
MARRAKECH – GNSO - RrSG Meeting
Wednesday, June 26, 2019 – 15:15 to 18:30 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

GRAEME BUNTON: Hi, all. We'll give it another two or three minutes for people to get into the room and then we'll get going. Maybe we should. Maybe it's time to get going. I've got two past, so maybe let's get this party started. Are we good to go in the back of the room, recording started, all that stuff? Awesome.

Hey, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting here in lovely Marrakech. This is, because it's a policy meeting, is something akin to a double-length policy call. I don't know that we need to go around the room so much because I don't see too many new faces. I'm not sure I see any new faces at all. Is this anybody's first or second ICANN meeting?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: This is my second Registrar Stakeholder Group.

GRAEME BUNTON: Alright. Well, welcome, Owen. You don't get to pretend to be a newcomer because you're now on the ExCom and I'm going to make you do some work.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So, the usual housekeeping stuff. Please say your name, unlike me, before you talk. My usual precursor has two components. The first is that, especially for EPDP members, GNSO councilors, and the ExCom, we get our marching orders from all of you and we get those marching orders perspective from the sharing of ideas. That requires input from all of you.

So, participation is extremely important for all of us. I want to make sure that we're hearing from as many different groups as we can, which means less Michele and more Vlad sort of thing. Yeah, I'm looking at you. It's really important that we hear diversity of opinion and we make sure that we're all on the same page and we can take your perspectives and continue to move forward in the rest of the ExCom or EPDP or GNSO activities. So, please, don't hesitate to get into a queue.

The second part of that is that sometimes participating here – although I try and run a pretty friendly meeting. It's not super serious. It can be intimidating for real to speak at the microphone and not everybody feels super comfortable to do that. But like I just said, that diversity of opinion is really important and the barrier here to discussion should be as low as possible.

I think people often in this space don't feel like they're an expert on topics, and therefore don't feel comfortable sharing an opinion. I think there's a lot of imposter syndrome sort of thing

going on where people feel like everybody else really knows what's going on and maybe you'll just be quiet. But I think the truth is, aside from very few people – maybe just Michele – actually have a really good sense of everything that's going on. It turns out that most people actually maybe know one or two things and that's kind of it, or only know a little bit about a lot of things. So, you're no different from everybody else in the rest of the room. So, don't let "oh, I don't really know a lot about this issue" be a barrier to asking a question or making a statement at the microphone. Cool? Nodding heads. Everybody is engaged. We're going to have some great chats today. Love it. Thank you. Alright, to the agenda, let's go. It feels a little low energy in here. Maybe people had a heavy lunch. Last night was hard partying. That's my welcome and introductions already four minutes ahead of schedule, crushing it.

We have asked GDD to join us today to talk about a few things including RDAP and what else is going on inside of the GDD. So, we're going to pass to them in just a second. But if people didn't know, Russ is sort of now the registrar guy. And many of you have known Russ. To be fair to Russ, Russ is relatively new to trying to understand who registrars are and what we care about. So, we're doing a lot of bidirectional education at the moment. I think, with that, I'll kick it right over to you and you guys can share what's going on inside GDD that you think registrars need to know about.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Thanks, Graeme, and thanks to all of you. As Graeme said, I am now also responsible for the registrar, what we used to call registrar service and engagement. Right after the Kobe meeting, Cyrus asked me to take on the registrar component. I was already doing the registry component of that. So, we're in the process of combining the teams from registry and registrar, what we call service and engagement, so you all have engagement managers that you talk to on a periodic basis when you have a question about some ICANN process or ICANN interaction. That's the team that I'm now responsible for.

You may recognize Andee Hill who has been on that team for a couple of years now. She's going to be really integral to our engagement with all of you. She's going to lead the account management and engagement approach for ICANN for our team with how we interact with you, how we understand what needs you have from a GDD perspective and go forward.

So, a little bit about me. I've been with ICANN for about six-and-a-half years now. Most of my time comes from the registry space. I started out on the new gTLD program team, so helped build the evaluation panels and the processes to test registries and things like that, resolve contentions. So, I've interacted with some of you who cross over to the registry space on that front.

I have a little bit of exposure on the registrar side before I took this role. I was one of the people who helped implement that WHOIS accuracy reporting system you all love so much, where we do WHOIS queries and then evaluate accuracy on a number of fronts. Greg and I had some fun go-arounds on that one. Is Theo here? I met Theo in that exercise. That was fun.

So, I've gotten a little bit of engagement. Like I said, starting about July 2017, I took over the Registry Service and Engagement role which is the role you might remember Krista Papac used to do and you had Jennifer Gore doing the registrar side. So, that's the role that's now being combined. We have the whole team combined to better support registries and registrars together. I'm really excited that we're going to do that. You can probably go to the next slide, Zoe.

I think there's some positive benefits that we're hoping to extract out of this for you all. I think, on our side, we'll have better information exchange. Sometimes we realized we were doing things very, very with a similar purpose with a much different approach internally on the same activity. So, hopefully, we can get that more unified, share best practices, learn faster.

Also, I think that will help in our engagement and relationship management with you all, especially as we see more and more

intersection between registry and registrar relationships and organizational structures and things.

Then, more common approach to how we administer the contracts as well. There's a lot of things in the contracts that are essentially describing similar activities in both the registry and registrar agreements, terminating a license, acquiring a license, transferring a license, changing contract information. If we can do that more consistently across the board in [inaudible] with the contracts, of course. I think that benefits everyone because we'll be better at it. It won't be [inaudible] tools and processes. You'll have a more common understanding and better expectations on what the process is going to be like coming in. So, we're trying to improve that user experience for you in how you deal with ICANN.

Now, I know from the little intel I have so far, most of your dealings with ICANN is not with GDD. It's with our friends over in compliance. And we can help with that, too. Obviously, they're responsible for the enforcement side of the contract but if it's not going well, please let us know. Please let us know what the frustrations are, what the pain points are. I can't solve the problem for you but our team can help be an advocate for you. You need to help us ... You might need to help educate us on what the issue is and what the confusion point is or why we may not be thinking about it appropriately but do share that and we'll do

what we can. We'll have the conversations. We'll try and get you together if it's necessary.

Something you may not know is we actually don't see the tickets go out. Our team only starts seeing them at the third notice process. So, don't assume that we know what's going on, that there might be tickets. The reason for that is generally they tend to resolve themselves. You guys figure it out amongst yourselves. There will be too high of volume for us to see everything. I know [inaudible] can relate. [Because you guys are] constantly breaking the rules.

But if there is a problem, please let your engagement manager know, your account manager know. Does anyone not know who their account manager in the room? Raise of hands. Nice work, Andee.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is it Cyrus?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I think it's Andee.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's actually Cyrus.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Cyrus Jamnejad, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [James], you'll be Goran's level.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: We've been calling them engagement managers. Maybe you had heard that phrasing?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But [inaudible], so I wouldn't ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You don't have any problems, so you don't need to contact us, right?

GRAEME BUNTON: Alright. I saw a hand from Vlad but let's all remember to say our names for the transcript. Vlad and then we'll come back to you, Russ.

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Thanks, Graeme. Quick question. I just want to make sure. So, for the Africa region, because I'm of that place of the world, it's Mukesh. Am I right?

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

That's correct, Vlad. A little bit about ICANN and GDD work. So, we have our team that's responsible for what we call service and engagement and implementation things. We have a team that's responsible for the service delivery side and customer support side. So, that's the team you may also interact with quite a bit. That's our GDD operations team. That's kind of our sister team. It's managed by Aaron Hickman. You might know names John Greg or Lauren Israel or Peter – I'll mispronounce his last name. But we work hand in hand with them. They're the left hand to our right hand at ICANN that do the service delivery. We help define these are the boundaries, the rules, the criteria [inaudible] put a service transaction through and they go and figure out how to do it 10,000 repeatedly, scaleably, all that kind of stuff and then deliver it and improve that over time. So, that's a little bit about GDD.

In general, I'm new to the registrar space. I'm still learning and I think you guys can all teach me a lot. So, where there's opportunity, please give me that opportunity to teach me. I may come back at you. If you bring me an issue, you're going to probably have to give me some education on it. But I welcome that. I think that's fun and it's also how I learn best. So, please do that. And I think that goes for our whole team, actually, the whole GDD team, especially your engagement managers. We want to

help. We want to be a resource to you. You may have to give us some guidance on how to do that most effectively.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Russ. We appreciate this opportunity to interact with you and help educate you. And for everybody else’s knowledge, we’re going to try and get GDD staff to join us probably on every other policy call for an update on what’s going on inside of ICANN from your perspective so we can share a little bit both ways and make sure that those lines of communication are open.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Awesome. That’s great. That’s kind of a quick preview of who we are. Andee, I don’t know if you wanted to say anything.

ANDEE HILL: I think you’ve covered it.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Alright. Since we have Rick from Verisign who is one of our experts on RDAP, maybe we could jump to the RDAP slides. I think they kick in our sixth slide or so. Maybe we can circle back.

GREG: One question about that WHOIS accuracy reporting system. Is that dead?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I'm not sure if it's been published. I think it probably got published. There's a letter that Goran just sent to the GNSO Council asking about the scope of EPDP phase 2. It had some ... In the phase 1 report, there was a footnote in there about data accuracy activities and that there might be discussion in phase 2 about it, so there's a clarification point that we asked of the EPDP about what is the scope that they're planning on talking about? In general, I think right now we're in a pause mode. We don't see a particular benefit to doing another sweep of data analysis at the time, given the data we would expect to get back.

I'm not an expert on this, but I think all the data that had been collected is not being analyzed and inspected and is being treated appropriately for data protection regulations and all that stuff, applicable law.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, dead for the moment I guess is what I'm taking away from that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Sounds like it and sounds like the EPDP has [inaudible] to do on that. I saw a hand from James.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Graeme. Thanks, Russ. Just very quickly, before we move on to RDAP, you mentioned just taking opportunities to learn more about the industry. I think, from our discussion – I don't think it was yesterday, it must have been two days ago regarding FOAs. But a common theme that I see emerging is a lack of understanding within the community and also within GDD and with compliance with the scale and speed of the transactions that occurring in this space. There appears to be an assumption, particularly in addressing some of the questions from compliance, that there is a human reviewing a lot of these, for example, changes, transfers, updates. When in the most common use case, these are machines talking to machines.

So, making policies expressible in terms of logic that can be written into code and operationalize that way I think is really important and would really like you to start carrying that message internally, that this is not a situation where we have just this army of minions looking over at all these transactions to verify transaction integrity. We're doing our best to communicate with what used to be a small number of registries and now a large

number of registries and this thing is happening several times a second.

So, I think that is just an underlying theme that keeps popping up in all of our interactions with GDD and with compliance is that this thing is a lot bigger and a lot faster than I think you guys may be used to.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, James. Good input. Very good.

GRAEME BUNTON: And then [Christian].

[CHRISTIAN]: On the input from registrars to you, I just wanted to note that on our meeting with the compliance, both in Kobe and in Bangkok, we offered our help to give input to the review that a consulting firm is doing on compliance I think at the moment, but it didn't seem like compliance wanted our input.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, [Christian]. I'll take that back, too.

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Quick question. You mentioned earlier that if we have compliance notices and stuff like that and we don't agree and come to you and then you'll take it up with compliance and so forth, I'm trying to understand the hierarchy over there in terms of [inaudible], what pull you have with compliance. If I tell compliance this compliance ticket is incorrect because of A, B, and C and I give them proof and they say no, then do I come to you and say this compliance ticket isn't correct because of A, B, and C? Somehow that will make it go away or what will happen there essentially?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks, Vlad. I do want to get to the RDAP stuff just because we have guests and then we can circle back to some things but we can try and tackle this one real quick.

So, you've got to respond to compliance as you indicate. We can be a facilitator, an advocate for you to help try and share your point or perspective on it, but it is going to be up to you to make the arguments to compliance. We can try and have them take a second look at things at times or that sort of thing. They're ultimately the decider on that. They're responsible for enforcement. They come through a different chain of command. So, I can't get you out of compliance jail but I can try and advocate.

GRAEME BUNTON: You're perhaps a lubricant where there's friction, to try and ease that process is I think how that works. So, we're going to come back to a bunch of other stuff on those slides, post RDAP. Alright, let's go right to RDAP stuff. And thanks for joining us.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: So, who knows that they're supposed to do RDAP later this summer? Who knows what RDAP is? Alright.

So, in February, based on the good work of a volunteer group of contracted parties that I think was led by Rick over here from Verisign with ICANN input, a profile – a response profile – was developed for the RDAP system that, based on that now, we've tripped the provision in our contracted that requests require all registrars and registries to implement that RDAP service and we recommend you use the profile that the contracted parties developed and was endorsed by the registrar and registry stakeholder groups.

The deadline for doing that is 26th August 2019. So, it's coming up quick, especially for a new system development. We understand this is a new system development in a lot of cases. So, first want to make sure everyone is aware. Looks like it is. Great. Thank you.

