

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group  
Tuesday 10 February 2015  
12:00-14:00 SGT  
Afternoon Session, Part II**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb>

Keith Drazek: Hi everybody, welcome back to our working lunch - if we could start the recording, please. If I could get a thumbs up, and I have a thumbs up, thank you all very much.

Okay, so hi, this is Keith Drasek. Welcome back to the Registry Stakeholder Group Meeting - our working lunch. We have four presentations or introductions today, depending on which way we go.

And we're going to start with - we've been joined by Elise Gerich from IANA. Welcome Elise, thank you very much for joining us. You know, when we were planning the meeting for today and coming up with the agenda.

You know, we recognized that particularly with the introduction of the gTLD program that this stakeholder group is quickly becoming one of your biggest customers.

With the delegation of new gTLD's and so we wanted to give you the opportunity to introduce yourself and to see if there's any questions here.

And of course, with everything going on in the IANA transition and ICANN accountability discussion, you know, your name is becoming more and more visible. And we wanted to give you an opportunity to introduce yourself, thanks.

Elise Gerich: Thanks, Keith. As you said, my name's Elise Gerich. I'm ICANN's Vice President of IANA and Technical Services. And I manage a department of 12 people at ICANN.

We handle all the processing of requests to create new TLD's in the root zone - as well as processing all requests to add protocol parameter numbers and things to the registries for the IATF.

And we also allocate the large blocks of numbers. Itanium system numbers, internet IP address numbers to the regional internet registries. And I was asked to just come here and introduce myself.

So that you could put a face to the name of our department and if you have any questions, I'd be certainly happy to answer them.

And yes Keith, you're probably our largest customer right now because we crossed 500 delegations in the root. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: And thank you, Elise. And I think that deserves a round of applause for both. And that's for both your team and this group. So, congratulations to everybody on reaching that number of 500 - that's incredible.

So let me open it up - any questions or comments for Elise. She's only here for a few minutes with us before she's got to leave. And we do have other presentations.

So, I just want to open it up. I saw Donna and then Jordyn and Jonathan.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Keith - Donna Austin. Elise thanks for coming. I guess I was the one that suggested that it might be important. There's a small working group of us that are involved in the CWGI transitions work.

One of the things that's become very obvious to me throughout the work that we're doing is that the CCTLD's have a long standing relationships with IANA and certainly the IANA team.

And I think that's something moving forward that we need to move into that space as well. And develop our relationships in a similar fashion. I'm aware that IANA provides a presentation to the CCNSO at every meeting.

And I think, you know, we haven't discussed this more broadly within our group. But I think there would be some value for us to start to have those presentations as well.

And I also recognize that many of our newer members may not be old timers in this space. So it's going to be really important that they become educated and understand what IANA is and what it does.

And, you know, where the contact points are for them. So, thanks for coming, I think it's a really important relationship that we will need to develop as a stakeholder group with the IANA team. Thanks.

Elise Gerich: Thank you, Donna. And just for those of you who might want to know more about what the IANA functions are and what ICANN does to take care of them.

We do have a presentation tomorrow morning, if tomorrow's Wednesday. I think its Wednesday. That starts around 8:15 in the morning.

And it's called, who, what, why - why the IANA functions are less interesting than you think.

And if you're interested in finding out why we're less interesting than you think, please join us tomorrow morning. And you'll hear about what we actually do in our day to day job.

And if you would like to invite us to make a presentation here as we do for CCNSO's in the future, we'd be happy to entertain that.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks, Elise. Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks, Keith. It's Jordyn Buchanan from Google for the transcript. And thanks for visiting today, Elise. I think, you know, one thing to build on what Donna said.

I think one thing that we're as new registry operators, we're starting to come into contact with is that IANA has certain - I don't know, just to show how naive we are at this point.

I don't know if the right word is policies or procedures that you guys have developed. And I think that's done in consultation with some community of IANA interested people.

And I guess I'm just curious if you could tell us, you know, what's the process by which IANA procedures and policies are developed?

And what would be good entry points for folks that are interested in participating in those processes?

Elise Gerich: So, the IANA department doesn't make any policies. I should be clear there. So things that relate to GTLD's - all those policies and discussions happen at the GNSO.

The policies for the CCTLD's happen within the CCNSO - and for the work and the implementation that we do in processing requests to be added to the root or to make changes to the root zone.

Most of those are really based on RFC - RFC 1591, which was written gazillions of years ago. And currently - it's really not that long. I tend to exaggerate.

But the CCNSO had a working group called the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. That has been looking into clarifying and interrupting that base foundation for how TLD information is entered into the root zone.

So, one way you can get engaged and in fact, the CCNSO is now discussing their framework of interpretation working group final report with the GAC.

Is to read that report and I think it will help clarify what some of the implementation choices are that the IANA department has taken based on policies that come out of that RFC as well as the CCNSO and the GNSO.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sorry, just as a followup. So, like maybe GAC can use this specific example to help sort of better understand.

Something I know is an IANA requirement is that each TLD needs to have name servers on more than one Itanium system.

And I don't think that requirement's in RFC 1591. So where along the way someone's decided that this rule that needs to be imposed.

I guess I'm curious - A, how is that decided and not because that's particularly good or bad rule. But just as an example of something that I'm, you know, curious how to engage on.

So, A, how is that decided and, B, you know, if we looked back over time and said hey, maybe networks are diverse in other ways today, we don't care as much about it.

(Unintelligible), like how would we go about changing that requirement?

Elise Gerich: So the technical requirements for the robustness of operating a TLD are things that were taken to public comment several years ago.

And that was one of the things that came out of that public comment about technical requirements for the robustness. And there's - we haven't changed those.

We haven't had another public comment or reached out to the community to say should we reconsider those.

And maybe that's time that should happen because as you say, technology's moved and changed and networks are built differently than they were five or six years ago.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Elise and thanks Jordyn and Jonathan, over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi Elise, thanks for coming to see us. As you know, I've got two hats really. One is a chair of the CWG on the transition. And obviously as a registry stakeholder group member and GNSO councilor.

I mean we clearly have a customer supply relationship. And that's been something that the registries have been thinking about quite carefully.

Have you got any thoughts that, you know, or any guidance that you think our - we have a little coordination group that's working and feeding information into the CWG and participating in the CWG.

Are there any thoughts or guidance you've got for the work of that group? Like any areas that you would advise we focus on? Or any things that you might of heard that have been missing already?

Any thoughts or feedback on you've got that you can - and I know it may put you in an awkward position. I fully accept that if you unconformable with getting involved at that level, that's fine.

But if there was something, you said well really, we'd love to get guidance for the future from you on this or on that. I guess that's sort of connected to Jordyn's point or any, you know, the others.

It's just any feedback that you've got for us would be great.

Elise Gerich: Well, I do feel a little bit awkward. Because, you know, obviously the discussions in the CWG are about what will replace the NTIA represents.

And I guess the guidance might be to be clear on what actually NTIA does today. And what it is that you're trying to replace and how that impacts the operations themselves.

I think there's probably less understanding about what the IANA functions actually are and how - what our role is in the operations of the IANA functions.

And what NTIA's role is in conjunction with the IANA function. So if you were able to get more information, perhaps that would help guide your conversations.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, that's very helpful and that's in a sense address the CWG. I suppose maybe I didn't ask the question clearly enough or perhaps I did. But we are your current customers and you're our current supplier.

You'll be our future supplier and we'll be your future customers - in thinking about us in that sense, as registries, your current and future customer's.

Is there anything you'd like us to be thinking about from a kind of customer perspective if you like and how we work with you in future?

Elise Gerich: Yes, so in the future working together and trying to meet your needs. I guess I'd like to understand, you know, if the interfaces we have between you and us and our tools are adequate.

You know, if there too complex, if they're too - if you can't understand them. Or if you only use them once every six years, should be spend a lot of energy trying to make credentials and secure thing that - if you're like me, you forget them if you don't use them for regularly.

You know, what is the interface programmatically that we have with you all and does that meet your needs? And then again, I guess for the communications are the types of communications you're receiving from us.

In response to say your questions or if we've made changes in something - if they're adequate - if they convey the right tone - if they, you know, provide useful information or if they're just spam.

