Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

Registrars Meeting

Tuesday 16 July 2013 at 09:00 local time

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/#jul

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Michele Neylon: Good morning everybody, we'll be starting in a couple of moments. Thank you.

Man: Let the transcript read Registered Stakeholder Group going from 9:00 AM to 17:00 local time.

Michele Neylon: Good morning everybody. I think we'll start things off as we're a couple of minutes past the hour already and we have a very busy schedule.

Good morning, Mr. (Anderson).

Good morning everybody. This is the Registrar of Stakeholder Group meeting. Welcome to Durbin. There is remote participation available.

If you're a registrar there is space at the table. I'm looking at you (Pete). Thank you, you can wave back. Yes, there is space up here you know. We have space at the table if anyone wants to come up and join. Honest to God, we do not bite.

I'm Michele Neylon. I'm the chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We will do a little bit of housekeeping before we kick off. Up on the main screen there, although you probably can't read it too well, is our schedule for the day.

We've got quite a busy schedule. We'll be in this room for most of the day, although we will have to move to meet with the board later on.

So as per usual if we could start off by doing a roll call. So I'll start: Michele Neylon, Registrar Stakeholder Group Chair.

Jeffrey Eckhaus: Jeffrey Eckhaus, NomCom, Vice-Chair.

Mason Cole: Mason Cole, Columbia Names, GNSO Counselor.

Kelly Salter: Kelly Salter Dada, registrar.

(Cardinal Vic):   (Cardinal Vic), (unintelligible), registrar.

Stephane Van Gelder: Stephane Van Gelder.(Internadix PSRUSA) registrar.

Bob Mountain: Bob Mountain, (main media) registrar.

(Nick Stinma):   (Nick Stinma), (ing.com) registrar.

Matt Serlin: Matt Serlin, (mockmonimar)/retired.

(Michael Ward):   (Michael Ward), (B NT Holdings), registrar.

(Bob Wygan):   (Bob Wygan), (web.com) registrar.

(Grant Muntain): (Grant Muntain), (DotCoop) registrar.

Adam Eisner: Adam Eisner, (Two Cows) registrar.

(Paul Anderson): (Paul Anderson), (Arctic Names), Registrar .

(Rob Vildam): (Rob Vildam), (Momentus) registrar.

John Berryhill: John Berryhill, (iRegistry) registrar.

James Bladel: James Bladel, GoDaddy.com, Do we all have to say registrar? Okay, and also what - treasurer. Thank you.

Mike Zupke: Mike Zupke, not registrar but ICANN still.

(Jennifer Stand): (Jennifer Stand), (Anweb.com), secretary.

Michele Neylon: Oh, P.S. She's also secretary to us the rest of the time.

Thanks everyone. Anybody else? Any other registrars down there?

Good morning (Mr. Larson), (Mr. Sofner).

We're going to go through - first up I think we have Mike who's going to - where is (Cyrus)?

Mike Zupke: I understand (Cyrus) is on his way but he's triple booked, so you'll get him hopefully shortly. But I'm prepared to start now if...

Michele Neylon: Would you like to kick off?

Mike Zupke: Yes, I'm happy to do that. Okay, thank you. Good morning all.

So I was thinking probably what is of most interest to registrars is a little bit about what we're doing to implement the new registrar (predation) agreement.

I'm happy to talk about other things like some of the consensus policy work that's underway in terms of implementation. But I don't have, you know, slides or a script here so I was hoping we could kind of have a discussion about what's of most interest to you.

I gave a short presentation to the GNSO on Saturday about implementation to RAA so I don't know if this would be redundant for the people in the room or if people would prefer me to do it.

I guess I'll sort of just ask for, you know, feedback on what it is you'd like me to talk about first, or at all. Nobody cares?

Michele Neylon: Oh, that's not true.

Mike Zupke: You know what it is? Everybody's waiting for (Cyrus) to come in and say it better than me, that's what it is.

Michele Neylon: It's quite okay. We're more than happy to (gut and fillet) it to you. We can wait for (Cyrus) to (gut and fillet) him.

I think one of the areas that is of concern to registrars is with respect to outreach, outreach activity we have planned. And we all know that there are significant changes in the new contract.

And one of the concerns that several of us have is that while a bunch of us do engage actively with ICANN there are quite a few registrars who don't and also quite a few registrars whose first language is not English or American and that they would have difficulty fully understanding what they are expected to do under this new contract. So maybe if you could speak a little bit to that - that would be helpful.