The other part of that is one of the things that's going to help this system work interoperability is we need to get a base URL from

every registry and every registrar. Where you're going to put that base URL is in your radar system right now for registrars and then ICANN will facilitate getting that base URL to all the registries. It will also I think get deposited in an IANA repository but we're working on maybe phasing that out. I don't know what the status of that is but we will make sure – ICANN will make sure and get it to the registries, so they can use it accordingly.

That was the first part of RDAP. Any questions there?

TOM BARRETT: Who else will that base URL be shared with? This is Tom Barret from EnCirca.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: It will be published on an IANA repository that I believe is public. This is where if Rick or anyone else knows a better answer, please jump in. Any other general initial RDAP questions?

MICHELE NEYLON: During the Bangkok meeting, there was some discussion about SLAs for registries and the way that registries have access to your monitoring system and they already have an authentication mechanism for that but there doesn't seem to be an equivalent

for us, whereas there will be SLA obligations on us. I was just wondering had there been any progress on that.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

I don't know the answer to that, Michele, but I can take that one back, too. Andee, can you make a note of that one for me? Just like today, you have SLA requirements for the WHOIS service and I think they've been converted into requirements for RDAP. And that's the next topic that we need to discuss about how do we get those into the contract. But noted that you do not have the equivalent API to access to the data.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks. Michele, you're correct. If I remember correctly, you were the one at the mic that connected those dots. Or connected the dots and then came to the mic. Something in that order. The issue is the information on that is available through what's known as the [MOSABE] which is available via credentials that are associated with that API leveraging currently registry service portal credentials, so there's going to have to be some mechanism made to allow the credential. Either registrars are going to have to be able to get credentials or somehow the credentials for the [radar] portal or whatever, [RSP], is going to have to be able to be wired in there but some mechanism is going

to have to get devised somehow. But to my knowledge, that's not been sorted.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

The next big hurdle I think we have as a group is the way the contract defines RDAP service at the moment is pretty lightweight and not indicative of a production-level service. Can you go the next slide?

So, what we'd like to do is to define those service parameters into the contract so that we can talk about how do we get from an WHOIS world to an RDAP world for RDDS. Our goal, and I think it's been the goal of the contracted parties as well, is to transition from a WHOIS service to an RDAP-based service for registry directory services. Registration Directory Services.

The things we found that are missing if you look at the way the WHOIS service is defined compared to the way RDAP service is not defined, in both the registry and registrar agreements are defining the output profile, the expected outputs of an RADP service. That's the profile. Defining what the service level expectations are, what performance we're expecting from the service, the SLAs, the reporting requirements. That, at the moment, is a registry obligation only, so there's no registrar equivalent reporting requirements that are being contemplated.

And then define what the parameters are to sunset, the WHOIS service, the Port [43] service.

So, that's the scope of an amendment that we're thinking is necessary to both the registry agreement and the registrar accreditation agreement.

The good news, as it says on the slide, is much of this has been discussed in that pilot working group that had representation from this body as well as from the registry body. So, we have a profile that you guys helped developed for us. We've got SLAs that have been agreed to in that smaller group and they're really just ported over from the WHOIS service to the equivalent RDAP service. We don't have reporting requirements for registrars. We have identified the equivalent reporting for registries.

The big challenge I think is getting those documents that have been created into the appropriate specifications and contractual language that would form an amendment to the RAA.

Again, with the commitment and goal, what we're trying to do is define the service to a production-quality service that makes everyone feel comfortable that we can turn off the WHOIS service. That's the carrot at the end of this amendment process.

The bad news is the amendment process is arduous at best. And we haven't done it on the registrar agreement. We've up-

versioned over time the registrar accreditation agreement, 2009-2013. But we haven't just done an amendment to it. But that is defined and contemplated in the agreement. But it's a time-consuming and challenging process.

[CHRISTIAN]:

I'm a bit puzzled about how there is not a plan when to turn off [inaudible]. If you look in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, it says ICANN requires different protocol, registrar [inaudible] operate a WHOIS service. I would say RDAP is a different protocol. So, if I read directly in the contract, I could turn off WHOIS in August. Tell me why I'm reading this wrong.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Thanks, [Christian]. So, I think the temporary specification does require and RDAP service – sorry, that's a different. We have a slightly different interpretation of that clause. A lot of it is that we need a production quality system and for the benefit ... I think we have a responsibility to provide a production quality system and what the contract outlines there is not a production quality system. It just says an RDAP service. It doesn't define what that is, what that isn't. So, I don't think we would believe you're honoring the spirit of the agreement and the underlying intention of that clause in the contract.

We're not here to try and pick fights about this. We recognize it's a weak point in the agreement. It's not a great story – which is why we want to get this amendment process going. And we really don't want any registrar to turn off WHOIS on August 26th. So, if you're planning to do that, we need to have a conversation and let's have those conversations, because that's not the intention of ICANN. That's hopefully not the intention of responsible registries and registrars. So, let's get that out on the table.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I just want to note that I would not be surprised if some people would turn off WHOIS, so I think we need exact communication on what the plan is and when you expect that we can turn it off and why in writing that we can send to all registrars.

GRAEME BUNTON:

I've got Michele and James in the queue. I think most of us hear you and we're not going to shut it off instantly, when contractually we probably could. But I would like ICANN to note that not doing so is a bit of goodwill on our part, that there's something there that's ... It's a favor, of sorts. Michele and then James.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks. My concern is around the communication piece. To be blunt about it, communications from your department as a whole suck. English is my first language. I would be considered relatively well-educated. I can't understand some of the notifications that get sent. English is my first language. How do you honestly expect registrars whose first language is not English and who do not have a legal team to understand and enact some of the things that you are asking us to do or obliging us to do contractually?

ICANN has vast resources at its disposal compared to ourselves. You have an entire communications team, yet for some bizarre reason, you allow ICANN Legal to draft incomprehensible notices that do not make sense to those of us whose first language is English. And I would look to the non-English speakers in the room to please back me up on this, that you, too, are struggling with this because I find it so incredibly frustrating. Those of us who engage at ICANN and spend [disordinate] amounts of money and time engaging with you on an ongoing basis, then end up being beaten up by the rest of the Internet community because stuff isn't being done. And I look at a lot of this as coming from the terrible, unclear communication coming from GDD via Legal.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Want me to go first on that one? Thank you. Heard that. In fact, we heard it I think right around the time we did the EPDP

implementation phase 1 or the interim policy for EPDP phase 1. We just issued a communication about the privacy-proxy, the extension to the privacy-proxy regime I guess in the contract. We did that ... After that feedback came and we attempted to make it as clean as possible, did we succeed?

MICHELE NEYLON: I'll review it and get back to you.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Thanks. Because that was really recent and relevant feedback and we really worked hard to not turn it into a really complex legal document. So, hopefully, we succeeded. If we didn't, let me know and I'll let Andee know. But we hear you on this and we'll keep working on it.

ANDEE HILL: I hear you. I don't disagree with you on a lot of those. Some are legal notices which are going to be a little bit different than our general communications but please forward them to me. Let me know what's ... I have a first hand in changing those. So, thank you.

MICHELE NEYLON: Just know that I appreciate that, as a legal notice, you do have to send the legal text. It's just that there is no reason why you can't have a more plain language explanation saying, "This is what we want."

GRAEME BUNTON: I'm going to interrupt briefly. I think they've heard that and I think that's a good point. We've got ten minutes left in our agenda for dealing with both GDD and RDAP, so I think there's a little bit more we want to do on that. Communication can be better, guys. Thank you. James?

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks. Two quick questions regarding RDAP. The first one is I think one of the ... And I may be a few months behind. One of the profiles I saw included a reverse search or reverse lookup function. Was that gone now, Rick?

RICK WILHELM: No reverse search.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you. Okay. Great. The second one is – and I haven't looked into this yet. I'm hoping that you have because the 2013 RAA has some hooks in there for RDAP obligations once the specification

has been defined that we would deploy it but it doesn't say anything about adhering to or complying with SLAs. So, where does that come into our contract that these SLAs are now ... We're on the hook for those. And the exception penalties that I assume are part of those SLAs.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Yeah. Unfortunately, when 26th August hits, we're kind of in a bit of unsettled ground. That's why we need to do this amendment, to pour it over SLAs appropriately and those will kick in. There's a lot of things in the SLA document. But those SLAs could kick in over time and then we'd phase out those WHOIS obligations in that same manner is the idea. Does that make sense?

GRAEME BUNTON:

We can all go thank Jeff Neuman for this because he's the one who fought the fight about how exactly SLAs and RDAP requirements and our contracts are going to work. If people hadn't heard it or been clear, we're going to need to go through a contractual amendment process on RDAP which means we're going to work with ICANN collectively. Before we formally start that process we should really be able to get together, have a conversation about what we think that's really going to look like before we kick that process off so that we can have a clean, narrow contractual amendment exclusively related to RDAP.

So, that's going to happen but it's going to ... If we do all of that front work, then it should not be a long, laborious process. But it still going to take some time so there's going to be some gap between the date of RDAP and between when this thing becomes binding on us in our contracts. We all just need to wrap our brains around that and I'll need some help from people to engage in that contractual negotiation process and do that right.

RICK WILHELM:

Just a real quick point of clarification regarding the SLA stuff that was discussed and agreed. There was no discussion. It was only around the technical parameters of the SLAs themselves – what the [inaudible]. There was no discussion about penalties or anything like that. Just so anybody here in the room is kind of aware of that. It was only around what the thresholds were, the percentages and the times and things like that. It didn't have anything to do with penalties or anything. Thanks.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Thanks, Rick, and thanks, Graeme. Really important point. The reason we're talking about this here is to get the process started. We didn't want to just issue a negotiation, like a letter the way the contract describes it if it just comes from the CEO to the chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and "let's go negotiate RDAP".

We're here to talk about it, to socialize it. As Graeme said, focus it down to just RDAP is the thing we're trying to negotiate into the contract and the thing we're trying to get out of the contract is the WHOIS obligation. This is step one of many. As Graeme said, I think the idea is that we can resolve a lot of these issues before a formal negotiation kicks off and we'll need help from the stakeholder groups to do that. And I think, as much as we can do it together across stakeholder group because there's an interoperable system here that we're trying to articulate. Obviously, there are certain things that are registry and registrar specific and we can have those conversations separate.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Russ. Hey, Tom. Tom Keller I think in the chat, who is not here, asked a question very succinctly that I've sort of heard before and it's very simply: why would we do this?

I suspect that he and others in the room would appreciate a reasonably high level about just why. I'm seeing some nods around the table.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Sorry. Also, how? My question is agreeing to do the negotiation for a contract amendment is one thing but how do you actually get us all to sign it?

GRAEME BUNTON: I think the why is why RDAP in general, not the contractual amendment piece. But sure, there's another how into the contractual amendment piece.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: So, why RDAP? I think there's a number of technical reasons for why RDAP. I think the WHOIS technology is some 30 years old or more at this point that's running WHOIS service. I understand that's the service you guys operate and invested in. There's been a lot of work in the technical community to get us to a more modern infrastructure which is RDAP. There's been a lot of work in the community at ICANN to try to get us to a more modern architecture. That also ideally helps scale for the challenges of tomorrow that are challenges of today which are data processing and data protection regulations. We think that it's a better model and we thought we were working in concert with the contracted parties, that we want to go from a WHOIS to an RDAP world and that's why. That's step one.

JAMES BLADEL: I think that, if I can paraphrase Graeme's question, it sounds like RDAP is arriving just in time for it to be completely useless, particularly if it's replaced by some sort of an SSAD, [super SAD]

access model or some other system that is used primarily for accredited parties and has some controls around it. It's in some sort of a centralized model. It sounds like RDAP is you've built the best horse and buggy system, but the freeway is coming through.

GRAEME BUNTON: My understanding is that the SSAD or whatever would be built on top of RDAP. Rick, you have something to add to that?

RICK WILHELM: Yeah. The RDAP ... So, I don't speak for the TSG or for whatever that access model is but the RDAP technology as a technology solution is adaptable on the foundation upon which a unified access model would be built. Building it on top of WHOIS would be staggeringly expensive and difficult for everybody involved on any kind of a client side or a server side. So, I'd actually flip it the other way around is that the technology is shown up and as mature, just in time to save us from what would be a very expensive implementation for a tiered access model in some other way that would be full of completely proprietary technology.

That being said, I'm not taking a position on this contractual matter between the registrars and ICANN, but from a purely

technology perspective, I think that point is plenty clear. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Rick. I think that's probably the best answer for why. [Christian]?