Things of that nature I think in an ongoing customer relationship. You know, are we meeting the kinds of needs and providing the service in a way that's easy for you to use it.

I don't know, those are thoughts off the top of my head and I may regret saying any of them later.

Jonathan Robinson: You won't. That's very helpful, thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Elise and thanks, Jonathan. So, we probably have time for one more question and then we have a few other things on our agenda. Jon.

Jon Nevett: It's not a - well, I guess it's a question real briefly. Have you considered forming a customer advisory group?

So, instead of doing a public comment every year or two, you have an ongoing group that you could survey or work with or send those kinds of questions to them.

And, you know, have an ongoing working relationship.

Elise Gerich: So we haven't really considered that so much. I think, you know, part of Cyrus Namazi's organization has done something similar. And maybe what we should do is leverage that to have kind of a portion.

Where, you know, we have our interaction with you. What we have done and we've just finished our third annual customer satisfaction survey.

We survey all of the customers that have used our service within the last 12 months. And we ask a series of questions and then there's some open ended questions where you can freeform - share your thoughts.

So, we have done that instead of the customer user group or - but, I'm not opposed to that idea. I actually love getting together with people and finding out what they're interested in.

But I'm - we haven't addressed that directly.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you - any last question? I thought I might have seen a hand over here. No, okay. Chuck, quickly.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I have a very quick question for Elise and then I'll - and my other question will be for - it's more information that she doesn't need to stay for.

You're dealing with a lot of people that haven't dealt with IANA before. How has that gone? Has there been some growing pains in that regard or has it gone pretty smoothly?

Elise Gerich: I'll answer this way. When we were getting prepared for the on slot of new GTLD's - somebody who works, who's been in the IANA department for many, many years.

Said, oh my god, we're going to need 52 new people to handle all these new requests that are going to come through. And we sat back and we said oh no, we're not going to hire 52 new people.

And basically, we have the same number of people. What we did is we just looked at our systems and said okay, how can we automate this so that we can receive information from the upfront processing end?

Which is when, you know, the GTLD and registry operators were working to apply for the new names. And these are the requirements we would need.

Can we build them into the upfront processing piece that already in place? So that by the time you all were ready to move to the IANA department for delegation, a lot of the upfront leg work that we have to do for CCTLD's.

If there's a new country created for instance had been done because there are far fewer countries being created than new GTLD's - so it was a really good collaboration internally.

So that we had a lot of that upfront processing ready and I think the hardest part was for the new applicant to understand that once they got their name approved that there was this other step.

And that they would have to then use credentials and register the name through the delegation process. That was the biggest learning curve. And we're over it now pretty much.

Because most people have figured it out and we figured out what we needed to do better. But I think that was really the curve. But other than that, it was a good collaboration internal to ICANN.

And then I think the registries themselves were very helpful in letting us know what we needed to fix.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much, Elise. And thank you for joining us today. Please feel free to use our group - the Registry Stakeholder Group for any kind of communications or outreach or anything you'd like to do in the future.

And look forward to doing this again.

Elise Gerich: Thank you. And thank you very much for inviting me. I enjoyed hearing your questions.

Keith Drazek: And thanks to Donna for thinking of it - thanks. Okay, next on the - yes.

Chuck Gomes: She can - you don't need to stay for this, Elise. But what I wanted to say is what IANA does for CCTLD's is the same for GTLD's and IANA who is and in the root delegation.

But the approval process of the two is very different. And that's something that the CWG and probably the accountability group also is going to have to differentiate.

For example, our TLS's don't have to go to the board for approval but the CC's do.

Elise Gerich: That is true that - I guess the steps of moving through from end to end are slightly different. But under the current existing contract with NTIA, the board doesn't approve anything.

The board receives the report and what they do is they verify that we the IANA department have followed the process that's been laid out.

And so the next step - the actual approval to go into the root as you know, Chuck, is NTIA. So they are kind of in the middle of the step there at the end.

And that is the same for CCTLD's and GTLD's.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Elise for the clarification. Yes, so the board doesn't disapprove I guess is probably a better way of saying of it.

Elise Gerich: No, I don't think so. I've never seen it happen.

Keith Drazek: All right, thank you very much for joining us. Okay, next on the agenda is Scott Hollenbeck. And he's going to give a presentation on the registry operations association - thanks.

Brad-tech: Keith, just quickly before Scott gets started. I understand that the Adobe connect room is down because of a scheduled maintenance with Adobe for all connect sessions around the world.

So, nobody can connect to anything. They are getting the audio stream though.

So, I'm hearing from people that, you know, if they can connect to Skype if you can - if you have a question, you can always send it to me or maybe someone else directly and we'll ask it in line.

Keith Drazek: Okay, Brad, thanks very much. I did notice the room was down. I didn't know why. So, thanks - Scott.

Scott Hollenbeck: Okay, thanks Keith. I'd like to thank you all for giving me the opportunity to speak with you here today. I apologize to everybody that the deck is a little bit longer, so we're going to skip through a number of things.

I'm here today speaking to you as author of the extensible provisioning protocol - EPP. And coauthor of the registration data access protocol or RDAP.

So, since you're all (unintelligible) registered operators, I think you know something about EPP but if you haven't heard about RDAP, you will - so please, pay attention.

And I'm also going to say upfront that I'm here to try to convince you to contribute some engineering staff to ongoing conversations at the protocol level.

Okay, let's skip through this next slide. We'll skip the background; go right to the meat if we could. Next slide, please. Next slide, please. All right, keep going. Okay, let's stop right there.

So for those of you who weren't aware, there's been an effort within the IATF for about the last five years - to come up with yet another potential replacement for who is.

This one is called the Registration Data Access Protocol or RDAAP. And what's important about this is that it figures heavily into the recommendations of the ICANN CEO's expert working group that delivered its final report last June.

It was approved by the IESG on, 1, January. And you can see the internet draft names right there.

The approval is important because any day now I'm expecting that the RFC editor will, you know, give us what they call a 48 review of final documents before these documents are available to the community as RFC's

And if you have read or (unintelligible) registry contracts lately, you will know that there are some terms in there that call for implementation and deployment of this new protocol.

You know, pending certain conditions being met. It's important to start thinking about this now.

Because one thing that RDAP gives you that Who Is does not is all kinds of knobs and dials in terms of settings for things like privacy, access control and authentication.

And right now there is no policy associated with any of those things. All right, so next slide please. All right, so when I talk about registration operations, what does that mean?

It's really about people who are developing and deploying protocols like EPP, Who Is and eventually RDAP.

And as the author of EPP, I can tell that very early on it became very clear that there was no way we're going to come up with a one size fits all protocol - given the different business models that are very tightly coupled to the provisioning protocol that we use.

The extensible part of EPP has been both a blessing and a curse. And just as an example, there is one pearl implementation of EPP in open source.

For which there are 24 different contract extensions. So now imagine you're registrar trying to work with these 24 different registries.

And to register and create a contact you have to have software that does this 24 different ways.

If we had a form in which we could talk about the development of these extensions, we could possibly flatten that number and make this more efficient for everybody.

And as I note in the bullet there, we really don't have a form for ongoing discussion. You might say "Why can't this be done in the IETF."

Because the IETF is focused on protocol development, not the operations of these protocols - and while we have mailing lists, we have no place to carry on these conversations.

So the bottom line here is knowing that we are all operating and deploying things. How can we do it more efficiently? Next slide, please.

So for a little bit more than a year, I've been talking about, you know, creating what Keith described as an operations association. Or as it is more periodic workshops focused on technical topics.

It became very clear at the workshop we conducted at the ICANN meeting in L.A., there was very little interest in creating, you know, a trade association or an industry association.

We don't need the cost, we don't need the obligation of, you know, more travel, more meetings.

But there did seem to be a lot of support for the idea of some type of low overhead workshops.

That could be held in conjunction with other meetings that people were either already at or they could participate with remotely very easily.

So, the most important takeaway from this slide though is that the success ultimately depends on participation.

If we're trying to get people to coordinate and cooperate - if you don't have people in the room, there's no discussion - there won't be any of those things. Next slide, please - so, now getting to the real meat of the presentation.