Mike Zupke: Yes, I'd be happy to. So to a certain extent I think you're (unintelligible) I know we talked a little about this already, but, you know, one of the things that we heard in Beijing and even leading up to Beijing was registrars saying, you know for one, you know, IBM's are going to be the first to launch, we want to see them be successful. That means we need registrars who are in those regions able to sell IBMs which means beyond 2013 to RAA.

So, you know, in particular people said we're in China this is, you know, this is the heart of it - we need you to do more in China. So I think it was (Fio) who said, "Yes, we're going, you know, going to do outreach in China."

And (Akryn) told the Chinese registrars I was moving to Beijing. They all applauded until the translator said it and then they realized it was a joke and then they laughed.

Yes, I was almost there.

So we've got plans for August 26 and 27. We've got an outreach session planned in (Jouymen) China. We, you know, didn't want to go back to Beijing for a couple reasons but we've got some registrars in (Jouymen) so it makes sense. You know, we're trying to go to the registrars. It's also not going to be a 100,000 degrees in August so we've got a two-day session planned there.

And we've actually got a session planned in Los Angeles. The dates aren't fully confirmed yet, but the plan is for the Thursday and Friday before that. So August 22 and 23 we're planning to hold an event in Los Angeles at the ICANN headquarters. Well, not in the headquarters, but, you know, people will be able to come and check it out. And that would be generally an operationally focused session and we would really like to have active registrar participation in this.

So what we're hoping is that it's maybe not always the usual ICANN liaison people who are attending but more like registrar operations teams coming in,

learning from each other, having kind of a round-table session to say, "What are , you know, what are the best paths to implement this new RAA?"

And we'll have of course staff people there to talk about, you know, compliance people to talk about, you know, interpretation issues that there might be. We'll have policy people also to talk about sort of what's coming up next. So, you know, and of course I'll be there so, you know, what more could you want?

So anyway so those are the two things that are almost firmly planned. The thing in (Jouyman) I think, you know, we're ready to sign the contract with the venue - everything is lined up.

The one in L.A. we've had kind of a last minute change of venue because we're trying to make sure that this will be affordable and justifiable for people who maybe don't get to travel a lot. So, you know, we're trying to make sure we've got rooms that are in a decent place but that aren't going to be, you know, extravagantly expensive.

So I think we've got a good plan for that so I'm pretty certain that Thursday and Friday, the 22nd and 23rd of August we'll have the event in L.A. And we're, you know, contemplating where else should we be doing this. You know, I've heard from a few European registrars primarily who've said, you know, we would appreciate to have one in Europe. And you know we're open to that. I was more open to that before I saw how much it costs to run one of these sessions when you've got all of these interpreters.

And so, you know, not that's it's been foreclosed, but, you know, I want to make sure that we're, you know, being responsible in how we're managing the budget. You know, I would take it now but I suspect that it's probably more likely I would get more feedback in the hallway or at the bar or something.

So if people want to make suggestions about places where we should do it or timing. I'm thinking if we do one in Europe it would be sometime in September so that vacation season is somewhat over in Europe.

But, you know, to the extent that people can say you know here's the justification for doing it in Europe, that would help me to go and sell it to management.

So, you know, that is sort of the plan. And then, you know, we want to do some online stuff as well. I think we'll be streaming at least the one in L.A. and we'll at least record the one in China, so it can double for others. But, you know, we're still looking for opportunities to do that and...

Michele Neylon: Thanks Mike. I've got a couple of people that want to start asking you awkward questions now I believe. I have James and then I have Kelly.

James Bladel: Thanks to (Leo) for the transcript. Do we have a bridge, do we have a transcript - is that all happening? Okay, great.

So it's James Bladel speaking and thanks Michele and just for full disclosure I'm one of the registrars that's volunteered to go around the world with Michele and help kind of explain this. But I just want to point out that, I raised my hand when you said budget and afford, and I want to point out that the sentiment in this group is that "we" did not do the things that precipitated this new agreement. Okay? It's never been the registrars that come to ICANN that are the problem.

So dollars spent on outreach are probably one of the best investments that ICANN can make. Because otherwise we're going to be right back here with a 2015 RAA and go right through that whole negotiation process because of some new program because of registrars who are not getting the message, who are not in this room. And that is the, to me, that is the impetus for this

outreach effort is we've got to take - they're not coming here - we've got to take the show to them.

You know, and I think, I strongly urge you to not only consider having an outreach event in Europe, that I think is a bare minimum. I think you've got to have two more. You know, I think you've got to have Latin America and I think you've got to reach out to another one in Asia outside of China.