[CHRISTIAN]: I just don't really understand the timing. I understand why we're doing RDAP. It will be fantastic in the future. If we do an access model, then it will be a great system. In August, it will basically be no difference between WHOIS and RDAP. It will serve the same data. No different at all. And this has been [inaudible] without having amendment ready and so on. And you have the risk in August that some people read the contract one way, some people read it another way and it could be a problem with the system in general, transfers and the stability of how we work if this goes wrong. And it could go wrong because it's being rushed through. There's no reason to do it in August. We could have done it next year maybe. It wouldn't make any difference at all.

GRAEME BUNTON: Michele and then we need to get back to some other stuff on GDD. So, let's see if we can wrap up this RDAP bit.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah. Actually, I just have to disagree with most of what other people have been saying about this. I think RDAP is a much more robust way of handling data. At the moment, the WHOIS out put on a thick registry says go look at the RDDS server of the registrar to get something. If you apply RDAP correctly, that shouldn't be the case. It should actually do all the redirects and the forwarding and all of that. So, I have to disagree. The deployment of RDAP, while I do agree on the timing – I don't disagree with you there. In terms of the technology, I totally disagree with everything that has been said on it, apart from what Rick was saying.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Michele. Do we have any other pieces on RDAP? Russ?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: No, I think we can move on.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks, Rick, for dropping in. That was helpful. You answered a good why for us. We'll give you guys a couple more minutes to wrap up some other GDD stuff and then I think we'll carry on with our agenda. Thank you.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Can we go back to our slide three, Zoe? Given the time, I don't think we need to go through all these slides but you guys have them. This is the quick set of bullets around what's happening right now with the implementation on the registration data policy. As of May 20 of this year, the interim registration data policy went into effect, which at the moment, carries through the temporary specification requirements. There's a multi-stage implementation to how we get to a full-fledged registration data policy. I know you all have members on the EPDP phase two and you also have members on the IRT implementing the phase one. So, I think you'll probably cover that in your other sessions. If there are any questions, let us know. Otherwise, we'll move on from this one.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: From staff's perspective, what's the timing of completing the actual policy for publication?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I think we're going about it in an orderly fashion. I don't think we have a set timeline. I think we're going through it, analysis, recommendation by recommendation and it'll take ... We're going as fast as we can and we're going as fast as we can in concert with the IRT. But we know and we're all working towards having implemented by the deadline specified in the EPDP.

Next one and probably the last one we really need to talk through is we owe you an update on across field address validation and we owe you an update on privacy-proxy implementation.

So across field address validation. Essentially, we're on pause. We think, given the state of the registration data system, we need to continue to be on pause until after phase one is implemented and can think about restarting the work. We'll keep an eye on phase two, given the conversations about accuracy going on there just to see if there's anything that may creep into that. But that one is going to be on pause for a little while and we'll keep you guys updated with our thinking on that. But essentially, we don't have a ton of ... We need to come to a common understanding of what the implementation would look like and then we can assess how feasible and from a variety of standpoints – technical reasonable, commercial reasonableness, and legality now. Any questions there?

On privacy-proxy, in a recent letter back from the GNSO Council punted it back, we had asked them, "Do you think we should pause this work?" They said, "ICANN Org, you're in charge of implementation, so do what you need to do." We still think we should pause the work. But they did ask a question about the change of registrant issue that punted to privacy-proxy implementation IRT. So, if that work doesn't go forward, where do we put it next? I don't want to solve for it right now, but that's

something that we're starting to think about and hopefully you all have start thinking about and I think it would be helpful for us to get on the same page before we go to the IRT because it talks about doing both of those things – talking about it with the registrars and talking about with the IRT of the privacy-proxy implementation. So, our goal is let's talk about it and maybe that can be a subject of one of our future policy calls.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah. We think both of those things should be paused. We're certainly not amenable to having two different disclosure regimes, whatever comes out of EPDP and then privacy and proxy. They need to be harmonized. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. I think, actually, the transfer discussion is something that's also being held at the GNSO Council level. So, there is some paper floating around.

GRAEME BUNTON: Is that the FOA?

MICHELE NEYLON: It's not just the FOA. There's a larger conversation. I think Darcy or Pam might be able to speak to it better.

GRAEME BUNTON: We can talk about transfers in general probably a little bit later on. Do you have something, Pam?

PAM LITTLE: There is a few moving parts at the moment. I think in the letter Russ referred to was about the change of registrant issue involving proxy-privacy registration and the council advice all recommended path forward was for ICANN Org to have a conversation with Registry Stakeholder Group to work out the issue. Is that right? Is that what you're referring to?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Yeah, that's the one.

PAM LITTLE: There's IRTP review, then there's also the gaming FOA issue. There are several issues. Thanks.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Yeah. So, as the new guy to registrant land, it sounds like transfers are a bit messy. We need to get up to speed on that real quick for you guys.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah. Do we have transfer? Where did my agenda go? No. We might jam that into AOB. Oh, maybe part of Tech Ops. Okay. We're going to address transfers at some point later in this conversation here today.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Do we have more time or no? Maybe it can be a future policy call.

GRAEME BUNTON: We're running into our EPDP conversation but I think we've got almost an hour for that. So, we have ... I'll give you like three more minutes. K

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Okay. I'll give that to Andee.

ANDEE HILL: So, can you advance the slide for me? I just wanted to give you an update on the naming services portal. We are on track. In late Q3 or Q4, we will be releasing what we call the version two and we will be – this year. We will be sunsetting [RADR] at that time.

I just added a few items in here, some of the things that you'll have access to in [NSP]. We are looking to closely mirror what the registry has and this will allow a foundation for the compliance piece that is coming I think Q2 next year. I know, from what we

hear from you, that's what you really want is the compliance piece. Does anybody have any questions?

GRAEME BUNTON: No but hear the usual grumbling about how this is seven years overdue. It's nearly completely useless in V1. It has a screenshot or something in it. There is just an ocean of cynicism that this is coming and going to be useful. I look forward to that happening and that will be great. Then, anything in here about payment? Can we start managing any of that through the ...

ANDEE HILL: That will come after the compliance piece.

GRAEME BUNTON: So we're looking where we can actually manage our financial relationship with ICANN sometime in 2025.

ANDEE HILL: I don't have the exact date. I will get back to you on that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Graeme, I did have a question, actually, before you said no questions. Are there any plans ... I know it would be way off so I'm sort of foolish for even asking this. Are there any plans to allow

registrar and registry combined [NSP] accounts for those that are on both sides of the spectrum? Thanks.

ANDEE HILL:

Yes, there is. When you log on as a credentialed user, you will actually be able to toggle between registry and registrar and then you will also, once the compliance piece is on there, you'll be able to toggle through to the compliance area. So, you will have one log-in. With the version 2, you will be able to credential additional users. Right now, you can only have the primary contact. And Graeme, you're correct, it doesn't really do a whole lot, so you'll be able to manage your users. It will be similar to registry where you'll have a roster of credentialed users that you can move around on your own. But you will need to contact our GSC support if you wanted to add users.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Real quick. Just to jump on that about it doesn't do that much. That weekly list of tickets that compliance no longer supports or won't give to registrars who ask for it. It is there through [NSP] so you can actually go in there and see your list of open tickets and those closed within the last 30 days as well, too. I use it every week, actually.

ANDEE HILL: Thank you, Owen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Quick question. With RDAP coming up and [inaudible] provide our URLs and so forth, anything in quarter 3 and quarter 4 2019, if I need to update that information, how am I going to be doing that?

ANDEE HILL: You'll be updating that in [RADR] until [RADR] is sunsetted. We will port that over to [NSP], and then after that time, you will need to contact us to have us update it for you.

GRAEME BUNTON: I'd be belaboring any more of this. Keep going, guys. Do you have anything else for us in one more minute or so?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Just a general thank you. Thanks for having us here, Graeme and team. Thanks for thinking about bringing us in to more of these conversations in the future. I think that will be helpful and I think it will really help the communication. So, I think we probably send way too many emails now because we don't really have another way of talking to you all that frequently and if we can build this as one of those channels, that will help I think everyone with the

communications. But definitely hearing Michele. Got to make them easier to read.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Great. Thank you, both, for joining us. That was good. Next up. How's everybody doing? I feel like it's a quiet room. Day three. Let's all get pumped up for some EPDP phase 2 discussion. What's that? Yeah. This is the best stuff! And I think it's James that is running this bad boy. Over to you.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thanks. Really, I know everybody just cannot get enough of the EPDP phase 2. But because of just everything that's going on and because I volunteered, like, probably 45 minutes ago to do this slide, Matt and Owen are going to jump in and help me out as well.

So, maybe just start off, level set. Everyone knows the EPDP is moving into phase two which is a model for access and disclosure of RDS data that would otherwise be redacted for privacy. And we're trying to do so I think with, from our perspective, eyes on the prize as to eliminate risk associated with GDPR and some of the other privacy legislation that we're all operating under.

The EPDP phase two is meeting twice in Marrakech. We met once all day yesterday and then meeting again tomorrow. I won't be there for that. We are a man down. Volker broke his ankle in

London, so we are really stretched thin in terms of our members and alternates. But we're going to cover it as well as we can.

So, just as an update, we've been working on the worksheets. This is the purpose worksheets and the use case worksheets. Is that what you mean by worksheets? No? Which worksheets? The ones that we went through all day yesterday before.

GRAEME BUNTON: The ones that Sarah does for us.

JAMES BLADEL: By the way, you're not allowed to come here anymore without Sarah, Graeme. That's a new requirement. We have spent a lot of time talking about definitions which has been a frustrating exercise.

Council board consultation input. The phase one recommendations were almost entirely accepted by the ICANN board with two exceptions. One is that after receiving some input from the European Commission they set aside one of the purposes that was in recommendation one, purpose two. They also made an interesting change around recommendation 12 which was about registrant org. They didn't necessarily accept ... They didn't accept it. They didn't reject it out of hand. They actually substituted a different idea.

So the GNSO Council had asked the different stakeholders to send some feedback to help them put together some feedback for the board. That took place on Monday as there was some board and council interaction. I think we're continuing to work on that to help get the board past some of their concerns on recommendation 12 which is really about registrant org.

And just to step out of the weeds for a second, registrant org is an empty field that people have been using for a lot of different purposes and a lot of non-standard meanings have been input into that field.

The EPDP phase one is now going to start treating that as a ... Put some definitions around registration org. So, we're trying to give the legacy users who may have put some out-of-date or aspirant or just copied their name, maybe, into registrant org. We're trying to give them an opportunity to either confirm or correct that information or to opt out of having registrant org data in the first place. So, that's causing a little bit of consternation and I have to continuously remind folks that aren't familiar with the registrar space that just because we remove some data from WHOIS doesn't mean we don't have it. It doesn't mean we don't know how to contact these folks. They're our customers. They pay the bills. We know how to reach them. But removing ... I think there's still some concern that when you remove something from WHOIS, it's gone forever.

I don't know if Matt or Owen want to jump in at any time. They're both kind of heads down. I'm just moving through here.

Third-party purposes and responses in user groups. There's been some discussions about walking – and Thomas Rickert has been helpful in this in walking the use cases through from ... I think we started one yesterday which was essentially trademark and intellectual property holders and establishing the whole end-to-end lifecycle of what a request and response would look like and what the purposes would be in establishing a legitimate basis for accessing that.

It's a torturous process. It's very detailed and each detail can sometimes go off the rails into a very sometimes helpful but sometimes academic discussion about the legality of the legitimate basis that we're trying to assert or claim, and then of course all the edge cases that may be involved. Owen, do you want to ...?

Well, the next section is phase two early input response and that was almost entirely done by Sarah in consolidating a lot of our feedback, so I'm going to pass or kick it over to Zoe. I will say one just inside baseball thing. The narrative is, at this meeting and prior to this, is that contracted parties are not giving this effort the urgency and the resources and the priority that it needs, that it's going too slowly and it's not making enough progress.

We pointed out I think on a couple of different occasions that we and the registries were the only groups to actually meet the deadline for submitting input. Every other group has asked for extension after extension and they still haven't done anything. And some of the groups still can't even give us a date certain when they will have their input turned in.

So, we made a point of calling this out, that you can't continue to bang this drum that contracted parties are not giving this attention and are dragging our feet, etc., when we're the only ones coming to class with our homework done. So, we were a little tired of that narrative and trying to use this opportunity in Marrakech to push back on that.

GRAEME BUNTON:

I'll jump in very briefly and there's not enough people in the room to really hear this, but we should be super proud and impressed with the volume of work that our EPDP members are getting done. It is bananas and they're killing it. Like James just said, us and the registries are the only people getting it done and it is hard yard. So, we all, if you haven't bought your EPDP member a beer this week, you need to do so. They are killing themselves for you. Thanks.

MATT: Thanks, Graeme. I think, speaking for all of us, we'll give Zoe all that credit. Honestly ... [applause]. And Sarah. But I will tell you we would not be meeting the deadlines we're meeting if it were not for Zoe keeping us on top.

GRAEME BUNTON: I just want to point out the registries have said that as well.

