we did go over something and it wasn't quite there. I think that this suggested approach is kind of at – will work for some but not others as you said, it's not a one size fits all which is unfortunate. But let's get back together. I know Erica had started drafting; she's always great so thanks.

Russ Weinstein: Yes, the key here is we haven't forgotten and we know it's important but we're not there yet and we can keep working together on it. I think our next topic is RDAP so I'm going to turn it over to Francisco to provide an update and maybe also from your side.

Francisco Arias: Hello, everyone. This is Francisco Arias from ICANN staff. So I understand that (unintelligible) already provided an update on the – this morning to you regarding the RDAP pilot discussion group. And so I'm going to be very quick, just high level, as you know the temporary specification calls for registries and registrars to implement RDAP following a common profile, service level agreement and a registry reporting requirements.

And we in ICANN (unintelligible) have been working with the, excuse me, with the RDAP pilot discussion group regarding the profile with Marc and team, later with Rick and the others that are in that group. And a proposal was put for public comment at the end of August and the comment period ended just

a week ago on 13 October. We now have to work through the comments and update the profile accordingly.

In regards to the SLA and the registry reporting requirements, unfortunately we have had some hiccups there and we're still negotiating the SLA and the reporting requirements with that group. There's been a couple of sticky issues that have been complicated to resolve. Let's hope that the time here in Barcelona for in person meetings helped to reach an end in that decision.

Next slide please. So this is an optimistic implementation plan for RDAP, just as of now this is the – what the crystal ball says regarding the RDAP implementation. And the first item there is the one that has already been met, which is the end of the public comment of the profile. On the line of the profile the next item will be the tier 1 there in November, we are estimating that in somewhere November, December, we will be able to finalize the – the profile with of course the talking with the RDAP pilot group. And following that per the temp spec and the contracts we will issue a legal notice for the contracted parties to implement RDAP which will come somewhere in the first half of the 2019.

Then going back to the SLA and registry reporting requirements, we are very hopeful that we can get something done in – by the end of the month, we'll see about that. And the next step will be to put that draft SLA and registry reporting requirements for public comment. Please note that we are not intending to – as of now we're not intending to wait for the SLA and registry reporting requirements to be ready; we intend to issue a legal notice to implement RDAP as soon as the profile is finalized. And I think that's all I have.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Francisco. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. And I know – thank you for all the work in working on the SLA and I know it's now down to a couple minor – I think minor issues I guess

between the Com Net agreements and ICANN so those discussions now are – the rest of the group is okay with it, I think it's just now figuring out whatever details for that, then it'll be published. So I have no problem with the timeline.

I guess we were – we've been asking for a meeting between our – or between us and your legal team to discuss how to implement the SLAs and the reporting requirements. I'm just – or are you still of the view that you're just going to issue a legal notice and the SLAs will be…?

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco. I think that's what we have said so far but we are open to discuss of course. But please notice that this timeline is only talking about the profile which I believe there has been no discussion on where that can be issued as soon as that is finalized.

Jeff Neuman: Right, so I guess I'll put a stake in the ground again that this stakeholder group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and in fact several Board members are of the view that we cannot have a legal notice for the SLAs, we have to do a negotiation period, so which is according to the contracts. So the sooner – and I know I've asked Cyrus this for many months now, trying to get our legal teams together so we can do this and not have that delay any part of it. And now it's several months later and I don't want to be blamed for any delay because we did make this request several months ago to get this started.

So I'm going to again put that request, can we please have a meeting with your legal team to understand why they believe that they can issue a legal notice to implement the SLAs and the reporting requirements? And then when they conclude what hopefully what we conclude, according to the contract, we're going to have to start the negotiation period. So I'll put that in the – stake in the ground again.

Francisco Arias: I hear you, Jeff. I only can say that I'll take back your request and we'll get back to you.

Paul Diaz: We got a queue now. Donna, you want to go first then Rubens.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin. So Francisco, it seems like this isn't the first time that Jeff's made that request. So is it – is it – has the – had you not gone back to the legal team to see if they can be responsive to this request previously? I mean, I want to understand why this is a repeated request. So why haven't we gone any further with this?

Francisco Arias: So I think we have had a number of conversations and we have explained our view, but I think on regards to the difference what I believe we have said is let's first finalize the SLA. Remember, what is it now, October, almost end of October, so October, September, this was supposed to be finalized in July. We are three months and we can – three month delayed and we can still not reach an agreement on what the SLA should be. And it doesn't – it's been a complicated set of discussions to get even though there are only three issues. It's been complicated to get to (unintelligible) of those issues.