The first workshop that I'm helping to coordinate is going to be held on 22 March, 2015 on Sunday, prior to the start of the IETF in Dallas.

You can get more information at the regiops.net Website. The URL is right there on that slide - including a registration page.

If you're interested in participating either in person or remotely, we'd like to ask you to take a look at the information there - register in advance.

And the agenda is going to be focused primarily on EPP extensions this time. There's a new EPP extensions registry that was just announced as a RFC a little bit earlier this month - RFC 7451

And so the first challenge in terms of coordinating this work is in getting a catalog of the extensions that are out there.

Until we have a measure of the size of the space it's really difficult to gain an understanding of where we have opportunities to gain efficiencies.

So, if you have developed localized EPP extensions or EPP extensions for your registry, I would encourage you to have an engineer on your staff or, you know, take a read yourself.

And see what it takes to catalog your extension. There's no cost, no risk and lots of benefit. So we're going to focus this workshop on introduction to that registry.

We're going to actually register a couple of extensions live as a demonstration. And then we'll spend the other remaining two hours or so talking about opportunities for work in new extensions.

So there's been a lot of discussion for example, about how we can come up with an extension for premium payments and things. And right now there's no standard way of doing that.

A couple of different proposals, it would be nice if we could take about it - figure out one way to do it. Next slide, please.

Second workshop - this will be held on the Sunday ahead of the IETF meeting in Prague, Czechoslovakia - so, hopefully very convenient for those of you based in Europe.

Same basic format - four hours on the Sunday. Same Website for registration information. The agenda for this will be focused primarily on RDAP.

And I'm hoping that by the time July rolls around, we will have gotten those RFC's out of the RFC editor. And people will start thinking pretty seriously about, you know, what implementation looks like.

I'd like to see some proof of concept implementation happening in the community long before the policy development starts.

Primarily because implementation experience will help us figure out where those knobs and dials need to be set, right, so that's workshop number 2.

And I believe that's my last slide. Next slide, please. Thank you. So as I said, these workshops only work if people participate.

We're going to try to make it very easy. So even if you can't be in the room at one of these IATF meetings, we're going to have a very workable remote participation option using WebEx.

Not just a phone bridge, interactive audio, interactive video. And if you can get someone to participate, there'd be a lot of benefit for the entire community.

Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you very much, Scott. And let's open the floor for any questions or comments. And I should note, thank you for correcting me.

In my introduction I referred to it as the association and it's not. So, I misspoke and thanks for that correction - so, any questions or comments for, Scott - anyone - yes.

Michelle King: Michelle King - Fair Winds Partners. Just one question, do you have like a 101 sheet for people who aren't technical that explains certain stuff that you do? I know it's geared more towards the technical folks but I was just curious.

Scott Hollenbeck: Yes indeed. I think there's a slide deck or two from the last workshop we did in Los Angeles. It goes into this stuff at a very high level. And if you're interested, I can certainly share that with you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you - any other comments or questions? Okay, very good, thank you Scott - appreciate it.

Brad-tech: Question - it's Brad. Do we have a copy of the slide deck someplace that I could forward to the people on my team for whom it would be more relevant?

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks Brad. And actually all of the presentations that are here with us today will be circulated to the list, so yes, and not just the one today but the previous ones as well that Scott referenced.

Okay, great. Thank you very much. All right, next up on the agenda is Kurt Pritz with domain name association - Kurt, over to you.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, Keith. And thanks very much everyone for giving me some time. I think that's a little big, right. So the domain name association has a little over a year under its belt and is beginning to record accomplishments.

And my purpose for taking advantage of the opportunity to address you today is review some of those accomplishments.

We're checking back with our members now to see if these are the sorts of things they were expecting that provide real value. And I also want to check with you, the members.

But especially the nonmembers to see if these are the sorts of things that you would find valuable in a trade association in which you would participate.

And, you know, during this meeting but afterwards too. I want to hear from you the sorts of things that would provide value to you as joining with other domain name industry participates, registries - registrars.

Both are CCTLD's and GTLD's. So, thanks for giving me the opportunity. Go on to the next slide. So, this is just a brief sort of round table on the specific work that we've been doing.

In the interest of member, both to promote the use and uptake of domain names as the best way to establish an internet presence. And make sure they work when they are taken and also to provide a voice for the industry in the policy sphere.

So first, and a big topic for this meeting has been universal acceptance. So the DNA (unintelligible) - building a repository of information.

A central resource where people can go to for thought pieces, articles - provide input. Perhaps download code snippets in order to attack their own problem.

So, the gist or the framework for that - repository can be seen at ua.thedna.org - so you can go visit that and if you went to the universal acceptance session here at this meeting.

You'll learn that I'm interrupting it as ICANN is handing off the universal acceptance issue to the community that's formed a communications subcommittee - an issue subcommittee and a committee formation subcommittee.

So, we are - the DNA marketing committee is contributing heavily to that communications effort. And it's one avenue for you to participate in universal acceptance.

So we're fully engaged on both those things. And boy, if you get a look at the repository, which is full of framework and recommend how it should be flushed out, that would be terrific - the next slide.

When it's not PDF, the things kind of fade in and out and (unintelligible) dramatic effect and it's scrolling to a slide with two boxes.

With regard to domain name promotion, we recently published the results of a global survey on domain name preferences. That's really interesting and the public version of the survey is at the dna.org.

You can just go to the front page and it's right there in the news. So, it's easy to find than a longer address. And we're using it to provide advice to our members and others based on the outcome.

How they should target their communications campaign and outreach. For setting the baseline to see how we're progressing as the whole GLD environment grows.

And I want to share with you just a couple instances of results. So, we'll do that really fast - as fast as the thing scrolls up. Go ahead.

So the big headlines that you can choose to repeat to others are that domain names continue to be relevant. And the internet using public is very open to using new domain extensions.

And I'll provide a little bit of data. But nearly 60% of the population worldwide is in favor of many more domain name and domain name extension options.

And even with that openness, internet users are generally unaware of the new opportunities. So that's a pretty powerful combination for the marketplace. That there's a product that people want and that the public is unaware of it.

So, clearly indicates where the need is. Can I have the next slide? So for example, you know, without knowing about the GTLD program in the UK and in the India when asked.

Where would you go for news? Half of the participants indicated they would go to domain names that didn't really exist yet.

And, you know, oddly in India, headlines today is a very - was a very popular answer. And we learned later that Today is the name of famous publications.

So, tying your domain name strategy to the local geography becomes an important aspect. Next slide - domain names are still relevant. People favor search over typing in address into address bar slightly.

But everybody does both. Everybody uses search, everybody still uses the address bar to type in domain names - or at least 85% of people. Can I have the next slide?

And this is just a repeat, but countries around the world - and we did the survey in 10 countries - strongly favored that there should be more domain name extension options.

And when you look at, you know, China and India, the answers in those countries were 70% or more of those 2.3 billion people. So thanks for giving me the opportunity to share it.

But go download the survey information - the public version of it. And I'd be happy to talk to you and interrupt the results the best I can but as a form statistician for the University of Michigan.

Okay, next. So, what else does the DNA do? Well, we strive to have a very strong policy voice and we come in rarely because we want to hit the sweat spot or intersection of interest of our members.

But we do come and we've seen the results of our comments come out in changes by ICANN. And Scott was talking about Who Is, so we commented on that.

We most recently commented on proposed trademark regulations in Europe that could result in frivolous litigation and court cases there. All about domain names that all of us what to avoid.

So we do that and then finally the reason I came was - next slide - was to invite you to a meeting on registry, registrar operations, improvement that's going to occur this week.

So the DNA registry, registrar operations group is open to all. We can't really create best practices while limited the membership to just our members.

So, over the past several months start (unintelligible) L.A. meeting, we created a charter.

And then have had approximately monthly meetings and now are launching this (unintelligible) group that runs the thing is launching two project teams to attack specific issues.

Can I have the next slide? And last slide, Keith, so you'll be happy. No, go back. There you go, thank you. So, the meeting is really - the slide says 3:30 but the ICANN meetings team moved it to 3:15 to give us a little more time.