MATT: Yeah, literally. Well, Zoe has sort of taken the registries under her wing and she's brought them along with us, which they appreciate. But just to pick up on James's point, I would encourage any of you if you're in conversations just casually about the EPDP in general and how things are going, feel free to make that point to anyone that you're having a conversation with. "Listen, contracted parties are doing all of the work that's being asked of them. They're doing it on time." So, this narrative, like James said, that we don't have the same urgency that they're wanting this thing to drag on is just absolutely not connected to the reality of it. Thanks.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: If I'm not mistaken, I think it was the GAC who couldn't commit to a time that they would provide their feedback.

JAMES BLADEL:

Yeah. Every other group just asked for more extension and the GAC said “TBD”. Thanks, Graeme. And I want to point out, too, that we have members and we have alternates and all of that goes out the window when the rubber meets the road. We work as a team of six, seven if you count Zoe. We’re all interchangeable parts. Everybody is kind of patting each other on the back saying I’m probably doing C- work one week and then I’ll pick something up and then Matt steps in. We’ve got each other’s backs and it’s a great team. All led by Zoe.

I don’t know where we left off here and I don’t know if you want me to just walk through these bullets because some of them are actually kind of blurry to me at this point.

SSAD is – and by the way, if that’s an acronym that you’re not familiar with we’ve been calling it Super SAD or Sucks and Sad or whatever. It’s a Standardized System for Access and Disclosure. We’re trying to push that as a replacement of UDAM or UAM or some of the other things that were saying uniform access model. The other terms that you were hearing – particularly here or previously – are I think ... Russ and Rick mentioned the TSG (the Technical Study Group) which was a group that was putting together technical models of how you would pull off a disclosure model that was trying to policy agnostic.

We've also had now three separate individual groups present to the EPDP their ideas on what this thing should look like. Then, of course, we heard today in answer to Graeme's question of "why RDAP?" We heard from Rick that RDAP is going to be the wiring and the plumbing that makes all of this SSAD stuff come through for us.

That seems to be the direction we're heading in. Of course, my concern is that some of the folks who were presenting are making a lot of ... They have to. They have to make assumptions about the policy in order to have – as inputs into their model. My concern is a lot of folks who are only participating in EPDP from a data consumption perspective, they can already picture themselves driving this car. They can kind of see the use cases and how they would use it. But the models that we were shown, some of them ... Smarter people than me have said they're dead on arrival. Many of the components of them are DOA just in terms of the legality of centralizing that data or transmitting it or cross-border stuff that I hear and I repeat but I don't get into.

Do you want to turn it over to questions, Owen? Take it away.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Just to clarify, Super Sad. The reason why it refers to both access and disclosure is because we couldn't agree on which one to use,

so we're using both for now until it's determined whether it's access or disclosure.

JAMES BLADEL:

Yeah. And that goes back to the third bullet point here where we're talking about working definitions. You don't want to know how much time we spent on access versus disclosure. It will make your hair curl. I mean, look at Zoe. Very curly hair.

From a high level, that's where things sit. We have a legal working group that's trying to address some questions. There's going to be a face-to-face meeting in September. We just received word that the budget was established for another face-to-face meeting sometime maybe January. To save money, we are trying to do that at ICANN offices which usually means Los Angeles which pisses a lot of people off that it's in the US. So, we may be back in Toronto in January again which is fun. But I think that we are working to ... And we do make I think a disproportionate of progress during those face-to-face meetings. Some of the budget has been earmarked for professional mediators to help moderate the conversation and keep us from going in circles. They've been very, very helpful. I know that sounds like a luxury maybe that a low-budget effort cannot afford and I would stress that we probably wouldn't be where we are without them at this point because they really move things along.

We can dive into the questions next. Your concerns about an access model like that, whether or not ICANN or some ICANN contracted provider sits in the middle and is kind of this clearing house for these requests, whether have to answer these questions or these queries in the blind. If we have some residual liability for fulfilling these requests, then we have to have the ability to say no, right? How many are we going to get? Do we need a human reviewing these? Volker seems to be of the opinion that we're over-engineering this because the volume of requests is so low that building an automated system is only going to encourage high-volume requests instead of if we did it piecemeal and manual, we could probably be done by Christmas.

So, all of these questions I think reopen for debate and discussion and I think the EPDP members and alternates have been trying to synthesize all of the best interests of registrars around the world and different business models. We have corporate, retail, wholesale. We have Europe and North America and we're trying to ... I don't think we've ever encountered any divergence in our interest but if you spot one or if you think you might know of some, please let us know. If you're following this and you think it's going off the rails, well we already knew that, but if you have an idea of how to get back on the rails, please let us know. Let's just throw it open then for questions because I'm probably tapped out in terms of what I'm able to share. Graeme, go ahead.

GRAEME BUNTON:

That's great. Thank you, James. The first thing I'm going to make everyone go do right now, if you have not, is fill out the SSAD survey we sent to the mailing list. I can't remember the title of that email but it's going to be in the past few days. SSAD Survey. For action and review, SSAD survey and EPDP phase two early input response. It came out from Zoe on the 18th at 4:29 PM Eastern Standard Time. Do it right now if you have it. I'm totally serious. The feedback in there is great and I will share some of it but I don't want to spoil it. So, you've got to go do it right now. Zoe just put it in the chat, so please go do that because I think it's going to be really valuable input for our EPDP members. I see a hand from Michele.

The last thing I'll say while I'm still rambling is that linkage ... So, it's the second to last bullet point there before "other" – [inaudible] of other. That linkage between liability and decision-making that James was just talking about is so crucial and is really going to be the tipping point for I think this whole thing. If we have any liability, we still need to have decision-making in this. That fundamental question of "is that liability removed from us?" is not ours to make. I think it's probably the European Data Protection Board or someone like that. I think the chances of them answering that question definitively might be pretty low. That's going to have a huge impact on all of this work. So, that's

really a question that all of you individually I think need to stew on a little bit because it's going to change the shape of this whole thing.

JAMES BLADEL:

Graeme, to that point, they could pull the rug out from under us completely. We've tried to make this point is that we're working ahead as intelligently as we can but we're working on spec. And if the European data authorities say there's just no way a centralized model with disconnected decision-making can possibly work and still be legal under GDPR, then I don't know where we go from there, honestly.

So, we're working on one big assumption and that assumption is that there's a way to do this legally, and if they come out and they paint us into a corner, we're in uncharted waters.

So, it's possible that our work could change. It's possible that our work could get harder or get less work. It's possible that they could just pull the rug out entirely.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, James. The rug out entirely I think looks like there is no centralized thing and all of us individually have to respond to each and every data access request that we get on our own

principles and approaches. You can go ahead and then I've got Pam.

MATT: Yeah. I was going to say that there's been some discussion about, if that does happen, then what we are building is a standardized request system. That's essentially what it turns into. If we're not building a standardized access, then we'll build a standardized request system. So, we'll see.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Matt. Pam?

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, James, and thank you for EPDP team again. I have a question and maybe ... A comment first, then a question. The comment is James referred to this as like driving cars on a highway or something. I feel like yesterday you had two presentations from two groups and it seemed to me like the driverless car issue. You already have the driver's car, but you don't have the policy to regulate the liability piece. Sounds like or looks like what we are facing.

My question is about timeline. You mentioned about the resource that's been approved by ICANN Org for the two face-to-face

meetings and the allowance for the mediation services. I think that then there was this question about where is the work plan because it's contingent upon having a work plan from the team. So, what's your sense about timeline?

JAMES BLADEL:

So, unless it's changed, I think the most recent timeline I heard was that we are trying to have some type of an initial report I had thought by Montreal with the time between Montreal and the end of the year/Cancun working towards a final report and council and board consideration.

I've heard others. I'm not going to name names. I've heard others say the line in the sand is October 1st. I don't know how we get there. Well, let me put it this way. If we're going to even hit the conservative timeframes, the pace of project needs to pick up. And what we heard on Monday was that means a lot of folks believe that we need to have more calls and longer calls.

What we've tried to establish is there is no direct correlation between the amount of progress we make and the amount of time we spend on calls. In fact, it would probably make the opposite argument.

So, I think we're concerned that these timelines are aggressive and yet we hear a lot of groups saying, "This date or else." So,

timeline, initial report, hopefully Montreal. Final report, around the end of the year. Board consideration, Cancun.

MATT: Sorry, Pam. Everything James said is right. The other thing I would point out is, keep in mind, we actually have not had any face-to-face time with our new chair. So, he actually wasn't at the meeting on Tuesday. He had I think a family commitment. Was it a wedding? So, tomorrow will actually be our first face-to-face meeting. We'll get a much better sense for how things are going to progress after that. But what James described is the plan as far as we understand it.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Matt, and thank you, James. I just want to [inaudible]. So, council will be expecting a work plan from the EPDP team and then be able to provide that back to [inaudible]?

MICHELE NEYLON: It's in the letter that you were sent via us today.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, the one that came yesterday or last night?

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah. This all happened the last few hours.

MATT: That’s right. But I think one of the challenges I think we found ourselves in is we start off down a certain path and we try that for a week or two meetings or so, and then we realize, nope, that’s not the right way to do it. So, we’ve had a bunch of false starts, frankly, where we just haven’t really gotten – at least I don’t have a clear sense of how the hell we’re going to actually get there at this point. So, hopefully, like I said, after Thursday we’ll have a better sense of that.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Matt. Not to put a finer point on it, if you have a look at the letter, which I know you only got in the last few hours, the continued funding for both the face-to-face meetings and the support for the mediators is contingent on there being a work plan. I don’t know how else to put a finer point on it.

Now, whether or not you’re able to follow the work plan that you give, that’s not the thing. It’s just there has to be a work plan. No work plan, the funding disappears. The funding for the work on the EPDP falls under the remit of David Olive which is what is in that letter that came from I think it was Cherine. Just so we’re

aware. I'm not trying to ... I understand what you're saying. I'm not trying to beat up on you. It's really just so you're aware.

The other thing is just on the earlier points that James was making about these presentations from various people, let's not just call them people. Let's be honest. Let's call a spade a spade. They're vendors trying to sell solutions.

JAMES BLADEL: We're not the buyers. They can try to sell us anything they want.

MICHELE NEYLON: No, no. No, sorry. My concern is that they are going around, some of them are going around to various other parts of the broader ICANN community trying to sell these solutions as if these were de facto solutions that would be both, A, acceptable and, B, legal. And that somebody really does need to make it clear that while I can understand and I don't have an issue with you guys having those presentations and looking at them and exploring them and all that, it's not that nobody is endorsing any of them. I'm not saying that you have.

MATT: All fair points, Michele, and I will say James, to his credit, when first Steve Crocker was brought in said this is going to open

floodgates, and once we allow one to present, you can't really turn the others down. But I think we all – and by all I mean the entire EPDP group – after we had those two presentations yesterday, I think we all agreed we're done, that's good. We've heard from these three. If anyone else wants to put forward, they can record a presentation. They'll make it available to us. But we aren't going to be having anymore presentations like that. Frankly, there's really nothing stopping any of those folks from going out and pitching this to whoever they want to pitch it to.

I do share James's concern that once someone saw that shiny big object displayed on the wall the other day, they're going to go, "Well, yeah, let's just do that," before we actually create the actual policy. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Alright. I think we're about on track for this particular bit. Does everybody in the room feel like they've got a handle on what's going on here? Does anybody have any sort of broad EPDP questions? Jacques, please.

JACQUES BLANC:

It's not so much a question. It's more a comment. There's a kind of irony here. To think that we are fighting over disclosing or not bogus info. Because more often than ever, when there is a real

infringement which necessitates real action from whatever enforcement body, [inaudible] in the WHOIS, is not true because the real infringers don't [inaudible]. So, at the end of the day, I think someday – it might be far away – but we will have to think about do we want – we, as a community. Do we want any form of real truthful WHOIS which can be a serious basis for infringement or do we want to continue fighting over whatever it is now?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Jacques. I think that's probably a pretty long discussion. Certainly for lots of people there's real intent of not to put your real information where you know it was being displayed everywhere, so there is some tension between how public it was and privacy. But you're right. I think we run into a real problem if there's a real barrier to getting this data and people jump through a bunch of hoops and fill out forms and provide evidence, new stuff. Then providing people with garbage is going to be problematic and will likely have some sort of consequences. So, it's certainly worth thinking about. You can respond to that and then I've got Michele.

JACQUES BLANC:

I will do a quick follow-up but maybe we will have to think ... And I'm not pleading for that because I've got no interest whatsoever here but we might have some kind of solution with the trademark

clearinghouse and the SMD file. The SMD file being a number which is completely anonymous and then there's a database [inaudible]. But there the discussions start again. Who are the database and so on?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Jacques. I've got I think two more survey responses in since we've been sitting here. Expecting a few more to come in and then we can talk about that. So, keep filling it out if you haven't. Carlos, you had a hand, too. And I think it was actually before Michele's, so please.