                  I think what we have proposed is let's first finalize the SLA, the, you know, the important stuff there, the substance of the matter and once we reach an agreement there, we can put that for public comment and then we can have the discussion about how to go about implementing.

Paul Diaz: Rubens. Defer? Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Just to respond to that, and this is again what I told Cyrus I guess back in May, June, June when we started that if we did it in that order that's fine, but you cannot enforce any of those SLAs until all this is done. So wouldn't it be better because we know that the negotiation process is going to take several months, I mean, not because we're going to have to sit down and negotiate different things, but there's time periods in the agreement, things that have to be done including a voting mechanism.

So we can do it that way, that's fine, but we're not going to get around the whole thing of – we've got to have a contract amendment and we've got to start that process so if Cyrus and everyone wants to wait until after the public comment is over, cool. Then we'll roll out the RDAP service and maybe at the end of 2019 we'll have some SLAs. But I don't think that's good from a visibility standpoint. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay, Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, Nic.BR. I just like to stress out that this is not just Jeff's point; this is a registry point, this is a principle issue of not allowing unilateral amendments to our contracts. So if ICANN insists on doing that, ICANN should be prepared to face stiff resistance including using everything that's in the book, requests for reconsideration, arbitration, etcetera, to not allow that. It's not about the SLAs themselves, which are probably fine, but the principle behind allowing unilateral amendment. So just a while you have been hearing that from Jeff, a lot, this is not just Jeff's pet project, not just Jeff's issue, it's an issue for all of us.

Paul Diaz: Thank you, Rubens. Anyone else? Okay. Russ.

Russ Weinstein: So thank you, Jeff, and thank you Rubens for continuing to clarify that point. I think we already understood that, that it was a registry-wide concern, not a Jeff Neuman concern, but thank you for clarifying that. I do think one minor clarification, I don't think we intended to wait until after the public comment was complete, I think we intended to reach agreement amongst ourselves on the substance as Francisco said before tackling the vehicle because we've been having trouble getting to the substance so far so I think we didn't want to pollute the substantive conversation with the vehicle conversation. But understand that's not your perspective on it, or your desired approach on it, but I think that's where we've been coming from so far.

Paul Diaz: All right. About 25 minutes left so let's keep rolling. I think next is the IDN implementation guidelines.

Russ Weinstein: All right so the IDN implementation guidelines, for those of you who aren't quite familiar or that familiar with this, in all of the – in almost all of the Registry Agreements, the IDN implementation guidelines are incorporated by reference into your agreements and as well as the Registrar Agreements. They're currently in a version 3.0 and recently a community workforce that you have representation on has developed a 4.0 version of those guidelines and they create new obligations or requirements for all of you.

And so what we're trying to do here is make sure that you as registries are aware that this is coming. They're not requirements in your contract yet because the Board needs to adopt them and provide an implementation lead time, but I wanted to make sure that you are all getting visibility into this. I know we did get comments from the Registry Stakeholder Group about the substance of the guidelines as they were going through the process on multiple occasions, but just want to make sure that the wider Registry Stakeholder Group is aware if you weren't tracking this carefully, and you support IDNs that you start paying attention and reading these guidelines now so that you can be prepared when implementation comes.

Go to the next slide. This next slide kind of shows the history of these things, like it says there, the 3.0 version was last developed in 2011 and then in 2015 timeframe the initiative started to update them. What we've seen so far even without the guidelines discussion but just the evolution of introducing new TLDs and more new TLDs supporting IDNs was this is a area of kind of not innovation but rapid development and learning across the community about how to do IDNs and to do them effectively and safely so that we're not creating risks to consumer confusion and cyber squatting and things of that nature.

So the working group developed a final proposed version last May and the next step of this is for the Board to adopt them so as we do with other recommendations to the Board, the staff has been pouring over those so that we can properly recommend to the Board what they're about to take on. Next step. The guidelines themselves, they're available at that link and total of 19 guidelines covering seven major topics and those are there highlighted on the screen.

As I mentioned, what we're doing is analyzing those guidelines and making sure we understand how we think it affects your contract and what we need to be prepared to build when the Board does give us the go-ahead so that we can adequately support you as contracted parties and your adoption and appointment of these.