So I urge you to attend. It's at 3:15 and (Sophia) - and the agenda really is to talk about our standard way of protecting IP during these meetings - for new comers who want to review or activates to date.

And we've established two projects that are ongoing. One involves invoicing by registries to registrar given as Scott mentioned, all the variable pricing mechanism that are in place and trying to deal with that.

And the second project has to deal with the release of delayed second level names. Whether they were delayed due to names collision or because they're two letter names or just four.

It's for individual registry practices - so we have those two teams. We'll spend you know, like 20 minutes on each team. So, those teams are just in the launching phase.

So I want to close with and it struck me that, you know, why is the DNA a good place to do this? And, you know, I thought we had good reasons when we started.

But a lot of them became clear later during our first meeting. One of the participants raised his hand and said, how do we protect our individual property interest?

Or how do we protect others from having their property taken? And that led us into an exploration of how they IETF handle that and the W3C. And it's quite a complex area and we spent a lot of time.

I and others spent a lot of time with (Scott Brander) in the IETF who developed their notice practice. And so we have in place a good policies - a good notice policy where members of these committees can participate.

And not worry that intellectual property rights will be falsely asserted against them or that their property's at risk. So, that's one.

And second, we've spent a lot of time lately understanding exactly what we can and cannot talk about.

So, we've engaged with attorney's that are, you know, couching us in how to avoid certain competition issues that can be improper if talk about that. And we're couching our project leads in that way.

So, what the DNA is bringing besides, you know, the conference line and to go to meeting in the meeting room here. Is we're really creating this shell where these conversations can happen in a really protected way.

Protected from an intellectual property standpoint and protected against antitrust risk and alike. So, we've spent the last few months building up those protections there to make it robust environment.

So, thanks very much and thank you, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much Kurt. Very informative and I know that as you said, you have a meeting schedule, you said on Wednesday - is that tomorrow?

Yes, so if anybody has any further interest in - any questions, I encourage you to participate. And, you know, I think it's just worth noting that, you know, the registry stakeholder group really is policy body or policy group.

You know, working within the ICANN community. And we obviously do a lot of other things but that's really our main focus. And certainly other aspects where registries might want to cooperate and collaborate.

And maybe I think the DNA would be a very reasonable place to do that. So, thank you - questions or comments for Kurt before we move on? Okay, so it is my pleasure to welcome Peter Vergote. Did I pronounce it right?

Peter Vergote: Yes, more or less.

Keith Drazek: Close enough. Thank you. Peter welcome. Peter is here on behalf of the Registry Stakeholder Groups if I'm not mistaken, first interest group. Other than the NTAG which was an observer interest group.

But we have the formation of the GEOTLD registries interest group. And Peter is here to give an overview and an introduction. And just like to take a moment to welcome you with a round of applause.

Peter Vergote: Thank you. Thank you very much, Keith - excited to be here because normally I'm wearing my CCTLD hat but since we've recently moved into G space as the operator of two geographic TLD's.

So, you will see more and more of our company in GNSO constituency. And more specifically in the registry stakeholder group as well. So, thank you for welcoming me and thank you for welcoming us GEOs.

We have been around for quite some time now. We have been working more in an informal way. And we realized along the way that we should get more formalized in order to get better results.

And to reflect our unique position that we take as GEO's. Next slide, please. So who are we? Well, in essence, you can see a lot of us on the slide in front of you.

Basically, we are - can you move to the next slide, please. We are geographical TLD's divided in three categories.

It's either related TLD's are related to city names or have (unintelligible) agents such as dot com, dot Brian, dot NYC. It could be geographic TLD's that are relating to certain area or to a certain region or its abbreviations.

Like you have dot rude, dot flounder and dot FRL - which is an abbreviation of a province in the Netherlands - or it could be a more broad geographic indication such as dot Zulu or dot (unintelligible).

But the thing that unites us is that it should be about an item designated GEOTLD. As you remember, during the application phase of the TLD's, you could either give yourself the label of a geographic or community based TLD.

So, in the end all the ones that applied for GL label and were awarded that label by ICANN would fit within our small group. And currently we are more or less with 65 geographic TLD's.

Next slide, please. So, what's our aim? Well, we have the feeling that we are quite a unique group and if you would ask people around.

I think that many of them would consider our kind of TLD's more (unintelligible) to a CCTLD than to a GTLD. So we have a kind of a bridging function in between the CC and the G world.

And we figured out that we need it to collaborate on issues of common interests. And obviously we as individual members of the registry stakeholder group want to do that collaboration within the registry stakeholder group.

And the initial idea was to look for the possibility of having a constituency within the registry stakeholder group. Some of us participated in the evaluation one working group.

That has concluded its business quite some time ago now. And though there was no consensus - we didn't reach a consensus in getting so far as actually to get to constituency.

So, we kind of moved away from that and we figured out a plan B, which is the creation of GTLD registries interest group. Next slide, please.

So the mission of that interest group would clearly be as to represent our unique views as GEO's within the registry stakeholder group. I'm not going to read it out loud.

But that is in essence what the slides in front you say. Next slide, please. So where are we now on the formalization process? Well, we managed to agree on a charter.

We notified the registry stakeholder group of that charter and our desire to actually proceed on the way to formalize an interest group. We have designated spokespersons for the time being.

And the spokesperson is (unintelligible) from Dr. (unintelligible) who is with us here and myself. So, we are well underway but still we need to take a few future steps.

And one will be to agree on a budget and on an annual fee. So that we have the working means to structure our work and to have a bit of secretarial aid to function as an interest group.

And of course, we need to transition now from the newly created interest group to an interest group with members.

Now we probably know who our members will be, but we need to formalize that process by sending out application forms. And actually process and approve the applications.

But before being able to do that, obviously we need to agree on the membership fee - because otherwise we would ask for more members to sign a blank check and that's not something that we would like to see.

And finally, when all this process is behind us, we can elect officers - a formal chair, vice chair and a treasurer. And next slide, please. And that's the last slide.

Well, if you want to get into contact with us, you can either contact Dirk or myself or (unintelligible) who is also involved with dot Berlin.

And we are actually - until we have formalized all the steps, we kind of fulfilling the roll - more or less of an executive committee and while we wait for formal elections to take place. So, thank you very much.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thank you very much, Peter. And, you know, I think this - it's been an important moment to remind everybody and acknowledge that the registry stakeholder group has for many years had the availability of interest groups.

The formation of interest groups and we very much welcome the GEOTLD's registries interest group. It's an exciting moment and I think, you know, this will only help to enrich the registries group as a whole.

You know, we would welcome other interest groups as well. Whether it would be, you know, officially dot brand or other interest groups.

You know, I think it's an exciting moment to note that, you know, we went for many, many, many years, you know, 20 GTLD's in the registry stakeholder group - give or take a few.

And, you know; now we have as at least mentioned earlier and as we know, there's been over 500 new delegations. Which is just really great and thank you - welcome.

Peter Vergote: Thank you very much.

Keith Drazek: Any questions - any questions for Peter? Okay, I see none. So thank you all very much.

Peter Vergote: Okay.

Keith Drazek: Very good.

Peter Vergote: Thank you very much.

Keith Drazek: Okay, so now we need to move fairly quickly. We've run a bit over time. We got started a little bit late with that session because of the lunch line. Although I think everybody would agree it was well worth it.

So, but we do need to move very quickly into a discussion of the IANA functions transition CWG work. And on the agenda we had really an update for the accountability group and the CWG on transition.

But I think in talking to others, I think we really need to focus the next 45 minutes, or so on, the transition CWG. It is I think the area where there's probably the most urgent input required.

And discussion making and dialog within this group. So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Donna - if she would like to take the lead on running this particular discussion.

And feel free to kick it back to me if you need to for any reason.

Jon Nevett: Do we have a plan for the 2:00 o'clock meeting with the board? Or is that something that we need reserve time for to discuss? And if so, we have to factor that in.

Keith Drazek: Yes. So we should probably reserve some times. Thank you, Jon. So, while we're having this discussion, think about what we would like to discuss with the board.

On the agenda, we do have a few items. Contract interpretation and compliance was one. Two character second level domain names was another.