CARLOS:

No problem. It's a comment to the members of the council. What James just described is for me a symptom of the new structure of the PDPs, that we want this representativeness and what's delaying this commentary is probably because the other groups don't have much to comment. You should be leading this commentary process because you are the effected party in terms of what's going to come out there.

The reason I'm mentioning it is because this morning I heard the chair talking about the way they want to proceed with the cases. If this is going to happen with the cases again, the risk of delay is very large. I think there should be a leadership or priority or

initiative always coming out of the contracted parties and not waiting for everybody to comment, because otherwise, you are going to be slowed down all the way down just because of this structural idea that the representation is equal. Okay, the representation is equal. That's nice, that's fine. We feel good about it. But it should not delay commentary process or initiatives, particularly looking forward to the case studies you are going to present because that's a flag. That's really a red flag what you just mentioned. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Graeme, can I offer a brief ... ? Just to respond briefly, yeah, I think that's correct is that we can highlight the leadership of the contracted party taking the initiative. I think that's what we were trying to do yesterday in acknowledging the difference between the narrative that we're holding up this process versus the reality that we are putting the comments out there, we are trying to drive this forward. So, that's what we were trying to highlight was not necessarily shaming other groups for not getting their stuff done but saying, "Look, we did our homework. Stop saying that we're dragging our feet."

Then, the second was if the other groups, including the GAC, don't have anything to say on this issue, that would be new. They've

had a lot to say I think up until this point and I think we kind of need that input in a standardized form so that we can proceed.

I don't want to say that we're waiting because we can't wait forever I think was the point you were making. But also, we can't proceed without in the absence of that feedback from the folks and the groups who will actually consume the data.

GRAEME BUNTON: Michele, did you still have something to offer?

MICHELE NEYLON: I think the point Jacques is raising, whether we're both approaching it from the same perspective or not, is still something that people really do need to really look at. This absolute fixation with WHOIS, whereas the data that we often find people are looking for are things like IP addresses, how things were paid for, what other services are attached to them – not the WHOIS data. And all the time they don't really care about that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Michele. I think we can wrap up this bit on the EPDP, although we're next going into the EPDP phase 1 IRT, right? Okay. This whole thing is moving quickly and also at the same time, super slowly. But there's huge impacts of this potentially on all of

our businesses and I know it's like a crazy fire hose. We certainly spend a lot of time and energy making those weekly updates that go to the list about what's going on. Please read them. Please give us feedback. It really helps all these members to hear what people have to say and think about everything that's going on. So, I know it's a lot, but do please try and stay as engaged as possible on this.

Next up is a little bit more on a slightly different [inaudible] I think, which is what's going on with the work out of the phase one and how is it going to get implemented. I have no idea who's on the hook for this. Luc! Alright! Take it away.

LUC SEUFER:

Okay. The group, we are now on our fourth or five meeting or fifth call. Fourth? Yeah. This is a very odd one to me because we are doing basically nothing during the call. It's just a recap of what we did between. So, we are meeting every other week and we almost are only working on Google Docs. And during the call, like I said, it's just a recap of what we've done.

The other odd part to me is that we are 11 registrars. We have 11 reps on this group. There is only three registry and just one BC and one IPC.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think there's some more joining.

LUC SEUFER: If [inaudible], it's like we don't care. Okay. So, we are working like that. So, we are working on every ... Every few days, we are working on a new recommendation so we are looking at each recommendation one by one. So, that's what we are going to do.

So, first one. The purpose is we all agreed that we need to put the purposes of data processing in somewhere. We have not agreed yet where to put it. I think it was Sarah who proposed to put it in the bylaws of ICANN and not in the policy itself.

The second recommendation was the work on additional purposes for EPDP phase two which is working on response, so we have nothing to do. There's nothing to do policy-wise.

Recommendation three, the work on the Super SAD. You have a trademark on it? So, this one is also outside of the scope of the cox policy so we are not working on it at this time.

Recommendation four is the accuracy. We all agree that the policy should not change the accuracy [inaudible] that we have in our RAA and RA.

Recommendation five, this is where we have [inaudible]. That's the collection of registration data. So, we are trying to simplify the

text of the recommendation and ICANN staff who have [inaudible] we have 14 staff on it. They have more manpower than us and they are sending us a proposal that we need to review very rapidly, in my opinion. But we are trying to stay on top of it and ensure that we are abiding by what the recommendation are saying. For now, it's still in discussion.

Recommendation six, consent for publication. It's just the one that says that we need to have some mechanism, the registrar, to have some mechanism to gather consent of the data subjects, so we have nothing to do here.

Recommendation 7 and 8.3, like before we are not looking at recommendation one by one, but some are gathered together like [inaudible] because they both pertain to transfers. So here, that's the same as for recommendation five. We are trying to simplify what the EPDP recommendations say, to have a [inaudible] policy.

Recommendation 9, spending. The big question right now is if we [abide by] what the recommendation says, we should have the policy targeted would be February 29th of next year, which means that if we kept the six-month [inaudible] that we have to implement, it means that we should be finished by August which won't be the case. The proposal we received was to shorten the

six-month implementation delay which I think nobody wants. This is one where we should make ourselves clear to ICANN.

Any questions? Eric?

ERIC ROKOBAUER:

Yeah. Just to add a little more commentary to what Luc was saying. Today was actually the first IRT meeting face-to-face that we had. Prior, we did have two or three calls, and before today a lot of the conversations were just instructing us on how we're going to go about doing the work. To Luc's point, when we were talking about recommendation five, collection of registration data today, there was a lot of discussion that we've been waiting for, members of the IRT.

So, the way ICANN was handling addressing it, resolving comments, was rapid fire, was really fast. It put a lot of the IRT on pause. So, I think it was helpful to have the face-to-face because it really enlightened a lot of us that we really need to be paying attention and watching what ICANN is looking to do as far as trying to hit that deadline. So, we need to do a lot of pushback with that, especially in our reviews.

And for those that aren't following it, definitely more the merrier to join us. How many of the registrars are on the ...? More to come. More join us. What is helpful, how we're doing the IRT, a lot

of it is in Google Docs. We're seeing a lot of the material. ICANN is sending them right at us. It's helpful to see it in action. Again, recommend joining and helping us.

DARCY SOUTHWELL:

I love this subject. I think back to the pain we had with the transfer part C policy, where you have recommendations, you have policy that doesn't match and you have policy that's not even operational. Like, it just can't happen that way.

So, I guess I'm really worried about the timeline because – and the council got an update from Dennis Chang yesterday that pretty much said, “Oh, well, it will be effective February 20th.” We all know that. I'm really worried how we're going to get there if they're writing a policy and that policy does not well match something that can actually work because we can't have another transfer part C – is that what we said? That was just a colossal disaster. And now we have ramifications that are not just operational, but we have to comply with GDPR. So it's like we have a whole other layer here that makes it more complicated.

So, whatever we can do on council to help because we're going to have to I think discuss this tomorrow because we didn't get a very good update from Dennis Chang about, again, what's the work plan and what's the timeline? Because you guys can't review it in a day and it's perfect. That's just not going to happen. Thanks.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Just to add to that, too, that will be helpful. One of the things that Dennis did show us, and his team, is the list of activities associated to the IRT. So, one of the earlier asks – I can't remember, it may have been registry that asked – was to get a map or updates of how long each of these activities could take or normally take. And that ask was made but we haven't seen that yet. So, that might help.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Eric. Thanks, Darcy. Anyone not from endurance want to chip in? Vlad?

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: I remember [inaudible] meeting, for every single [inaudible] review and discussed, there's a sort of starting date and ending date for it. [inaudible] on the actual Google Docs themselves, that's essentially the predictive timeline in terms of where you guys are actually going. Whether you guys stick to that timeline is entirely up to the group. But I understand [inaudible] every single task, proposed item this and that. Which is odd, because you guys discussed five today but that's due to start on the 10th of June I think.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Just to add a little bit. Yeah, it's very confusing because those dates are to make sure we review what ICANN gave us, but then as we've said in our comments, we're like, "So, we still want to talk about this." Anyone can add their review and analysis on these docs, but we still have to talk as a team. It's a little odd there, so we'll have to go back and discuss with that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Cool. Code will have to be written. It's going to be fun. I certainly appreciate you guys also paying attention and everybody else who's paying attention to the IRT, because again, that's a bunch of work as well. We can't all pay attention, so thanks. You had one more piece to add there?

GRAEME BUNTON: Just to give another shout-out, they keep coming from Sarah Wyld. She's another one that's been doing a lot of comments on it. So, if you guys see her, make sure, give her kudos and thanks. I've got to find out if she's actually doing any work-work.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: She did say she's keeping track of her time for this, so in theory, you could ask her for that.

GRAEME BUNTON: She doesn't report up to me, actually. She reports up into product, so I'm going to have to have a chat with her manager. But I will certainly pass all of those good wishes along. Thanks, all.

I've got 11:54. We have a break in six minutes. Is there anything we can accomplish in six minutes or do I want an extra break? Yeah, it was maybe silly. So, maybe we'll take a break and then we're going to come back with an update from the GNSO Council, Tech Ops. Compliance, Policy Team. We're going to talk briefly about the charter and some work that came out of the strategy meeting. Then we'll have time for a little AOB. So, there's still plenty to come. I know it's getting late in the afternoon but let's go blast some coffee. Wait, [Christian] first before we go coffee blast.

[CHRISTIAN]: I just wanted to add that when you come back from the break that we have available chairs at the table for everyone sitting in the back. There's no reason not to sit at the table. So, after the break, come sit at the table.

GRAEME BUNTON: Alright, guys. You've got until 10 past. Oh, it's a short break. You've got 15 minutes. Go grab a coffee. Oh, it's not an official

break. This is an us break. Okay. Go have an us break. No coffee. Blast some fresh air. And we'll see you back here in 15 minutes. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Can we pause the recording, please? And to everyone that's in the Zoom room, you don't have to leave the room. We're just taking a pause, so you can stay up, get your own coffees and we'll start again soon.

GRAEME BUNTON: Alright, guys. Are you guys ready in the back of the room to start us up? Great. Alright. Let's all take our seats and get going again. I am well aware that it is now 5:00 PM. We're long in the day and we still I think have another hour of agenda, hour-and-a-half. Oh, boy. So, this is a long haul. I get that these are better in the morning. But this is the only time slot I could get. So, we'll try and keep this light and vibrant, make sure everybody is engaged. If all goes well, then maybe we can through the agenda a little bit quicker than we've got set out. So, let's get right back into it. What is next on our list of fun things to do? Council update. Pam, please take it away.

PAM LITTLE:

Hi, everyone. I'd firstly like to acknowledge we actually have my fellow councilors here, Carlos, with us and we have Michele and obviously Darcy. But I'm tasked to do the update but please feel free to add or correct.

Today I want to share with you what's going on at the council. I use this topic like the headline, the latest is the council never goes through unchartered waters. It does feel like that. I think we keep hearing about we're in unchartered territories or waters and it does feel like that on the council because we are dealing with a number of issues that we faced for the first time. So, here I have a list of some of those as examples and some of them maybe not the first time but complex and difficult of what we are actually doing at the moment.

The first one, we actually – James has already talked a little bit about that. This one is about ... I won't repeat what's going on. This is about all the phase one recommendations and two of them the board did not fully adopt.

So, because of that, some of our members, I don't know whether you know, there is an ICANN bylaws mandated consultation. It's like a mandatory consultation because of the board's action of not adopting all the EPDP phase one adopted by the council, then sent up to the board. So, we had that bylaw mandated engagement or consultation on Monday. And from my

perspective, I feel that consultation actually went quite well, because as it turned out, it really wasn't a big issue at all. It was kind of some sort of misunderstanding.

So, the path forward now seems to be the council will be drafting a letter explaining – because one of the recommendations – sorry, recommendation 1, purpose, there's no controversy. Everyone is okay with that. There's more work to be done with that. So, with regard to recommendation 12, the treatment of [org field] after non-verification or confirmation, what work happened with the data whether it's redaction or deletion. The council will draft a letter explaining more clearly the intention of that recommendation in consultation with the EPDP team about the content of that letter, then send that letter off to the board. Hopefully, that would do the trick for the board to then change its mind, adopt those two recommendations, then we can have this one closed off. So, that's that item.

The next one is about the IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanism. It's a mouthful, I'm sorry. I talked about this on a number of occasions with our members here and elsewhere. This one, why it is challenging is very simple. IGOs and INGOs wanted a new dispute resolution mechanism or a modified UDRP or URS so they can use those mechanisms or the new mechanism for trademark infringement because they feel like,

their position is those existing mechanisms do not work for them because they are not a typical trademark holder.

So, we had a working group that spent four years working on that charter goal but it failed to deliver. It's not fail to deliver. They did deliver recommendations but their recommendations, one of them basically said there's no need to have a new dispute resolution mechanism just for IGOs and INGOs.