We think our role is largely education based but we will have to provide some service related to enabling these guidelines into implementation so, again, the message is start preparing now, we're thinking the Board would probably be able to consider these as their workshop in late January and the recommendation from the guidelines group I think was a six-month implementation window for the majority of the guidelines and an 18-month implementation window for a small subset of the guidelines related to the systems you use, what we call the LGR format of the IDN tables. So I'll turn it back to questions for this.

Paul Diaz: Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. The question to Russ, have you related how many current IDN tables in IANA are going to be noncompliant with the future set of these policies?

Russ Weinstein: No, I don't think we've done that analysis. I think that's a pretty large endeavor.

Paul Diaz: Okay…

Francisco Arias: So this is Francisco, just want to interject there. The IDN 2008 is not a new
                    requirement, that has been there for a few years at least in the previous
                    version, the (quorum) version, version 3, it's already there and all the new
                    TLDs that went through the evaluation PDP etcetera, they got their tables
                    tested for IDN 2008 compliance, so that should not be an issue.

Paul Diaz: Liz.

Liz Behsudi: Yes, just to clarify, the recommendations and implementation guidelines will
                    apply equally to IDN.idn as to second levels?

Russ Weinstein: Yes, these guidelines are for IDNs at the second level across the board.

Liz Behsudi: Okay, second level and also the top level, yes? You have IDN.idn or for
                    example, you could have a second level IDN.org, right? So, yes.

Francisco Arias: Yes this is Francisco. These are our guidelines for IDNs at the second level.

Liz Behsudi: Oh, thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Not seeing any more questions, let's…

Russ Weinstein: Yes, as Francisco says, I think GDD's early analysis was largely a lot of the
                    recommendations here are things that are already being done by registries
                    today but there are some new elements that you need to go in and check out.
                    All right.

                    So my next topic I wanted to bring to your attention was the public interest
                    commitments dispute resolution procedure and some improvements we have
                    planned related to the procedure. This procedure was developed and
                    implemented back in 2014 as part of the kind of onboarding or the

implementation of the new gTLD base agreement and the requirements embedded in there.

It's been very little used so far, I think we've only had two cases where we've had to exercise a panel and it's – I think what we've uncovered is based on that limited experience and those as well as some complaints issued to our complaints officer, Krista is in the room, and can speak to some of that stuff if needed, we've identified some opportunities for operational improvements.

As with many things when we were launching the new gTLD program and then the Registry Agreement and all those support services, GDD had to provide – or ICANN had to provide to implement that Registry Agreement, things were done as best we could but without testing so to speak. You know, we didn't have it in a – we'd never done this before. And so as we get experience with those first uses we identified some things that maybe are less than ideal. And those have been flagged both directly from registries and complainants and there's some suggested improvements that we wanted to accomplish this year.

And like I said, these are primarily operational improvements, were not trying to change standards of what complainable or what the panel should do and how they should decide, this is more about transparency and communication so the four elements you see there on the screen, sharing communications with both parties, similar to how other dispute resolution services operate, disclosing identifies of selected panelists with the parties, I see you Jeff, sorry, setting timing expectations, particularly when the panel will be appointed and once they're appointed next steps, and making sure that we centralize the location of all the existing panel decisions into a central repository. And that's not procedure-based, that's more of operational again.

So the intention – our thought process was that we would tackle these and put them for public comment in first quarter 2019 with the goal of hoping to finalize it by the second quarter 2019. But wanted to bring it to your attention

so that wasn't a surprise first of all, and see what if any interaction we should be having together before we get to that step. So that's why we're talking about it today essentially. Like I said, we're focusing purely on operational and transparency issues, not about the substance of the PIC DRP or what goes into specification 11.

Paul Diaz: Jeff, question.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. Jeff Neuman. And thanks, Russ, and I think this is a good initiative to start looking at the PIC DRP having had experience with it. If I could – and I liked what you just said about what interactions we can have beforehand. I – obviously I don't know what's been received to the complaints office of what you all have been talking about internally, but it would be good to have a session before to start brainstorming other – things that other people may have noticed about the process that could be approved, again, not substance, not – so I mean, I would love to provide some feedback, for example, and there may be others.

So before ICANN just posts this set of amendments, otherwise if this comes out for public comment, and let's say someone like us were to propose additional things, it would look almost like we're asking for something in addition as opposed to based on feedback we already have. So if we could set that up I'd be happy to participate, or it should be open but I'm letting you know that I would definitely participate.