If there's other things that we want to talk about, please think of them and bring them to the table. But at the same time, I want to, you know; think about maybe switching things up with the board a little bit.

And to the point of the discussion on the email list earlier this week, you know my initial thought.

And I'm happy to get push back on this - was, some of the questions that we were asked from Fadi and from the board, you know, "What would good look like in 2015 for the organization? And what are the risks to the enterprise, in a sense?"

Maybe we go in there and simply turn it around and ask the board members those questions and see what they have to say - just a thought, if they want to switch things up with us.

But I do think we have a couple of important topics to raise with them. So Donna, back over to you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Keith, Donna Austin. So I think what we're going to do here, we'll - some of you may have seen the presentation that Jonathan has been doing this week and certainly the webinars that were held last Tuesday. So I'm just going to do a really quick and dirty kind of overview of that.

Then I want to have some discussion around the - some questions that Larry Strickling asked of the group via a state of the net address that he had. And then Chuck, I might hand over to you and we'll go into the questions from the discussion paper. Thanks.

So Valerie, if you can move through. Okay, pretty obvious.

So if we just - I think this is an important point that currently there's 134 people in this transition group. There are - 19 of them are formal members.

But everybody participates on an - pretty much on an equal footing. We haven't had to call any votes or we haven't got to a position where we're talking about consensus yet.

And the designated five subgroups that we've organized, the work is important as well. RFP 3 is where most of the debate is happening at the moment.

RFP 3 is the group that developed the proposal that was - that is currently on the table via the 1 December public comment period. And this - as a result of the public comment period and a recognition that there was some appetite for looking at another proposal, a second party - a second subgroup was -- I can't think of the word -- established to look at an alternative proposal as well.

And I'm - and just to the fact that we're not doing any work, that group, that secondary group only kicked off their discussions I think the first week of January. So those discussions have only been happening over the last three or four weeks. Okay?

So there's two models under discussion. And I'll just go through them briefly.

I'm not sure what - so the way that we've categorized these two options is external or internal-to-ICANN options. The external-to-ICANN option is basically replacing the function - not the function, replacing NTIA with an external third-party contractor. And that contractor would actually hold a contract with ICANN to form the IANA function.

So that's what we mean by external. It's actually a body sitting outside of ICANN that has the authority to enter in a - enter into a contract with ICANN for the IANA function.

The internal option is about how do you - it's kind of remove that contractual relationship and ICANN maintains the IANA function in its own right. There's -

one of the challenges that we had very early in the discussions is that the accountability piece hadn't started. And what was evident from the get-go is that there is a lot of distrust about ICANN and particularly the way that they managed that accountability process and whether these two streams were related or not.

So we kind of started from a low point. And that's why we spent a lot of time focused on, you know, accountability mechanisms.

So we've got the message pretty clearly this week that the - we need to have some faith that the accountability stuff will actually be handled by the CCWG. And we should now focus on what needs to happen to replace the function that I - that NTIA actually performs as it relates to the operational piece of the IANA relationship.

Valerie, if you can move to the next one please.

So the - there are currently two internal-to-ICANN proposals that are on the table. And there is - and there are also now two external-to-ICANN options.

It gets a little bit legalistic. But one of the - they all have common elements in the two models at the moment.

So there's the multi-stakeholder review team which is a - it's kind of the oversight body. So in the event - and I've missed an important piece of the thing here. One of the critical pieces of the discussion is the ability at any point, if performance of IANA is not up to scratch, is to start a process which would effectively take the IANA function out of ICANN. And that's been a pretty critical part of the discussion.

So the multi-stakeholder review team would actually be the body that oversees on a higher level the performance of IANA or maybe a, you know, we haven't got down into detail on this but maybe on a rolling-12-monthly

cycle that they would do a review of the IANA function based on what is coming out of the customer service standing committee which is kind of underneath that. But the customer standing committee is more associated with monitoring the IANA functions on a more day - not so much a day-to-day basis but on a more regular basis.

And then there's independent appeals panel which in my mind is probably going to just slip away because of the accountability discussion. But this - one of the other discussions that probably is still circulating a lot is that the registries are pretty much of the view that the IANA function is very much a - it's an operational, it's a technical function. It's about implementation.

There's a lot of discussion about the policy. And this independent appeals panel is related to whether IANA has actually implemented in accordance with policy. But there's a - whenever we talk about policy it's a pretty - there's blurred lines.

So I think at one point there was concern that the registries were going to develop some kind of cartel and overtake the world inside of the IANA transition and that will be a concern. So I think Stephanie closed them down on that and said that's silly; we wouldn't do that.

So they're kind of the common points of the two models. And in my mind this is like - it's very high hierarchical. So you'll - the multi-stakeholder review team is a body that oversees everything. Customer standing committee is the one that is more - closely has that relationship with IANA on a more regular basis.

And IANA currently has reports that they release on a monthly basis, those reports based on SLAs that were developed as a result of community comment, as I understand it, related to the last IANA contract. And so they monitor performance on that basis.

So on a monthly basis the customer standing committee would reviews - review those. If they're okay with it then there's no action. If it becomes a systemic problem that they think there's poor performance then that might be escalated to the NTIA to deal with. So it's kind of - in my mind it's always been a hierarchical kind of situation.

Valerie?

And I'm sorry if I'm talking really quickly here. But I just want to get to the end I suppose.

I'm not going to - I don't - Keith, Stephanie, Sarah, I'm not sure that there's value in going through the detail of the external or internal models. I think at a high level we probably, you know, get what we're talking about here.

One of the conversations that has been happening and that I've been talking to people about here this week, we've - Valerie, can you go - scroll through please? I'll let you know. It's pretty close to the end.

So the state of the net speech that Larry Strickling gave two weeks ago, I think it is now -- stop there; thanks -- so as part of his speech he - my reaction to the speech was that he was putting the CWG on notice. He wasn't on - I wasn't particularly sure that he was happy with the path that we were going down.

So he has, in his speech, raised four questions related to the proposal which at that point the only one on the table was the external-to-ICANN option. The message that I think we've got pretty clearly here this week is that the external-to-ICANN option is probably - it's not saleable. NTIA is - it won't be acceptable. And at the end of the day why waste our time on something that's not going to get us over the line?

So I - there's still - and I can't say with any certainty that the external option is actually off the table in the mind of the CWG. But there's certainly been a realization that it's something that we need to think very seriously about, about whether it's tenable or not.

So these four questions, I'm not going to read through it but just to highlight that the questions that Larry have raised - Larry did raise in his speech has kind of had an impact on the work that we're doing. And certainly the clear message that we're getting here this week is that we really need to think about what we're doing and make sure that we do have something going forward that is acceptable.

I think Larry gave - there's a group of us met with him this week. He gave us a very strong message that he has to be able to defend it on the Hill.

So it needs to be a proposal that is - I think we've been discussing at a very high level what we think would make up the structural framework of what we're doing. It seems that what Larry is really pushing for and certainly what Fadi has been saying, we haven't got the detail that they need yet. And that's where they want the focus to be.

Keith Drazek: So yeah, thanks, Donna. I just wanted to jump in.

I think one of the messages that we heard very clearly is that Larry said, you know, they've been describing NTIA's role in the IANA stewardship, you know, IANA function stewardship as being administrative and clerical and sort of fairly simple and that there's a concern that if we, the community, build some, you know, very complex process with lots of moving parts and all of that suddenly it doesn't look so administrative or clerical anymore, even though it may be somewhat closer to that and that he is - and there's a concern that in order to be able to explain and justify and vouch for this new proposal in Congress and around the world that we need to make sure that

the IANA stewardship function's replacement, the CWG, is focused on - really more on the operational accountability. Thanks.

Donna Austin: So I think that's kind of the overview. That's where we are now is that decision that the CWG, if - in my mind if we can have some agreement at the end of this week that perhaps the external is off the table that's going to make it easier for us to focus on what we think a transition that is internal to ICANN can look like, get into the detail and have something that's actually tenable for NTIA at the end of the day.

Does anyone have any questions at this point? I know that I've been talking pretty quickly.