I just - everything you can possibly do is still not going to be enough and I think that the message back to, you know, whoever has got the purse strings here is that this is going to be a (gating) factor of whether five years from now we say that the new GTLD program was a success or failure. Because people are going to hang the actions of these registrars who are not getting on board with the 2013 as a failure of this whole community and this whole organization.

So I just feel like we've got to solve that problem now or it's going to be the controversy de jour in 2015/2017. So that's just me weighing in on that. So we need to get whoever's got their hands on the checkbook to open up a little bit.

Mike Zupke: Thanks, James, that's helpful feedback. Part of the problem is, you know, for the first time I'm sort of managing the department's budget and I had no idea how much this stuff costs when I was planning it.

So, you know, there's still an opportunity to go back and ask for more money and this is actually good feedback for doing that. So thank you. Kelly?

James Bladel: If you need us to help you make that case, to write a letter as a stakeholder group, to weigh in, you know, whatever you need to make that case because I think the concern is, is that this is going to fall on its face, and that we're going to be back here getting smacked again for the actions of people who

just - registrars - who just aren't on board. So I just feel like we're going to get punished for...

Sorry, apologies in the room and on the phone. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Kelly?

Kelly Salter: All right, Kelly Salter, (Dada Group). And yes, my hand immediately went up to Michele when I heard that we may not be doing outreach sessions in Europe. As a European registrar - absolutely we want you to do those outreach sessions, whether it has to be me attending in person - we are an internet organization, maybe we could do online workshops, because it's not only ICANN's that you need to be concerned about.

As registrar's we may have to pay to send our staff who haven't been at the ICANN meetings, haven't been, I wasn't part of the negotiation team so I'm fully aware there are parts of it that I may interpret incorrectly. So, yes, the European registrars, I am sure, do want the outreach session.

Mike Zupke: Great, thank you for that feedback.

Michele Neylon: Anybody else want to get in the queue? (Chelsea Handler)? No?

Mike, just speaking both as the Chair of this group and also I think just as a registrar as well, I mean, the budget excuse, I think, isn't really going to fly.

Yesterday and during the opening session (Afhadi) made announcements of multiple initiatives that are going to cost potentially millions of dollars over the next few years; and you held a signing session for both registries and registrars which was a fantastic photo opportunity.

But if the organization is not going to fund the outreach to reach the registrars then that's all kind of smoke and mirrors. I mean, if you don't put your money

where your mouth is on this then the new RAA is going to be a total failure and you're going to have the GAC you're going to have (LEA) coming down here, the IT constituency, government, everybody else. It needs - this needs to be taken seriously. And as Kelly said, if it's Webinars - fine, but it has to happen.

Go ahead Kelly.

Kelly Salter: Kelly again from (Dada group). Can I just make you aware of the timing of your workshops and outreach, because obviously we have a time limit to become compliant and implement and that time is going to be upon us before us? It's not a huge amount of time we've got to get this all done. So I appreciate the holiday seasons around the world, but the sooner the better.

Mike Zupke: Thank you. Understood. And, you know, just to be clear I don't want it to sound like I'm saying we can't do this because of the budget but I'm really saying, you know, help me to justify this so I can go back and, you know, explain my error in the budgeting and ask for more money.

Michele Neylon: Matt, go ahead.

Matt Serlin: Thanks - Matt Serlin. Hey Mike. Have you given any thought to when the online registrar training modules will be updated with the new 2013 information?

Mike Zupke: So, yes. We've given some thought to that. And we've been doing updating for things like the ERRP and some of the other IRTP work that's been done. So as we've begun that that's all kind of going to roll into the same project, but we're, you know, not trying to hold it all up as one big release because we've got to develop and king of, you know, got to work on modules at a time.

So it's, you know, I think in this trimester that's going to be one of our big projects that we'll be working on. And, you know, I don't have a final estimate

for how long it will take to get it all updated, but I think the policy work that's been coming out - that should be ready to implement within I think probably the first month of this next trimester. So it is, you know, rolling out.

Michele Neylon: Okay thank you. Have you got anything else for us, Mike? Any other exciting news?

Mike Zupke: So, I don't know if you've noticed, but (Tim) I think is in the Adobe Connect room. He's back in action here, he's asked me to express that he's been feeling better. I don't - nobody asks - they don't usually ask me how I'm doing, they ask me how (Tim)'s doing. No you don't.