So, the council was agonizing for many months. We have the final report from the working group July last year. We didn't vote on those five recommendations until April this year. Basically, we adopted four recommendations that are kind of just status quo. It means nothing changed to the UDRP. No new dispute resolution mechanism. But we refer one of the recommendations – recommendation 5 – to the RPM Working Group phase 2.

Now, the thing is, the GAC was so unhappy about what the council did with those recommendations because it didn't really achieve the goal they wanted, now those recommendations passed or adopted by the council are actually with the board. But the board has just written to the council advising the council that they do not intend to be involved in a so-called facilitated dialogue between the council and the GAC. Again, this is some other mechanism. If there's a policy recommendation that's

inconsistent with GAC advice, then there has to be some sort of a dialogue going on and facilitated by the board.

The council has been resisting to have such a facilitated dialogue and I think the board made the right call – not to get involved. So, they're saying you, the council and the GAC, try to work it out about your differences and solve this problem. In the meantime, we're going to put those policy recommendations that are sent up from the council for public comment, maybe see what the public says. I think the board basically is buying a bit more time for themselves to see how this plays out.

So, the council now had a meeting with the GAC, a small number of council representatives, including myself and others, had a meeting with GAC representatives, mainly IGO or INGO. Some GAC members were interested in this topic yesterday.

Basically, what they are pushing now – the GAC is pushing now – is they want to redo the policy to be able to develop a new dispute resolution mechanism for IGOs and INGOs.

So, this is [inaudible] keep coming back to the council, keep appearing on the council's agenda. The council is trying to deal with this. I really don't know how it's going to pan out. I feel like they are very diverse views, extreme views. Some people feel like that we should not, or the community should not, just be dictated by the GAC's demand, what they want. And if they don't get what

they wanted, they go and lobby the board or they get to redo the policy.

So, this one goes on and on and I don't know how it's going to pan out, but hopefully there will be some sort of a solution or resolution that will be acceptable to all parties' consent. So, stay tuned.

The other one is PDP 3.0. This one you might have heard on other occasions and the evolving ICANN governance model also makes reference to this one. The council now is at that point where we have a small team of council members volunteer to draft the implementation steps of those improvements that were a product of the ongoing work over the last 13 months or 18 months. We actually had a plan about what those improvements should look like, but now we have this implementation stage and the council small team is working on those improvements.

The plan is to wrap-up all those implementation plan or steps by Montreal meeting. We only started working on this after Kobe meeting, the small team. We haven't made as much progress as we would have liked, so the plan for us now, the small team, is to have weekly calls instead of biweekly calls we had been having, and hopefully we can speed up our work and deliver the final product in time or on time before Montreal or at Montreal.

The next topic is about internationalized domain names. This is a topic I can never get excited and I can never figure out what exactly it is all about. Maybe Michele can help me out here.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Pam. The internationalized domain names (aka IDNs), we actually discussed this at our council meeting earlier today. Sorry, I'm trying to see if I can parse this, but it's like three or four different topics related to IDNs that mashed all together into one topic. I think coming out of our meeting today, I think we did manage to push for that to be separated out a little bit.

So, you have IDN variance in both Cs and Gs. You have consistent policies around IDNs which would mean possibly the development and more standardization around whether or not you can mix IDN script with non-IDN script. There's also some security and stability issues around a lot of this because of certain types of attacks. I'm sure there something else that I've forgotten. Oh, yes. Excuse me? Something like that, yes.

There are certain aspects of it that are super technical. You also have the issue that there are IDNs out there at the moment that are assigned based on one set of rules. Then you have other IDNs out there that are assigned based on a totally different set of rules. And for those of you who are IDN experts, I am simplifying this.

Unlike a lot of the GNSO activities, this is one where we have to do this in coordination with the ccNSO. And for those of you who are not familiar, the ccNSO is the Country Code Naming Supporting Organization. Unlike with the GNSO, the ccNSO does not – two things. One, they're advisory. There's no actual contractual obligation, so they can talk all day and all night about whatever they want to talk about, but they can't actually force ccTLDs to do anything.

Secondly, not all country code top-level domain name registries are members of the ccNSO. They do have pretty good coverage in terms of all the big ones are in there, all the really important ones are in there, but not all ccTLDs are within the ccNSO.

So, as a segue, for example, at council we were looking at emojis in domain names going back a few months, and while the policy at the gTLD space is pretty damn clear, there are some of the ccTLDs who were off doing whatever the hell they feel like doing. I don't know. What else can we say about the IDNs? Do you want me to take anymore of this [inaudible] for you?

PAM LITTLE:

No, it's okay. Basically, that probably is more of a registry issue than registrar. So, we have a small team within the council that's dealing with those and trying to figure out how to deal with the policy issues versus implementation issues.

The next one is about competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review team recommendations that were passed through to the council. Some of you may know that review team made quite a lot of recommendations and only a very small number of recommendations were actually adopted by the ICANN board and the rest of them got distributed to different SO or ACs or potential owners.

GNSO got five of those. Two of them would probably or potentially have an impact on us. One is about recommendation for registries and registrars to establish a privacy baseline or something, and they specifically said this has nothing to do with the WHOIS. The other one is about asking ICANN or someone to do more studies about abuse and also name and shame those who are mostly involved in abuse, like most registries or a particular registrar. More engaged in abuse activity.

So, what I feel like we can do – and I did volunteer on a council meeting today – was we would look at those partial recommendations and then come up with some proposed owner for those or treatment or reaction to them. I feel probably most of them, these two items particularly I mentioned, we probably don't have to do anything, but we'll see how the council small team decides. Then we'll present that to the whole council to see whether we have agreement about how to treat those partial recommendations.

The next one I just realized, looking at our agenda, Zoe we got that one on a separate agenda item. This is about the independent review process implementation oversight team and [inaudible] to get more people to sign up to join that oversight team. That's on our agenda.

GRAEME BUNTON: We can talk about it right now.

PAM LITTLE: Okay. So, the council basically being asked to go out to our stakeholder group to ask people if you have the expertise in this special area, which arbitration, litigation, legal expertise, please sign up to these implementation oversight [inaudible] people to help them finish off their work. I'm not sure whether we got people from our group who one has the expertise, who have the willingness or bandwidth to sign up. But if you are interested, please respond to the call to join the team.

So, these are really the key items as far as I can tell to be relevant or be of interest to our group. But moving on to consensus, I just want to mention this. And this is my own personal text, so Michele and Darcy feel free to jump in.

I feel the council are dealing with a lot of issues that are complex and all for the first time. So, a bit of a trial and error or learning as

we go how to deal with those issues. But we also facing with a lot of ICANN process that are really complicated. For example, when we look at the non-adoption of the two EPDP phase one recommendations, the process described by staff seemed to be so daunting and we feel like this is going to be a huge hurdle or distraction and additional work for council or the EPDP team phase two now, if we have to redo those two recommendations. But it turns out maybe it's not such a big deal. But things like that, it's just creating extra work for everybody and it's just why we really have to look into this evolving ICANN governance model, how to make things work a bit faster when they need be, rather than be bogged down on process. I feel that's one of our key concerns or challenges.

The other challenge or concern I feel, having been on the council for almost two years now is kind of the dynamics within the council and the bandwidth of councilors. The dynamics you see in the particular working group or a more challenging one such as the EPDP also play out in the council at the council level. You have sometime almost opposing interests from one particular stakeholder group and you can see that on the council when we have an item for vote, often you can see that clear demarcation which group is supporting what position and which group is opposing what position.

Then, because of all these challenges, it's really creating a bandwidth issue for councilors as well. We keep creating small groups to deal with a subset issues that council is facing. For example, IDNs we have a small group. We are now working on PDP 3.0. We have a small team. And that's ongoing work.

I never envisaged ... I thought the councilors would have a monthly meeting and that would be the end of it. I didn't envisage there's so much ongoing work in between meetings. I'm sure everyone feels the same kind of pressure and bandwidth challenge.

The other one, based on those issues I just mentioned, you probably already can sense this sometimes tense relationship or tension between the council and the board. It's whether already adopted recommendations from working group. Then they get sent up to the board and the board send them back or reject them. Who is calling the shots, right? Who is having the final say? Is this truly a bottom-up or is it top-down? We're often faced with that challenge and the question.

The other is a relationship with the council and the GAC. With these IGO issues, and obviously according to those who have been involved for many years, it's been a longstanding history of issue and I feel that has created some tension between the GAC and the council, and there are some people on the council who

feel the need or desire to maybe repair that damaged relationship somehow.

So, this is what I see as challenges in the more high level but I would welcome my councilors, fellow councilors. Carlos has his hand up, and others, to chime in.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Pam. We're running a little bit behind now I think, so maybe we'll try and keep this bit short because I think Toby is in the room remotely and is looking forward to doing his Tech Ops update.

Those key concerns are really interesting. It's like really big existential stuff that you guys are tackling right now, so again that work is appreciated and things we all need to be paying attention to and thinking about. Carlos, brief one.

CARLOS:

Yes, a very quick one. The IGO case is a very particular case. There were high expectations in the RPM PDP raised by Phil Corwin through outside expert about the unity of the IGOs but Phil Corwin was fired before the RPM ended, etc. It's a very particular case, so we have to be careful there. The GAC tension has always been there.

What I want to underline, I've been a little bit longer than Pam there, to me is really a surprise that over the last year the consensus breaking down particularly with the IPC and with the Business Constituency. Five years there and I never saw it before, and for that I have no explanation. Thank you very much.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. Does anybody else have any ... Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: It's one thing that we said multiple times. From the GNSO councilor perspective, we need your input. There's topics that might not be of particular interest to myself, Pam, or Darcy, but they could be of real interest to one of you. If you don't let us know, we can't mind read. If there's stuff that we're discussing that you don't understand, please reach out to one of us.

We have the policy calls which probably some of you might find helpful, but if there's stuff that you want us to go into in anymore detail, I think all three of us are pretty much open to discussing it whenever you need. But please do let us know.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Michele. Darcy?

DARCY SOUTHWELL: I think the key concerns are interesting because they're the same things that a lot of the PDPs are suffering from and I think it's partly how ICANN operates. I think Keith, as our chair, has done a really great job of starting to push back on that a little bit because we suffer from this is the way staff wants to do things. I'm not pointing the finger at any particular staff. I think it's just the way ICANN wants to work. And in some cases, it doesn't work very well and I think that the dialogue we had with the board this week, they get that. They're trying to do the same thing.

I hope that some of the things we can do here to make improvements will also kind of trickle down to the PDPs. But if you're experiencing some of these same challenges about processes and bandwidth, etc., your input is also helpful there because I think it's a systemic problem. It's not just a council problem. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Darcy. Thanks, Pam. Thanks, Carlos. Thanks, Michele. Let's move right along to Tech Ops update. Toby, are you there?

[TOBIAS SATTLER]: Can you hear me?

GRAEME BUNTON: We can. Go ahead. You sound great.

[TOBIAS SATTLER]: Great. Hi, everyone. So, a short TechOps update. So, TechOps has great participation and there are a lot of discussions, so that's definitely the way to go. However, we are missing people because we are short on resources because everybody has a day job as well. So, if someone would like to join TechOps, we are definitely looking for more people.

So, what are we currently working on? We still work on topics such as the reporting repository and reports. There's great participation, input comes from the registries on that, and hopefully we will find a way forward on that. As well as we are working on the registry maintenance notification saying which we have posted to the IETF [inaudible] group and asking for adoption.

We are also working on the registry mapping and transition topic. This is, just to explain it a little bit, a document that describes a registry from a technical perspective, so that it's easier for registrars to implement such a registry and the transition part is for registry itself, based on the mapping, if a TLD backend change is going to happen. So, these are the things that we are currently working on.

On top of that, there's of course the white paper thing from Tom Keller regarding the new transfer procedure which is going on. I think we are currently at this level where we need to decide how to move that forward. There was a lot of discussion lately, especially at the GDD Summit, how do we approach that? Are we going for asking the GNSO Council, asking for a PDP? Are we just going back to the chairs of the Registry and Registrar Stakeholder groups? We haven't decided yet but we are in the process.

Another thing which came up at the GDD Summit was the auto-renewal process. This is quite new. There was the discussion on how to standardize the auto-renewal process. This is relatively new, so there's nothing specific to say on that.

However, all these things we are working on boils down to one point and that's also a great topic for TechOps is the future of TechOps because right now all we have accomplished so far are documents, proposals, and one of the discussions—

GRAEME BUNTON: Did we lose you there, Toby?

[TOBIAS SATTLER]: I'm back. Can you hear me?

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah. Keep going.

[TOBIAS SATTLER]: So, all the work we have done boils down to the [inaudible] future of TechOps because all we have done by so far, writing down documents, doing proposals. The question is how do we get these things live? There are different point of views from the registrar perspective as well as from the registry side and this is a discussion we hope that we find resolution in Montreal. That's quite ambitious. This will be necessary, because otherwise we are just producing papers that no one is going to take on. I think that's practically it from the TechOps part. Are there any questions?