Jon Nevett: It seems like one thing you mentioned is in both tracks right now with the internal and the external is that there is this notion of separability. Do you expect that notion to survive the discussions, you know, like the latest from Larry? And is that an important characteristic of a transition in a world in which we assume that there's reasonable accountability procedures from the outset?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jon. That's a good question.

I think the only way an internal-to-ICANN option is tenable for those that are really pushing for the external is that there must be that ability in the event that the IANA function is being performed badly on a pretty constant basis that that can be taken out of ICANN in some way. And certainly the internal-to-ICANN options that are on the table actually have that.

One is categorized as a golden bylaw where through some process or mechanism you could actually take the IANA function out of ICANN and put it somewhere else. So that notion of separability will survive regardless of whether it's internal or external, on the understanding of most of us that it will never happen.

Jon Nevett: Okay. Thanks, Jordyn. Thanks, Donna. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. So I get the message pretty clearly even if it's not explicitly from both Larry and probably Fadi of ICANN that separability is not liked, it's not appealing but it's baked into - the principles have never been fully and formally signed off by the CWG. But it's in the principles and has never been challenged. So it's kind of a fundamental of the CWG and therefore - and it seems to be a very firmly held view of a reasonable proportion of the CWG participants.

So to that extent I think it would be hard to get it off the table completely. And therefore I would go along with Donna's view which is that it needs to be sufficiently - a sufficiently extreme scenario that it is extremely unlikely to ever occur because one would build sufficient remedies into the escalation part or sufficient opportunity for remedy that no sane organization would not remedy the faults that it seeks to ultimately protect against.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jonathan. I had Sarah, then Jordyn.

Sarah Falvey: This is...

Keith Drazek: Oh, Tim too. I saw your hand earlier, right? Okay.

Sarah Falvey: Charleston Road Registry, this is Sarah Falvey. I just want to respond to that.

I personally think that given how the discussion has been going up until this point, if the - this one sticking point is this concept of separability and there's enough in there that people feel comfortable I think that that - I think that it will go through.

I think we've been having - the discussions that we've been having about having an external solution and all of these things, I think if in the end of the

day we come up with an internal solution that serves the needs of the registries and addresses the concerns of NTIA but happens to have this sort of separability point that's got the caveats around it that you mentioned, I personally think that it will go through and be approved.

So I think, you know, to Donna's point, it - this is one of those - that and the (CSC) seem to be two pieces that everyone is in pretty much agreement on, that concept of creating a customer service committee which hopefully would be staffed by registries to discuss things like service level agreements and things like that and then this idea that if something were to take place that was catastrophic, that we would have as a community some ability to move forward in a sort of a way that we all anticipate.

Keith Drazek: Yeah. Thanks, Sarah. And I think your, you know, your point about if something catastrophic happened I think is the key is that like this is, you know, a lever of last resort. You know? I mean all, you know, only in the worst of scenarios would it ever be used in a sense but that it would be there to provide the confidence to the users and the community, you know, to make sure.

I guess the question - the argument really is: do you - if you can fix ICANN that is operating IANA in perpetuity presumably, if you can fix ICANN then does that resolve the problem of the, you know, IANA not functioning?

In other words if you can spill the board and have all kinds of levers built into the bylaws and protections built into the bylaws is it better to fix ICANN and leave IANA where it is or do you have the ability to, in a sense, if you don't have those extra protections in the bylaws and the ability to spill the board and reclaim the organization, if you will, then is it better to be able to take it elsewhere in the worst-case scenario? And I think that's the crux of the argument.

Sarah Falvey: And just quickly to Donna's earlier point, the concept here would be very technical in nature. So it would be, you know, the - it's - things are not being updated repeatedly or there's some sort of constant, you know, service levels not being met or - we haven't quite talked about it but it would be the idea that ICANN and the IANA staff are not technically performing sort of their jobs and their functions. It would have nothing to do with sort of anything else; I think is how it's being discussed.

Keith Drazek: Okay. I had a queue. I think it was Tim, actually, who had his hand up earlier -- apologies -- then Jordyn, Jonathan and Donna and Rubens.

Tim McGinnis: Thank you, Keith. Tim McGinnis for the transcription.

I guess I just have a question. I'm looking - I've looked at the IETF proposal and I looked at the numbers community proposal. And they have an MOU and a contract respectively.

As the third customer, don't we as a group - third customer of the IANA don't we as a group want to directly be able to take IANA elsewhere if we're not getting good service from the service provider? It just strikes me that all three should be done roughly the same.

If we have two external agreements to run IANA and then one internal and we really don't have any mechanisms by which to, you know, control who - control our registry then we're - I would say that the registry - naming registries are at a disadvantage in that.

Keith Drazek: Thank you. And I think you're absolutely correct about that last statement. It is one of the reasons why the naming community, the gTLD space in particular but the naming community is so unique and different than the numbers and the protocol parameters. It is because we are part of this, you know, part of this organization, this community. And its policy, processes are internal to ICANN as opposed to external like the others.

So anyway I saw Chuck and Stephanie go up that wanted to respond, I think.  
And then I've got a queue going. Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: This isn't a direct response to Tim. But I just wanted to build on what Donna had said and what the other people working on this track have contributed.

One of the things that has come out in our conversations during this meeting and also when we look back through the remarks from Secretary Strickling is that one of the criteria that came out when this transition was announced was the fact that this proposal had to meet the needs of its customers. And we have to really strongly maintain the position that we as registries are those customers.

So going forward - and I think Jeff Eckhaus' points in the last meeting were very well taken that we owe all of you guys a little bit more structure around how you can contribute to this work and what we're actually looking for from the broader group. But to have that criterion really work for us and get us what we need out of the proposal it's going to be really fundamental to get input from this wider group.

Keith Drasek: Okay. Thank you. So I've got in the queue Jordyn, Jonathan, Donna, Rubens and Phillip. Anybody else?

Okay. Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: Sorry I'm asking stupid questions. And I'm sure the person I'm sitting next to and work with knows the answer here.

But I'm coming back to separability for one more second just because it seems like byzantine and sort of bizarre. And I think Donna and Jonathan

both sort of implied there's people who really, really want this and therefore, you know, we sort of go along with them just so we can get this thing done.

I guess I'm curious who wants it. Do people that are actual customers of IANA think this is important or is it just like this random sort of the broader ICANN world saying like oh yeah, we don't trust ICANN; we need this thing?

It seems like, you know, to Keith's point if you had mechanisms in the accountability track that just let you, you know, spill the board for I - like you're basically rebooting ICANN. It's like a new entity at that point. Not quite but, you know, there's inertia.

But you have - that seems like a substantial remedy. Or just like fire everyone that works for IANA and like hire them again. Like those all seem like things that would be much more sensible remedies than trying to build in like a weird golden bylaw or something.

So I guess I'm just curious who's pushing for this and does it make sense to go build in a relatively convoluted process when we could have a much simpler approach from the accountability track.

Keith Drazek: I'll respond to that. I think Chuck wanted to respond.

I'll tell you there's one ccTLD registry in particular who has spoken on this and I think has strong feelings about it. And the argument that they've made and I think actually has some merit is that there is currently separability or severability in the relationship in a sense that NTIA can rebid the IANA functions and that it was never guaranteed to go to ICANN permanently, even though some would say well ICANN was created for this function and all that kind of stuff.

There was a contract there and that the - actually having a contractual relationship that allows for a rebid or separability is really maintaining the

status quo. It's just a question of a different party as counterparty to that agreement, not NTIA - who would replace NTIA.

So they would say or they would argue: actually suggesting that there shouldn't be severability or separability is actually the dramatic change here or would be the dramatic change. The question then is how do you ensure we as users, customers of the IANA function and then the community, if we're talking about it going to ICANN permanently, how do we make sure that we keep ICANN and IANA accountable to us without that threat of a rebid.

And so I think, you know, it - that's I think maybe the sort of philosophical response. But Chuck and then Stephanie.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. First of all even in our meeting with Larry and Fiona on Sunday I posed a question about separability. And they're okay with that I think.