And I think, you know, while we're kind of waiting for (Cyrus) I'd be happy to get into the daily retention waiver stuff, if you want we can talk also about (unintelligible) validation stuff - I'm happy to talk about that, you know, if you guys would like.

Michele Neylon: James, go ahead.

James Bladel: I actually wanted to follow up on the outreach efforts because I was thinking it was not just the new RAA although that's a big chunk of it. There's also two new consensus policies. There was a left over little tangly loose end from IRTP B, there's the EERP and we're talking about implementation of IRTP C.

So we've got a kind of a backlog of pipeline and this is one of the things I think is that is on a list of topics to discuss with the board. But I think where I'm going with this is to make sure that we use these outreach opportunities to discuss those as well, especially the operational one in L.A. and I'm presuming the operational on in Europe.

But, you know, let's also, and I'm going back to (Body's) presentation now. Registrars need a base camp. We've been climbing too hard and too fast and we've got now a backlog of change. I'm in the policy development group and

we're changing the changes that haven't been implemented yet. Okay, so we need to kind of catch our breath here because I'm concerned that the end result is we're going to confuse the heck out of registrants.

They're not going to understand how to transfer a domain name, they're not going to understand which - these new notices they're getting from registrars about expiring names. We're all going to get added to spam black lists, you know, by registrars email systems - registrants email systems. So I think we need to pause and resist the temptation to fly in and start tinkering again.

Mike Zupke: Thanks James, I think that's a really good point and maybe that's a discussion that we can have briefly. So you mentioned, you know, there is IRPT B - I'm not sure if it's eight or nine - which is the one that is the (unintelligible) is changed. But you know, this is something that got posted for public comment and public comment period closed and (Steve Gobin) wrote the summary and analysis and it's now sitting waiting for me to post it.

But, you know, this is something that we've talked about at some other venues before. But, you know, I'm very sympathetic to this. You know, like you say there's changes to the changes that are going on. And so, you know, one of the things with that one that - before we begin implementing that, you know, truly and earnest when we say, "Here's your deadline." I think we do need to maybe have some sort of a community discussion about how do we phase these things in.

And part of it is, you know, we're kind of at this point where a bunch of the staff has got a bunch of stuff that is in the pipe line for the patients. So we can kind of deal with that stuff, you know, maybe in a slightly informal way.

Maybe we go to (Janice Owen) and we ask her for feedback. Maybe we go to the (state-appointed feedback) groups and ask for feedback. And that's actually what I would like to hear, you know, what process you would be

using but I think there's a bigger issue that, you know, something you could take up with the board that's - stuff just keeps coming.

But even if staff were to slow down right now, you know, the backlog might just keep piling up. So, you know, that's way, way above my pay grade so I think it would be a good discussion to have with them. But in terms of what can staff do now, I would, you know, I would like to hear suggestions on how we can deal with that in a way that is helpful to you.

James Bladel: Do you mind, Michele, am I jumping the queue?

Okay. So the answer is, I think, and again this is a spoiler alert for what we want to talk about with the board or I wanted to get on their agenda was we need some kind of change management philosophy. And it's not any particular issue; it's that they're all hitting at once. It's like the perfect storm.

There's a difference between fixing things and creating other chaos, you know, and I think we're right on the hairy edge. So I think what we'd like to see is some sort of a change management program like many, I think, of us have in our own organizations where we say, you know, this is the 2014 release of this and it's going to happen, you know, it's going - we're going to discuss it operationally in the first quarter, we're going to begin implementing in the second quarter and then we're going to have follow up in the third quarter, or something like that.

And we're not going to change anything in the interim; it's going to come back around. So it's more of a release cycle approach as opposed to just cramming everything into the queue. I think that, you know, putting some intelligence behind that and managing that would go a long way at least to alleviate some of the concerns that we're going to hear from our customers.

Mike Zupke: Thanks, that makes sense to me.

Michele Neylon: Anybody else want to get in on this? Anybody remote - do we have some people on the phone (Rich)?

(Rich):   No, sir. No we don't, sir, no.

Michele Neylon: So, Mike, would you like to talk to us about the data retention exemption process (unintelligible).

Mike Zupke: I would love to, thank you.

Michele Neylon: Do you have something to tell us about it?

Mike Zupke: So you know I talked a little bit with the GNSO about this and I got some feedback from them and I think a lot of it was sort of, you know, channeling, what - how do registrars react because a lot of them don't actually have, you know, skin in the game but they were saying, "If I was in your shoes this is what I, you know, what I would want."