Russ Weinstein: Great. Thanks, Jeff. And I'll turn over to Krista in a second. And I do want to make clear that the report from the complaints office is published and it's available at that link so there were seven total complaints, I think I linked to one of the responses but they're all the same, right. It was essentially one investigation, or not investigation, not allowed to use that word, research and one analysis and report.

Then the other part of that is is maybe Paul and Donna, there's an opportunity to form a little work party amongst the stakeholder group that we can work with as opposed to having to navigate the whole stakeholder group at a time.

Krista Papac: Thanks, Russ. This is Krista Papac. Some of you may know me. One of the things I want to say Russ just said, which is this is all published, the complaints that come in get published as well as the response. To Russ's point, there were seven complaints all about one PIC report that went to a panel. The complaints are each about 70 pages in length, I'm sort of setting your expectations and I'm trying to maybe give you guys for those who are interested in looking at this, give you some pointers if you want to find the most efficient way to get through the documentation.

So there are 70 pages of complaints, they're very – the tone is in a very – it's very legalistic so at least for someone like me who's not a layer I know many of you are lawyers, it takes a while to read through them. But what I ended up doing is because it was a complaint about one report, even though there were seven complaints, I addressed all of the issues that are contained in the 70 pages of complaints in one report back and one response. That response I will also warn you, my response is 10 pages long. I did my best not to make it any longer than that.

But it's, I hope, but actually be interested if anybody does end up reading it to hear your feedback. I hope it's fairly easy to follow. But more than anything wanted you to know it's published, and wanted to set your expectations about what it would take to go through and read all of the complaints as well as the response, so thank you.

Russ Weinstein: Thanks, Krista. So we have I think two more topics. I don't have any more slides. We have two topics and I think only about 15 minutes left. Is Maguy in the room by the way? She is, okay. So the two topics were RSEP and the

compliance audits which I know is of great interest. Do we have something to talk about on RSEP or should we go to the compliance topic first?

Sam Demetriou: I think we can go to compliance first. Brian gave a pretty thorough overview so I think it's just if members of the larger stakeholder group have questions for you.

Maguy Serad: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Maguy Serad, ICANN Contractual Compliance. I know you wanted some clarification, a pre audit notification went out before – last week announcing there is a limited scope registry audit that's going to be conducted focused on DNS abuse. We received some emails saying thank you, let us know when it's coming out; and we had some confusion in the communication that we hope we have addressed directly with Jan contacting and responding to the confusion.

The biggest confusion was which TLD is it. At this point we are going to do a all inclusive TLD review related to DNS abuse. Last time we did an audit of this nature that is focused was a couple of years back when we first launched the new G program and there was a lot of big concerns about specification 11 3(b). We did it for about 250 TLDs where we did like a proactive review of those. This one, again, it's a few questions, it's – and then requesting some information.

The audit timeline is going to be an RFI will go out next week. In the request for information, which is the first notice, it will follow the same timeline as a full audit. There are 15 business days to respond to it. But in the announcement, in the email that goes out next week, we are putting back what we call the audit outreach. We used to conduct an audit outreach with every audit launch to address any auditee's questions and we conducted two, one early in the morning to account for the regions and one late in the evening.

So then towards the end we stopped having attendance so we canceled it for the last few audits. But for this one we're going to add it again. And hopefully what we'll do, the plan is, we'll send the RFI out and the outreach will be within the same week so it gives you an opportunity to look at the questions and if you have questions please join the audit webinar or the audit outreach so we can address your questions.

The process is the same, the review the same, and when the RFI goes out we will also publish the list of TLDs that are under the audit. We started publishing the list of who's under an audit as soon as an RFI goes out so that everyone knows who's being audited instead of waiting until the very end when the audit report is generated. With that I'll take your questions.

Paul Diaz: Alan.

Alan Woods: Alan Woods from Donuts. So because my life revolves around the same topic all the time and that is GDPR, can we just maybe flag with you that especially considering it's – if it's to do with DNS abuse, can we be certain, number one I know that you're using third party provider, therefore, just from the contracted parties' point of view that if we're transferring data, especially DNS abuse data, which could relate to personal data or could have personal data involved, that there are, you know, data processing agreements in place so that we can just have the concern dealt with. And so I'm just flagging this at the table.

Another thing that probably we should consider and because I know you have specifically an office that would be in Istanbul and the transfer of such data outside of the EA would also be a consideration that we have to be very careful about international transfers and Chapter 5 of the GDPR. I'm sorry for having to bring that up that way but it is a concern that we just you know, with everything that is happening at this particular moment in time and the huge amount of focus that's on that, I just think, you know, I would advise caution

and ensuring that before this all starts that we are all on the same page on that. Thank you.