The principle of separability is not in - but it's a rare thing. If you look at the IATF proposal, if you look at the numbers proposal, they have it in theirs. The - and - but the thing of it is we have been focusing on the ability to do that and not on the operational side. And consequently, that's what's being attacked. And the separability is -- like he said -- it's there now. Is it the major issue? No. The major issue is the operational functions and making sure that follows through.

I think the working group is going to end up still with a separability principle, but it's going to be an arrear exception. It's something we shouldn't be focusing our time on and unfortunately we've been spending 95% of our time on that -- maybe more -- and not on the operational side. And I think that's where we as registries can take the lead and redirect that.

The - now, how much do you have to prepare, then, for separability? We've been spending most of our time on that one issue and that's still something that'll have to be resolved, but that's not the major issue. It's the operational

functions that need to be addressed. And we have a challenge there, because -- like Donna said -- we're dealing with a multi-stakeholder community and they all want to have their hands in it. And that's where we get the complexity, all the structures and everything else. And we've got to work that issue.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Chuck. Let's get back to our queue. I've got Jonathan, Donna, Rubens, and Phillip.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I think I was going to pick up on the separability point, but I - it seems to be it's been pretty well discussed and explained and Jordyn's questions answered. You did make me think a little differently it, Keith, when you put - because I've always seen it like Sarah represented it which is as a requirement under certain conditions related to specific technical failure to perform.

But there is an argument that says that you don't need to change the supplier if you can fundamentally reorganize the supplier at the level that's potentially proposed by the accountability track.

But for the moment I think it's kind of a sufficiently strong principle and belief and the other things that have been said -- existing condition -- that it seems that we might focus too much energy if we try and get that off the table at this point. If in the event the accountability group does develop sufficient confidence of this - the stewardship group that it's possible that that could go off the table.

But for right now I think it'd be a distraction. I think I'm with Chuck. The big message we've got -- and I'll be frank with you -- my current thinking is to (unintelligible) of the group into -- one -- this issue of separability -- and two -- everything else, which is the operational functions of the group. And that's something we need to discuss as a group.

I haven't discussed that with the group, but that's really where my thinking's starting to go so that we can directly respond to the -- in my view -- not wholly warranted criticism -- although there is - Chuck made the point that we spend a lot of energy on this -- but nevertheless, we've - my feeling is as I said perhaps earlier we've come to the meeting and presented our biggest challenge. We've got some really good feedback as a result and I think we should take it as feedback. I think it's a little unfair at times it's been criticism.

On a purely practical point, I wonder whether we shouldn't invite the registrars or - to pull in with us in our little group. That might give our group some more strength and - yeah, okay. So that's just a thought and it sounds like there might be a response.

Woman: Yeah, I already discussed this with Graham, and if people from this group are amenable to that, he is very much interested in participating and seeing the extent to which we can coordinate as customers and their customers whose businesses are also affected by proper questioning of IANA.

Keith Drazek: Yeah, thanks. And I would fully support that. You know, I think -- going back to this question -- if we're talking tactics in terms of making sure that we get what we need out of this whole process -- both tracks -- accountability and the transition tracks -- I think - I can't see why we would take severability off the table until we're sure that we're getting what we need in the accountability track to be able to fix ICANN.

In other words, I mean, just to even - and even the external discussion, you know, why would we take that off the table until we know that we're getting what we need on the accountability front? The bylaw changes, if it's a membership structure, or something that gives us the authority over the board in very rare instances where we could, you know, spill the board, recall board members, challenge a decision, have independent arbitration. You know, the things that are being discussed in the accountability track right now.

But until we are confident that we're getting what we need out of the accountability track, I can't see why we would give up severability. Okay, so I do have a queue. I have Donna, Rubens, Phillip, Sarah. Yeah, go ahead.

Sarah Falvey: Can you explain -- I just want to make sure I understood what you just said -- do you think that we should take - should not take the external to ICANN option off the table or do you think we should not take severability off the table?

Keith Drazek: I - what I meant and - what I meant was definitely not severability and maybe not external option. But I'm going to leave that to the CWG, because that's - I have not been involved in the CWG. I'm leaving that to your group to figure out. But to me the issue - we should (unintelligible) or severability off the table until we know we're getting what we need out of the accountability track, in my opinion. So, okay. Donna, Rubens, and then Phillip.

Donna Austin: Thanks (unintelligible), it's Donna Austin. One of the principles is actually that we - any proposal that is on the table we would revisit in light of accountability recommendations. At - I think at the point that we made that decision we only had one option on the table. It could actually be that we have, you know, two that are reasonably well developed so that -- depending on how we react to the accountability recommendations -- we've actually got one to go - that we do have a viable option to go forward.

I just want to make some points about - some - where I think we have actually got some agreement with the CWG. And it relates to, you know, this separability and what would trigger that discussion about moving IANA out. We have - I do believe we have agreement within the group that it would have to be the registries that trigger that. That they would have to be agreement from the registries and that trigger would come from them. It would not come from the areas of the - whatever group would come up with.

So I think it is - while we've got some, you know, negotiations about whether we should have had 12 or 26 people on an MRT, I think there is a reasonable agreement among the group that we are the primary customers and therefore we have a weighted say in anything that happens. And certainly the discussions around what would trigger, you know, discussions to sever the IANA function, it would have to come from the registries. So I think we do have that agreement within the group.

So - which I think is a good thing. And there is recognition that we are the primary customers and therefore we have - we should have a decent say in what happens. So I guess that's the main point I wanted to make.

And I would now -- to Jordyn's question about the separability and whether it's still an issue or not -- I think in terms of where we started, I mean, we've shifted a long, long, long way from where we started. I mean, this discussion - there was some in the group that actually wanted the discussion to start around let's move IANA out now. And that would be the starting point. So we have come a very long way. I know some people don't think we're doing much, but we have. It's - we've shifted quite a bit, so...

Keith Drazek: Yeah, thank you Donna. So I've got Rubens then Phillip, and then we need to draw a line under this because we've got to talk about the board session before we walk over there. So very quickly, if possible. Sorry it took so long to get to you guys.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. One of the possibilities that - of the IANA contract would be to allow it was for the society to question not only ICANN service at the IANA function but IANA's (unintelligible) policy. So if ICANN suddenly started making weird policies or policies that nobody agreed, removal of the IANA function due to that was a possibility. Do we have a replacement for that under either models?

Keith Drazek: Yeah, so to answer your question as briefly as I can, I - there - the accountability CCWG is working on exactly those kinds of replacements. Mechanisms and levers that the community would have built into the bylaws, secured, and, you know, basically giving the community the ability to correct ICANN's behavior through authorization of - or ratification of board decisions, recall mechanisms to spill the board; things like that. So definitely in the accountability track.

There are efforts to try to find and try to identify and have consensus agreement around how exactly to achieve that. So more to come on that, okay? Phillip?

Phillip Shephard: Thank you. For the (unintelligible) with the BRG, but asking a question, not a position. Once we accept IANA's to do the oversight -- the community oversight body -- once we accept the logic of an internal solution and our preference of the trigger for change is us, the registries, then the role of the community oversight body -- currently the MRT within the IANA - in these proposals -- is a fairly removed and general community oversight body.

Now, it strikes me that that is very similar to the concepts being discussed under why the discussions on accountability that other mechanisms will be the trigger body. And the community oversight body appeals that, therefore looks at that. So, I mean, is there a possibility that we end up with two very similar community oversight bodies or was the thinking about that those effectively should be - that this proposal of the MRT and whatever comes out of that are going to somehow be merged bodies?

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Phillip. Sarah?

Sarah Falvey: This is Sarah. So I don't know necessarily what's going to happen. The MRT I think is a really - it's a big sticking point and I -- this is personal opinion -- but I think we should be really careful about creating any kind of oversight body that's multi-stakeholder, because one of the - specifically for the IANA

function's technical piece. Because what happens is everybody wants to be a part of that and the discussion on the list has been, you know, having five GAC members, having everything that IANA does be reviewed.

And if we're talking from a technical customer perspective, I mean, you're - one, your TLD will be entered into (unintelligible) in like 12 years. And the second thing that will happen is the policy will be re-litigated 400 times. So, you know, we have concerns now about two letter codes, like that's going to be easily stuff kind of compared to like what will happen if we see a multi-stakeholder body take over what should just be a very technical process.