GRAEME BUNTON: Looking around the room to see if anybody has got any questions. It doesn't look like it at the moment. On the future of transfers piece, what I think we've sort of been talking about here, Toby, is that we're going to take that white paper from TechOps and start talking to other stakeholder groups inside of ICANN to see if we can get in front of any issues they might have with a new PDP to make sure we understand the space and the politics before we do that. Then I think it's going to be a PDP. I think we're going to kick off what will hopefully be a quick and efficient technical PDP on transfers starting with a white paper. That is obviously wildly

optimistic, but I think if we do a little bit of groundwork first, then that might not be awful. I think probably Montreal is where a lot of those conversations are going to start happening because not a lot of those people are here and we're also running out of time at this meeting. I have some work to do I think on the future of TechOps stuff. But thank you for that. Anybody else have anything for Toby on that? Going once, going twice. Great. Thanks, Toby. Appreciate you dialing in.

[TOBIAS SATTLER]: Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Compliance update is Greg.

GREG: Thank you, Graeme. I'll start, as always, by reminding registrars that there is a compliance sub-group in which we discuss compliance issues and raise any issues that you are seeing. If you're not on the group and would like to be, please email Zoe and she will facilitate that.

First, before I talk about the registrar audit, it's just worth noting that we did not have a session with compliance during this meeting because we asked Jamie, who is here, to meet with us

and he said no. We even followed up and said, “But we really, really want to meet with you.” And he said no. I guess take that for what it’s worth.

I think, from my perspective, that is the most concerning because we’ve been told a registrar audit focusing on abuse is coming up but we don’t have the exact details. Last we heard, it’s now in August but we haven’t really received a defined scope or really any concrete details. So knowing that is coming up and trying to get ahead of it, the group put together a list of questions that we think that compliance would be within scope to try to be constructive to say we’re not just trying to say “don’t ask us this”. We’re trying to help you and come up with things that you might be interested in. Then we also came up with a list of questions that we consider out of scope, to set expectations with compliance going ahead of the audit and hopefully influence what they eventually send out in August.

So, I’m going to send that out to the group one more time before sending that to ICANN today or tomorrow, for any last-minute thoughts. We got some good feedback in the closed compliance session on Monday. So, that’s that.

Compliance issues and review. So, compliance issue is just a general reminder if there are new things we are seeing, bring

them to the group’s attention so we can discuss them as a group and bring them to ICANN.

Then we also brought up this new idea of a compliance review which I think is going to be our work going forward. We haven’t given it much thought but much like ICANN is auditing us, we were considering maybe we should audit ICANN in some way. For example, give a poll and say, “Can you tell us what are the complaints that you’re seeing and how many were valid?” or, “How many were responded to on time?” Because I think we voice issues about compliance within this group and to compliance’s face but I don’t think the rest of ICANN understands the challenges we face. I don’t know. It’s just something that we’re toying with. So, as we think about this more, maybe we can come up with questions that we would want to ask ourselves internally to get some data points because right now we’re relying on ICANN metrics which I don’t think any of us really rely on or believe are meaningful metrics. So, that’s one issue that if you’re on the compliance sub-group list you’ll be seeing emails about and we’ll try to put some structure around.

Then, the last issue I think most importantly to all of us is the gaining registrar FOA. When GDPR came into ... The temporary specification had a clause basically saying that if you can’t access the then current registration data, do you not have to send a gaining registrar FOA. Practically, when the data became

redacted by and large across all registrars, the gaining registrar FOA effectively prevented a transfer because it wouldn't go to the registrant. A lot of registrars stopped sending gaining registrar FOAs because it is technically and commercially impossible to check to see if an email is present, and even if an email is present, it's not necessarily going to the underlying registrant. It could respond with a web form.

So, we thought that compliance had understood this and they did not seem to be enforcing it or they're at least deferring to our interpretation of whether registration data is available. Recently, a couple of registrars have received follow-ups basically prodding them to, it seems like, check and they should be sending gaining registrar FOA which I think everyone in this room realizes is impossible and would effectively stop transfers which is the opposite of the intention of the transfer policy which has allowed people to freely transfer.

So, a couple of members on the team had a meeting with ICANN policy staff as opposed to compliance to try to say, "Look, this is an open policy issue and compliance is basically insisting on this interpretation that we don't agree with, so here are our concerns." We explain them and they're considering those and hopefully going to talk to compliance to say, "Stop doing this." In the words of Graeme, it seems like there is some progress but TBD.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Greg. You're done?

GREG: I'm done unless anyone has questions.

GRAEME BUNTON: Alright. I'll do a brief editorial and then we can take some questions. So, on the gaining FOA, it was a pretty good meeting with staff the other day. It wasn't just policy GDD. Russ was there. We kind of kicked his ass pretty hard which was good. I think he learned a bunch. He mentioned to me that there might be some progress on this issue with compliance which is sort of what we were talking about with Russ earlier today how that should work, [inaudible] gets it, he understands and then goes to see if he can advocate for us. So, I'm hoping for some positive news on that one maybe. Crossing our fingers.

I don't have any other intel on the registry audit other than they probably still haven't figured out exactly what they're going to audit which is why I think the questions that you guys built are probably pretty great. I don't necessarily think that ICANN will listen to them but I think they're an interesting starting place for discussion.

Then I still really like the idea of that compliance audit, so we should take that back to the compliance team and build some structure around that and see if we can do it because it would be fun. I saw a hand from Pam.

PAM LITTLE: The latest I heard is now it's going to be September.

GRAEME BUNTON: Beautiful.

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Quick question. When you spoke at the beginning, you mentioned that you tried to get this meeting going with compliance and they just told you no twice. Was this a blunt no or just, "Well, I can't because I'm not at the meeting," or, "Maybe let's do it next week," or did they just completely shut you down?

GREG: So, he said compliance staff wasn't coming except for him, but as Jamie is in charge of compliance, presumably he would have some information about compliance. It was pretty close to a blunt no, with a caveat that ...

ZOE BONYTON: I should add, yeah, it was a blunt no, but he did explicitly say he had requests from a lot of other groups and said no to everyone because it's a policy meeting. So, although we do subsequently know that they ended up talking to ALAC and in the GAC. So, yeah.

GRAEME BUNTON: What's frustrating about this is if they're auditing abuse, which they sort of said specifically that they're going to audit 3.18, and certainly in the community now and in Bangkok we've heard a lot from Goran and Jamie and Brian Schilling on consumer safeguards wanting to talk about abuse. So, a meeting with compliance is a great place possibly to talk about some of that stuff. Or to talk about the potential questions that could be in an audit. It's a really missed opportunity and I've essentially told everyone on ICANN senior staff that this really rubbed most registrars the wrong way. They have certainly heard that really strongly.

I haven't seen Jamie yet this week to have that conversation with him. He's too busy presenting to the ALAC or something or the GAC. Also, a couple of us have dinner tonight with Goran. There's probably not a good way to bring that up there, so it might be another place for that conversation but certainly people are hearing about our unhappiness with this.

GRAEME BUNTON: Just to add on, when we did meet with GDD and policy, there's a really constructive piece of that in that they don't know how transfers technically happen. They don't know the programmatic nature. They don't know why even if there's an email address, it could still fail because there's an auto-responder. That is useful information for Jamie to know and he's never met with us ... From my perspective, he's never taken the time. Alright. So, what is the exact issue here? Can you spell it out for me? That's my frustration.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: I agree with Greg on that. He doesn't ask any questions to try to learn more. I think what really rubs me the wrong way about him is that he's here, and when it comes to compliance, they've got two groups they need to be paying attention to, and yet that's not who he's meeting with. I'm sorry, why did ICANN send him? His money didn't need to be spent now, did it? If he's not going to meet with anybody ... They don't have to send the whole staff. I don't care about that. But it's like he's here, and prior meetings he doesn't engage with us. He doesn't say anything. Wasn't it the last meeting where he kind of shut it down early? Was that in Kobe where he's like, "Yeah, we're done here." Was it ... Okay. He kind of did it in Kobe, too.

Anyway, if he has time to meet with other people, how come he doesn't have time to meet with the two groups that he's supposed to be most concerned with?

GRAEME BUNTON: There is, as far as I'm concerned, no good answer to that question. Vlad?

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Yes. I [inaudible] with Greg and Darcy. Seriously. These are your paying customers. They should be your top priority. And if you're saying no, this is [inaudible]. Maybe this is why we need to get together with Russ and say, "Hey, Russ, maybe you can ease this question here," [inaudible] this question essentially to maybe get us a meeting where possible.

GRAEME BUNTON: Russ is very clear that this is pretty un... Yeah. And so is Cyrus. So, GDD staff have heard this extremely clearly. Michele and then I kind of want to wrap this up because we're ten minutes behind schedule. I can literally see you dying in this room, so I want to see if I can get us out of here in the next half-an-hour.

MICHELE NEYON: I totally agree with everything that's said. I think one of the things we might need to consider is doing the thing that they hate, but that seems to be the only way to get an actual reaction which is to publicly name and shame. So, you write them a letter.

It's ridiculous. I mean, you write them a letter, they bitch and moan. "How dare you write the letter. Oh, my God. Oh, my God." But if you try to do it by back channels, we end up in this situation which is [inaudible]. Now that Pam is saying it's pushed out to September, what's to stop them from saying, "Oh, let's audit RDAP."

GRAEME BUNTON: Right. Anybody else, complaining about compliance and Jamie not meeting with us aside?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Take this comment as you would like. I think perhaps one of the reasons why he's not really engaging is, honestly, when I worked in compliance, I forgot Jamie worked in compliance. The amount of interaction, he'd show up in town and, "Oh, shit, that's right. Jamie does stuff with us." So, that's a comment for you to take as you want.

GRAEME BUNTON: And maybe we should be advocating ... I don't think any of us were in love with Maguy and there were certainly some issues with that relationship, too. But maybe what we can be doing is saying that it kind of feels to us like there should be some intermediary between the compliance staff and Jamie for us to deal with, if he has more important meetings to attend. Yeah, I don't know that I would go quite that far. Thanks for that, Greg.

Policy team. That's Owen. Owen, how's it going? What are you at three months now in the policy?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: No, it's only been since May. Time flies. Part of my secret plot to take over the Registrar Stakeholder Group. No, just kidding. I know Graeme had said let's try and keep this interesting and witty and exciting. I'm sorry, there's really not much I can do here. So I'm going to post in the chat something I started giggling at later if you want to. The Queen of England wore a green screen colored shirt the other day and the Internet went wild. Take a look at your own leisure there if you want to be amused. I won't mind the laughter in the background.

So, this is a new thing we have here. This has been idea that's been kicking around for a while. Never really got underway with Sarah's departure, so I've taken up and run with it.

So, what's our purpose? It's to review and keep track of policy, what's going on within the Registrar Stakeholder Group. That includes doing public comments. What ongoing policy initiatives are there? Who do we have on that? Just basically trying to get track on that. We do have that information kept in some various forms and stuff like that. Zoe is going to help me get that stuff together so we can share that with the group. We also have a sub-team now. I think it was ten members or so, give or take – 10 or 12 – on there. And those are people who have stepped forward to get involved with these types of policy initiatives. It's not necessarily you're going to be on a policy thing but you'll be on that kind of steering group or something, kind of a committee as opposed to just one person or two people being in charge of that. So that will give people the opportunity to see what we have ongoing, what they need to comment on. When there is a comment, triage, get some people involved [inaudible] can draft that. Again, that work is kind of being spread out to others as opposed to just a couple people doing that.

Right now, we're scheduled to have monthly meetings and that's just to have a placeholder and not forget about ourselves because there's not really any ... I don't think there's any upcoming comments. I'm looking at Zoe here.

ZOE BONYTHON: So, early next week ... There is a comment that's being worked on right now about organizational reviews and there's one or two more that are going to be coming up here.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Okay. Thank you for keeping me in line, Zoe. So, we'll have that and we'll get people involved on that. So, we may keep the monthly meetings or we may move to an as-needed basis on that and you can do some of the stuff offline as opposed to having to have a call.

We also have a policy tracker which right now Zoe is keeping track of and we like to hopefully make that something we can share with the team as well, too. So the whole stakeholder group can look at that if they want to. If you've got dying curiosity about what's going on in the policy world, you can take a look at that. That will also have a review – put a process in place in how we're going to triage, determine whether to do a comment, what the comment should be. So we're in the process of developing that. Zoe, yeah?

ZOE BONYTON: Sorry to interject there. I want to mention something about the public comment process that we just agreed in the team to not only be helping with triage but also it's part of the process that

the policy team actually reviews the comment. So, we're more [inaudible] even more members than we possibly know about it definitely reviewing public comments. And even before it goes out to members, the full membership.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Thanks, Zoe. I guess the key concern we have is finding volunteers to do this initial drafting. That's usually where more of the work is. I guess the hope is putting this before a wider audience that will get more than likely more people who might step up, so it's not always the same people who have to keep doing that. We'll get different people based upon what their interests or what it is going on. That's all I have. Unless there's any questions or comments.