Maguy Serad: This is Maguy. Thank you, Alan, for the two questions. So as you know besides just the external aspect of GDPR which I refer to it from a temp spec perspective, because Compliance is not here to enforce GDPR, but we also as ICANN Org have taken on our own internal exercise to ensure that we are also GDPR compliant and one of those exercises required that we have that agreement that noted with the our vendors, similar to what you heard Russ talk about earlier with the data escrow providers. So we've done that.

And to assure you, as many of you know, our audit team is LA-based. I know our vendor is global so we will be dealing with based on the responses and the reports if it's – if you heard us in the past, we receive audit responses sometimes and reports in multi languages. Our audit team is bilingual, Russian and English. I can offer my services in French and Arabic. But outside of that we do have to depend also on our audit partner to review some of those.

But it is all based from the Los Angeles office as our audit team, that's where they're based out of. But if you have any questions like I always say, the compliance verb is "ask" and I would like to ask you to ask us questions if you have any concerns. Don't just, you know, I've had a lot of people stop me in the hallways, I've talked to many people, and after I talk to them, they go, like, you know, so.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Maguy. And this is Jeff Neuman, I was one of them who submitted a very confused several emails simply because of the way that the email was addressed. I hope that in the future just to I guess give everyone information, so there are a number of us, a lot of us, that manage multiple TLDs and the email had the addressee in a BCC as opposed to the two or the CC line, so therefore you couldn't, as the recipient, see who it was going to at all, not just

the TLD, but you couldn't see the actual registry operator that it was going to so that affected some of us that manage multiple different registry operators.

So that's hopefully in the future we can – I know it's an automated system so that's probably not as easy of a fix but hopefully we can fix that going forward. The other thing is I had a good conversation with Jan and I thought maybe I would just repeat it here as well because I think it's – it put one of these things that put me at ease, but it's helpful for everyone is to kind of view this more, at least what you explained to me and correct me if I'm wrong, it's more like a request for information than it is a audit.

I know we sort of use the term "audit" because that's what's in our contract but this, from my understanding is more of an information gathering exercise than it is an audit – I mean, I guess to the extent that if you're not doing it at all then it's an audit against that provision, because you're not doing it at all. So to turn this sort of into a question, what is the baseline, if it is an audit as opposed to a request for information, which is what I understand it to be, if it is an audit then presumably there has to be a baseline of what is compliant and what's not compliant.

So I guess that's sort of a question, is this more of a request for information? Or is there part of it that is an audit to which you're comparing it to some sort of baseline? And if there's a baseline, what would that be?

Maguy Serad: So it is called an audit because that's what it is. But it is – part of the audit it is a request for information as we call it an RFI. There is not a baseline. The baseline we're looking at it is, as you know, a couple of years back when we did the 250 reviews specifically on spec 11 3(b) we found out that many TLDs did not have one or they were in the process of implementing. Throughout the years as we conducted full audit reviews, we also part of that full audit review we had a spec 11 as one of the questions in there.

And through that process we have learned what – from the different registry operators what are some of the practices and what the reports look like and what to expect from those reviews as we look at them. So that's the first aspect of it is to confirm that yes, the audit and the security reporting and the monitoring is taking place. So some of the questions are generic, could be like what is your process, what's the frequency, things of that nature. And then ultimately based on the Registry Agreement it will be send us your security report.

So to review the security report we look at the content of it, we look at what type of data is being reported and what does it look like. And we may go back to say, hey, can you help clarify how is this and what does that mean? For a baseline I was here earlier when everybody was passionately talking about the audit, I'd heard, you know, I know you mentioned DAR and I know you mentioned publicly available reports. So we are not looking at that as a baseline but it is a resource available to us to review. It's not meaning that if you don't have everything in DAR or you don't have everything in your report that one is right, one is wrong.

We are using that as a resource because that's one of the tools we have available to us and the publicly available information. So again, our goal here is to – as you heard at the opening ceremony, there are two big objectives, right? One of them was – as everybody first to do it as the GDPR, the big G, or capital G, but the other big worry in the community is the IANA infrastructure reviews. So we're hoping that by doing a focused effort on this, we can really, you know, all of you who are sitting, and I'm not worried about your security reports or your audit because I know what you do and how you, you know, your passion towards what you're doing. So we're hoping that we can ease that perception of there is no DNS infrastructure reviews and kind of focus on the area.