And I think the other thing that we need to remember is as the customers of the IANA functions, we should make sure that we maintain that role of being able to have control over -- not have control -- but have there be a communication there between IANA and kind of what we need and that we're able to participate meaningfully in that process. And if we have an MRT, I personally think that we will sort of lose that ability.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks. Okay, Stacey, last comment before we move on.

Man: Jon's losing his mind over there.

Stacey King: I just wanted to give a quick example...

Keith Drazek: So we're due at the board at a quarter after. So we have a few minutes to walk over there after we have a five minute conversation. Oh, perfect. Okay.

Stacey King: Just - I'm just going to give a quick example of what Sarah's talking about. One of the things that came up was that a delegation and re-delegation, analysis should be done of whether a particular string that's going to be entered into the root violates national and local laws. Which for a CCTLD maybe makes some sense, but for a G that means you're looking at local, national laws globally. I mean, I don't even know how you'd do that. So those

are some of the policy things that were starting to come into play that we heard from others.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you. We need to move on. And I do just want to take one moment to thank all of the team that has been working on this and Jonathan who has been the chair of the CWG on behalf of the GNSO. So I think they do deserve a round of applause here because despite what some might say, there has been an incredible amount of work going on for months on this. And so I'll just leave it at that. Thank you all. Okay, discussion of our topics with the board. We had two that I identified earlier. Jon, go ahead. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Why don't you just remind everyone what the two are.

Keith Drazek: Yep, was just about to. Contract interpretation and compliance impact and then two characters.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. So I'm thinking that maybe we go up a level on two characters. Use that as an example of GAC interaction with operations of our businesses, right? What's the impact that the GAC is having? They're an advisory body on policy, right? And we're finding several examples of them having an operational impact on us. And, you know, maybe that's something on a higher level we can raise and use the two character as an example.

Keith Drazek: Yep, I think that's fair. And again, I think both of these -- if we talk about contract interpretation and, you know, compliance impact and what you just described -- again, we can go back to the - sort of the meta message of predictability of process. So maybe that's all we talk about is predictability of process for the community, how it impacts us, our concerns about -- for example -- the GAC and -- for example -- you know, ICANN's own internal - I mean, any other thoughts or comments or suggestions? Chuck, Jordyn, (Jonathan). Jordyn, go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah, so I think to - I like where Jon's going and to build on what you said earlier, Keith, of like turning this around. I'd maybe change that topic even a little bit more and say, "Hey, guys, look." They know why we're mad. Like we don't need spend 45 minutes telling them why we're mad about the two letter stuff; they've heard it already, right? So like preface it with that. Like, "You guys know, that this, like - we had a process, we thought it was going to work, it's totally unpredictable."

And engage - like ask them questions, right? Like, what's the board's view of what the GAC advice is supposed to be doing, right? Because I think that would help inform our ability to understand and react and propose ways forward with interacting with the GAC. Because right now we just sort of like lob stuff and hope that they interpret it the way we want them to. And there's a thousand other groups also lobbying them. So I'd appreciate insight into what the board thinks the right engagement model is.

Keith Drazek: Yeah, I think -- just in my initial reaction, Jordyn -- I think that makes a lot of sense. You know, they said earlier in the week that, you know, they - they're looking for ways to, you know, sort of change up the dynamic in the Tuesday sessions. You know, instead of us going and rattling through our list of concerns and having a little bit of Q&A, why don't we just tee it up at a high level and then engage them in their views on the issues that we care about?

Okay, so I had Jonathan. Sorry - Jonathan, Tim, Jeff, Chuck. Who did I miss? Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll try and be super brief because others are waiting. I think they are briefed about our issues, so I agree we probably don't need to go into detail. I'm sure they've got proper, thorough briefings on those things. I really like the idea of asking questions because I think one of the issues of the dynamic is we come and make statements.

And actually I think to the extent that we can ask questions; one of the questions that I was going to make which relates to - which - or a phrase that I like in adjacent to your predictability of process one is integrity of the model. Because this is what - this to me seems like a key point.

And then - so that's related to what we were already going to discuss - Jon's original point and so on. I - there's a couple of other questions I've got that I could think we could use. I don't feel passionately that they have to be raised, but I'll throw them out there. The one is what do they think about the work of the two CWGs today because of accountability and stewardship? What's their feedback?

And then the other thing is they spend a lot of time together at ICANN meetings. What are the top three things that they're spending all their time on? So those are two questions that we could ask them. But if we've got other things that people feel would be higher priority, I'm more than happy to defer those.

Keith Drazek: Yep, thanks Jonathan. Jeff - I'm sorry, Tim. Tim then Jeff then Chuck.

Tim McGinnis: Thank you (unintelligible). Tim again it's National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. Back in October we said -- talking about the proposed bylaw change -- the RISIG opposes this change, which would only increase the existing tension between the board's obligation with respect to consensus GNSO recommendations and its obligation with its respect to GAC advice which must be addressed in this process.

I think we need to hit them again with that and reiterate that; that this continued GAC board tension would only be made more intense and frequent if the bylaw change went through and, you know, it would require a third of the board to agree with the GAC. So I think that - encouraging the GAC is the last thing we want the board to do. So I think that should be our message.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Tim. Alright, Jeff, Chuck, Stacey, and then we need to go.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman with Valideus. I want us to stay a little bit away from just saying predictability of process, because it's actually more than process. And Steve Crocker for many meetings will always say, "Well, as long as the process is right, it doesn't matter how the substance comes out." And that's actually not true. We need predictability in all sorts of areas.

And the comment I raised to Fadi this morning at the DNA breakfast was we had a substantive policy for years -- ever since the white paper 1998 -- that we would not create new international law. That we would not create new rights that don't exist under international law. Yet that's what the GAC and others are trying to do in a number of circumstances.

So even if the process was 100% correct, the predictability of sticking to things that we had come up with years ago and that the Department of Commerce had put out in a green paper and a white paper way back when ICANN was established, it's important to stick to precedent. And if we can't stick to policy precedent as well as process precedent, we're going to crumble and fall.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Jeff. I think that's a great point. So predictability maybe at the high level and process and policy are subsets of that. Okay, Chuck then Stacey.

Chuck Gomes: And I'll be brief; totally agree with Jeff. The issue we're dealing with - the board understands predictability. They understand what we need in our businesses. We don't have to - we can say it again, but let's not harp on it. But the issue here is really the GAC board relationships, the GAC community relationships. And until we solve that problem, we're going to keep running into this. And that's the - I think the higher level that we really need to be focusing on here.

Now, there's not an easy solution because it's a sensitive issue, but it's right. If they don't have any standards, they can just subjectively say, "This is a problem." You know, the dot Amazon example is a classic one. There's no international law, there's no local law, even. And we need to tackle that problem. And it's a tough one.

Keith Drazek: Thanks. Stacey?

Stacey King: I'm wondering if it's worth being fairly direct in a question. So we - this morning when we heard (unintelligible) talk, everything they said is, "We'll take this into account for the next time." They weren't talking about now. Is it worth going in and saying, "Did you the board tell the staff to stop the process? And if you did, why was that not transparent and public? If you didn't, are you going to tell the staff to start the process back up?"

And I think that will then lead into the discussions about what's been going on with the GAC. But I do wonder if it's worth being direct and seeing if they'll respond.

Keith Drazek: Okay. You know, I think we ought to consider this an opportunity for everybody to weigh in with their views. Let's keep it respectful, obviously, but I think this is an opportunity to have some, you know, lively dialogue. Shake things up a little. I'm going to hand it over to Paul for a moment for an important announcement and then we're going to move on to the board meeting.

Paul Diaz: And very quick, but we've been doing a lot of hard work and once in a while we get to do things that feel good. As I think most of you are aware, one of our favorite colleagues just had a birthday recently and, you know, Cherie over here is always doing so many good things for us that we wanted to use this as an opportunity to say thank you, Cherie and actually we have a few things for you to say thank you for all you do for us. It's very much appreciated.

Keith Drazek: Alright everybody. So we'll move next door and then reconvene back here at 3:30 for the remainder for our working group session. Thanks.

END