GRAEME BUNTON:

I don't have any. I'm not seeing any around the room. Thanks for joining the ExCom, Owen, and stepping up. There's a lot of work on your plate and we appreciate you getting to it. Let's keep blasting on. Oh, sure, sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

As I'm writing the recap, can people sign up to be in the policy group?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Yes. Email Zoe. Charter and incorporation update. The board voted on RrSg charter on Sunday – Monday morning, Sunday – and they approved it. So, we are actually ... wait. Unanimously! So that was what we thought was going to be quick turned out to be a two-year saga, but it's now official. We've been operating under it for probably about a year at this point. Pretty close to six months. About a year. But it's now actually official that this is our new charter. Congratulations, everybody, and thank you, everyone, who worked so hard to get that done. There's an awful lot of Zoe in there. Benedetta from ICANN staff. I think Theo is in there. I think Lindsay Hamilton. Luc, thank you. All you people. That was a huge amount of work and thanks for getting that done.

Articles of Association and progress of incorporation. So, we've been talking about this for a very long time, too. It is really fits and starts. A lot of that lately has been on me. Thomas Rickert did some work for us to come up with a potential model. We talked about it I think in Kobe and we decided that it was too heavy. So, he's come back with another set of possibility but what we're missing right now is a document explaining why this new version of Articles of Association solves the problems we're trying to solve.

What I have for everybody is a legal document and most of you don't want a legal document. You want a one-pager that says, "This is how it's going to be structured. This is why it's structured this way." Then we can move forward. So, I'm working with Thomas to get that done and I think we can expect that probably inside of the next couple weeks to a month, I would say. Then hopefully we can start kicking that one down the road and getting it done.

If you ask any RySG ExCom member about how they found incorporating in the US, it's a pretty funny answer. So, feel free to try that out. That's all I have on that.

Strategy meeting actions. Do we have ... So, we had a strategy meeting at the end of Kobe and that is a process that we are going to keep running I think every year which is at the tail end of the ... Is it the first meeting every year we're planning on doing it? Yes is the answer. Where we tack on a day to talk about how the SG works. The various structures inside of the SG, how our processes are going, what we need to improve. And we had another good one of those sessions in Kobe. Lots of good input. We have a whole set of action items we are still slowly working on and I thought I would share some of that, though it's impossible to read and it might be too long in the day to really get there.

But a bunch of these things have actually been implemented. A bunch of these things are still ongoing and/or have yet to be tackled. But a lot of it is just minor incremental improvements on how we do things and other things that are going into the operation procedures, which is a document that I don't think anyone has really seen yet, aside from a few people on the ExCom. But expect that to be shared out as a draft in the very near future.

What that tries to do is capture all of the ways that we operate that aren't explicitly in the charter, so it's how to keep the SG running and efficient and effective on a day-to-day basis. So, expect to see that coming out, too. I don't think we need to dig too much more into that at the moment. Oh boy, do I not enjoy seeing that. Oh boy. I'm so into everyone, I'm remote.

Open questions and AOB. I knew I could get there. What did you do? End of slide show.

We talked about across field validation. We talked about transfers. One of the topics that has come up historically a few times is that a number of us have issues with domains seized by law enforcement or court order and they end up stuck on our tags and we're paying for them for forever. For Tucows, that amount ends up being tens of thousands of dollars a year. I think for GoDaddy has said in past meetings it's into the six figures of

dollars a year. So, we've talked a little bit with Verisign about resolving that directly and that's been real slow and I bother them about that probably once a quarter to see if I can get them to move. They don't want to do that unilaterally. They would much prefer something come from the broader ICANN community but 90-plus percent of this problem is specifically Verisign. So that feels like a slow way of doing things.

We talked about this also with public safety in the past. Gabriel from DOJ, who is actually down at the end of the table, took that back from the last time. I think we had a Public Safety Working Group meeting and actually shared with me a brief procedure for discussion on how ... Are you saying forfeiture or seizure? You don't have to go on the record. Sure, if you don't mind, that would be great.

[GABRIEL]:

Sure. I'm glad you gave the briefing on the background because I didn't want to share anything I shouldn't on that. This is [Gabriel] and I'm in law enforcement in the States. When I heard the [inaudible], speaking only for myself and not for my organization, I took it to heart because you're right, that's something that shouldn't be going on. This is on us as law enforcement to not leave you guys holding the bag when you respond in good faith to legal process, right?

So, to show that this isn't just empty, I went back and over the last few months since Kobe I've been working with others in the Department of Justice and trying to find some good steps to improve the processes on our end. If we get good feedback on the steps I've shared with Graeme – and there are sharing caveats for what I am proposing so I don't want it up on the slides right now. Sorry for those that are listening in. But when we get there, it can be shared.

I am asking for feedback because there are some technical steps listed there and most of the steps will be law enforcement engaging at the registry level as opposed to the registrar level, but nonetheless, you folks understand this space better than I do as an outsider. And if you have comments, we're very much soliciting those [inaudible] feedback. It can go through Graeme to me.

The end goal is if it becomes viable and everyone from ICANN to the registries to you to DOJ feel that it is a viable algorithm to follow, then we're going to try to share it broadly across federal law enforcement, US law enforcement, potentially more broadly than that. Then thereafter, maybe move backwards towards the backlog that's preexisting.

One of the issues that you should be aware of is there's not quite the same level of impetus I think for most cops to remember to

take follow-up action. So, just as a quick metaphor for you, when we go into a house and see someone's computer, they want it back. So, seizure is taking custody. Forfeiture is taking ownership. Someone that has their property taken from them over custody through a seizure will typically come back and let us know that they want it back, and if we end up deciding, no, it's contraband or there's stuff here you can't have, what have you, then we go and we seek from the court a forfeiture order and then it becomes ours. Given that bad guys don't say, "Hey, yeah, ISellCrack.com, I want that domain back," there isn't that same impetus which means law enforcement doesn't always follow-up. That I think is why you're left holding this.

So, we're trying to resolve the issue. We're trying to be legitimate public servants here and I would appreciate any feedback that you have to offer after you see what Graeme shares.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks for that, Gabriel. I'm sure there will be members who appreciate hearing that and we'll try and get you that feedback in short-ish order. What's nice I think for all of us is this draft lives at the registry level, so the registry does this work instead of us and those domains would come off our tag and we don't need to worry about it. I think that's good.

Jacques mentioned something about ATRT-3. Do you want to give us two minutes on that?

JACQUES BLANC:

Actually, Greg has left the room and it's a pity because he said that maybe we should be updating ICANN and guess what? We are. At least that's what the idea of the Accountability and Transparency Review process is. We are actually working on the Accountability and Transparency Review #3.

So, inside this ATRT team, there's people from the contracted parties and constituencies. There's Pat Kane on the registry side and I am on the registrar side representing part of the group. So, we are actually looking for feedback from the community on what your relationship with different bodies of the ICANN are.

A couple of those two bodies – and I'll go back to Pam here – are what's the relationship with the board like and what's the relationship with the GAC?

So, I am going to send you the questions that we have been asking the community and these questions were asked to the GNSO yesterday. But it was GNSO general session, so very brief. We had a feedback from James Bladel, by the way, but we're looking for much, much more. So the questions will be sent to you by Zoe I guess because I gave them there. Please, if you want to engage

with the ATRT team, do so. We're taking all the feedback until the end of July. We'll be glad to hear you. We will be glad to read what you have to say. If you want to be heard, participate in one of our meetings. We've got a meeting every week. So, if you want to be there, you can contact me, you can contact Graeme or I will give the address of the ATRT-3 secretariat directly. Please do not hesitate to do so. Like in any other group, if you don't talk, we cannot know it. That's that, I guess.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jacques. So, I really just sprinted through the last few agenda items there so we could wrap up a little bit early. I think we're 20 minutes ahead of schedule. I think I'm out of AOB. Although, it's nice to have Bruce back in the room. Hey, Bruce! Just hiding. Yeah.

BRUCE: [inaudible].

GRAEME BUNTON: I wouldn't go that far. Does anybody else have anything they wish to raise with SG? I've got Owen and then Michele.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Just real quick. It slipped my mind when we had GDD here and they were talking about RDAP. I do recall, I think it was during Kobe, they mentioned that there is ... ICANN is working on a client for RDAP. Does anybody remember? I recall that. I'd like to know if they're actually still doing that or when they plan to, I don't know, share that with people to use.

MICHELE NEYLON: Owen, there's a few open source ones available already. If anybody is looking for details, ping me and I'll get one of my guys to send all the links through. There's a bunch of them ... Several of the registries [inaudible] have released ones. The only thing is they assume that everybody is working java.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: ICANN, too, I think. Thanks, Michele.

GRAEME BUNTON: If those haven't hit the list in some time, it might be worthwhile sharing them again, if you wouldn't mind. Just the whole list. I suspect people would be curious. You had something else, Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON:

Let me try and put this into something more coherent. An intellectual, coherent sentence would be helpful. In Bangkok, there was a session or a couple sessions around abuse. There has been a lot of conversations over the last couple of months around DAAR. There's going to be presentations on that again here and at other events. ICANN has actually been sending one of their staff who is involved with the DAAR thing to a bunch of Internet policy and domain name events across the globe. They'll actually be presenting again in the DNS forum in Botswana in a few weeks.

So, there's a lot of interest in doing something around it and they're also organizing an abuse conversation in London next week. The thing I suppose is really just going to make people aware that that stuff is going on, that ICANN Org is kind of struggling with this a bit because they don't want to go down the route of trying to push some kind of convoluted policy development thing. But at the same time, they're conscious that there is an expectation that they do something or be seen to do something. There's also probably going to be more ideas being floated on that over the next while. Plus, we've also had, I would consider, relatively constructive engagement with law enforcement over the last few meetings, [inaudible]. But just something for people to have on their radar.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Michele. We're going to be talking about abuse a lot over the next couple of years, I think. Related to what you were saying there, though, it comes to my mind that there are two places where we're going to start engaging a little bit more at the registries and that is going to be on DAAR. They're doing a lot of work there. ICANN I think has said publicly that, at some point, DAAR will start adding registrars or data about registrars into DAAR and giving us something. Have they?

Anyway, the short answer is we're going to be working with them a little bit to make sure that we have a coherent perspective between contracted parties on what ICANN is doing with DAAR.

MICHELE NEYLON: There's this really stupid problem with DAAR which some of you may be aware of and others probably aren't. Due to the license agreements that ICANN signed when they spun up that system, they are in the rather embarrassing position of being able to say to you as a contracted party that you have a problem but unable to give you any of the data related to the problem. By the way, I think law enforcement found this quite entertaining as well.

GRAEME BUNTON: That was my impression. I heard briefly about this, that everyone thought that everybody was getting the underlying details from

their high-level DAAR reports and it turns out it's not at all actionable by anyone.

The other piece that we're going to be working with registries a little bit closely is on the registrar audit. A few of them have volunteered to share with us – and lots of us are also sitting in those rooms, too. But to talk and work with us around what they did and how they pushed back to ICANN and whether there's places where we need to do that, too. So, head's up. We will be working closely with those guys on those two issues. Then I think Zoe said she had some AOB, too.

ZOE BONYTON:

Thank you. I do. This is just a polite reminder to people that you may recall that we migrated our servers. We're now with Michele's company. But as a part of that, our main registrar member list has now changed from being ... I can't even remember now. It's changed. We've simplified the end of our member list. It's just @rrsg.org now.

MICHELE NEYLON:

I need to fix that for you, Zoe.

ZOE BONYTON:

No, no, it's done.

MICHELE NEYLON: I'm going to fix it so that you don't have to remember the address. I just haven't had a chance to do it, I'm sorry.

ZOE BONYTON: Okay. In any case, just as a reminder, because actually I noticed that the other address is not going through to my emails today. So, if you could just start getting into the habit of sending it to that member list. Both member lists still function. The emails will go through. That's not a problem. But just to try to get into the habit of sending it to the member list that ends in @rrsg.org. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Zoe. And thanks to Michele for hosting it. Paul Goldstone did for a gajillion years and that infrastructure was aging, so it's nice to have it on what I'm sure is your very modern, most boutique white glove service for very inexpensive rates.

MICHELE NEYLON: So, when we're talking about abuse, we should be clear that the abuse is abuse of the DNS, not abuse of Michele.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yep. Any last pieces before I let you all go and be free, except for EPDP members who I think have one last thing? And then a few of

us have dinner with Goran. So, we're all being punished. Oh, right. Lots of people have lots of stuff. Thank you very much, all, for a delightful meeting. We'll see you all in Montreal, if not here for the next day. One more day? One more day. Thanks, all.

ZOE BONYTHON: Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]