We just finished, if you have been following the audit activities, we just finished an audit – a full audit on 20 TLDs, if you want to know who they are

go on our website, we have it listed. The audit program closed at the end of – what month are we – October, last month so we're in the process of generating the audit report. We found some amazing reports through this audit and we found some deficiencies. And what I mean, deficiencies like some TLDs didn't have anything.

But when you go to publicly available reports you see that there is some DNS abuse happening. And we're not saying why aren't you matching this, we're saying are you aware of this? Do you conduct audit, you know, your security reviews on this? So this is a learning process but it's also a discovery or like you said, trying to see what's going on, how can we work together and hopefully by finishing this exercise and publishing that report we can prove that hey, you know, it's – we did it a couple years back, we've done it, embed it in the big audit but this is truly a focused audit and here's how the environment is looking.

Paul Diaz: Okay, I had Jonathan and Jon. We're at time so please, let's get through this as quickly as we can, we can just go a couple minutes past.

Jonathan Robinson: Paul, it's Jonathan Robinson. Maguy, you mentioned early in your sort of introduction that you were doing an all-inclusive TLD review, could you just be clear on what an all-inclusive TLD review means? What – in terms of – what does that define in terms of scope or which TLDs or what did you mean by that? Thanks.

Maguy Serad: So we hope to publish that list by early next week. It's the new gTLDs that have not been in this past 20 audit. Now for this past 20 audit we have some TLDs that have remediation plans that we're going to be retesting but some have completed the audit and there is no follow up action. We have some what we refer to legacy TLDs that have renewed their RAs and they have abuse in their agreements and provisions. And we know also there are legacy TLDs that don't have that in their agreements and for those of course it's not about enforcement, it's again what Jeff was referring to, is request for

information and hopefully easing up that concern that we all keep hearing about. And it's big on Göran's agenda too and on the community topics.

Paul Diaz: Jon.

Jon Nevett: Thanks. Quick question. Jon Nevett. Maguy, we're going to get these next week? Is that right?

Maguy Serad: That's what we're working on, yes.

Jon Nevett: Do you have draft language that you would be willing to share? Because if there are any questions or comments or concerns we're all together this week, I would highly recommend that you send that out now so if there are any issues we could deal with it much more quickly than when you officially send it out.

Maguy Serad: So it's being finalized, but as you guys know, in the past we have not published the audit questions because we continue to evolve them and change them as we go from audit to another. But many of you have taken our audits in the past few months so the language about the security report and sharing what's going on there, it's pretty consistent. Maybe we've added a language about, you know, what is your process, what do you do with this audit report and like do you send it to your registrar? This is the type of things we look for we're adding in there, Jon.

Jon Nevett: Okay so that's a no that you won't send it this week and…

Maguy Serad: No I will not.

Jon Nevett: Okay. And what kind of confidentiality will you provide for responses?

Maguy Serad: So it's reviewed by the audit team and it's maintained in a very confidential system that's encrypted and secured. And when, as you know, when we

complete every audit we remove all the data. If there is an audit for a TLD that's still under remediation, we have to wait until the remediation is completed so we can retest it and compare against what they had submitted to us but once we close an audit with any TLD we do remove and delete.

Paul Diaz: Last word, Liz, real quick.

Liz Behsudi: Very quickly. Very quickly. Other than with your vendors, do you share any of the data or submissions with third parties?

Maguy Serad: Third parties, no. I just want to – it's the ICANN audit team and for transparency sake, we will probably engage (John Crane) if we have some understanding to understand what does this mean, because we are not technically skilled for this, sometimes we do have to depend our internal ICANN Org internal, please, Liz, I'm doing the peace sign because I saw you do that earlier, internal. But as I just said to Jon, we do remove all of our data.

And if I may add, no, one second, the last audit we saw amazing security reports out of not all 20, a couple of them.

Paul Diaz: Okay, guys. Well thank you for that, for all the things. We have to take a mandatory break, we'll start up again at quarter after.

Russ Weinstein: I just have one – so first thank you all for having us. I am not trying to eat into your break too much but also a sincere thank you to you, Paul, and the other members of the executive team who are rotating off after this meeting. Really appreciate the work you all do for the stakeholder group and with ICANN and it's been a real pleasure working with you and I thank you personally for helping me come up to speed on my new position. So thank you very much and good luck and, Donna, I'm looking forward to working with you as well.

END