   And, you know, maybe it's just a matter of precedent setting, but what - so what we're talking about is the 2013 RAA has a new set of requirements related to retention of customer data, some of it's technical some of it's personal. And so, you know, we've heard from this Article 29 working group which I think I (unintelligible) 27 when I was in the GNSO, but I meant 29 - and working party I should say.

   And, you know, they 've expressed some concerns about this and we've heard from some registrars - kind of one-offs - some concerns about this, saying, "You know we believe this conflicts with our national law or you know, some jurisdiction law that we are obliged to abide by." And so, you know, the agreement itself actually has a provision for registrars to request a waiver in this circumstance.

And so the onus on registrars isn't intended to be super high or super hard - you need basically, I think, three questions or so. You know one is - tell us what the law is; tell us what the provisions of the RAA are that, you know, you think are in conflict and then explain what the conflict is. So the process that we've sort of envisioned is we've got a form that allows you to do this, to tell staff, you know, here are the three questions, here's how we've answered them.

The contract also says that if a registrar in your jurisdiction has already requested a waiver you can site that, because ICANN must post the determinations so you can site that previous request and ask for that so you don't have to go through all of the same steps. Now the part of this I think that is a little bit more kind of operational friction for registrars is that in order to initiate the process you've got to have some sort of a written opinion either from a nationally recognized law firm or from some governmental body, could be advise or a ruling, something like that.

So, you know, what the working party said was that we don't think registrars should have to go to every single government in the EU and ask for a determination. And I don't think that, you know, that's not the way that I read the agreement. You can, you know, you can go to your boss, I think a lot of registrars have. So, you know, the questions that's sort of open right now is, you know, (unintelligible) in Ireland and (Volkers) in Germany, you know, and one of them gets the waiver can the other one say, you know, I want a waiver based on the one that was previously granted?

And so I think that, you know, I don't have an answer to that question. I think that's going to require someone else, probably legal people. You know, I don't foreclose the possibility that we might be able to do that. You know my goal is to make it as easy as possible for people to want to sign up to new RAA so, you know, to the extent that we can make it easier we're completely willing to do that. And if that means, you know, sort of interpreting jurisdiction to

(unintelligible), you know, if that makes sense legally within the contract then that's fine. So, questions about that?

Michele Neylon: James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Seriously? Nobody wants to - I feel like - okay. So this is getting more complicated than it seems I think because I think there was also some question of whether the Article 29 working party was looking at the latest (res) of the RAA because I think it was changing in between the time of their announcement.

So I think that we shouldn't consider that this is an issue for European registrars. Registrars who have customers in Europe or are seeking to gain customers in Europe are also affected, doesn't matter where the registrar is. So this is a bigger issue.

I want to point out that no one seemed to have - or at least to my knowledge - no one seemed to have a whole lot of heartburn over the data retention spec which was, I thought , fairly adequate in the 2009 RAA. So it seems to be whatever we change, whether we change the timeline or the field that seems to be the trigger this heartburn.

But I just wanted to say in general that we don't want to see is ICANN and the registrars becoming the bone in between two dogs and the two dogs are different parts of government: one is the cops and one is the privacy officers.

And they're having this fight, not just in our industry, they're having this fight, you know this tug-of-war out in the real world and we can't just be like the weathervane just being pulled in one direction or the other.

They have to resolve this and come back here with a consistent position on what they want to do and I think that really kind of falls onto the GAC and that's not an registrar ICANN, you know, that's not our issue to resolve I think

because whatever way we swing on that the other dog is just going to say they were not listened to. So, you know, I feel like we need the GAC's help on that.

Mike Zupke: Thanks. And, you know, and I think we got an offer from one of the representatives from the EU in the GAC to talk to us a little about this to try and help us kind of solve this issue, you know, how do we figure out, you know, the best way to kind of balance this out so it's not this tug-of-war you're talking about.

Michele Neylon: Any...Kelly?

Kelly Salter: Kelly Salter, Dada. And the complications with the EU registrars is that it's not only relating to what jurisdiction we're in, but it also relates to whether they're a business or consumer.

So for example under U.K. law consumer protection - data retention - is a lot stricter than if I'm retaining business data. So we need as simple a process as possible. Where if we counted the European - well it's not just Europe - but we can have a standardized acceptance across our base rather than 20 different rules depending on what customers come from which jurisdiction.

So as soon as possible we need to see from you - this is the process, this is the form you need to complete, these are the steps, this is the acceptable evidence that we will require to grant that exemption. Because we can't enter into a contract without good faith that we would be able to get than exemption because we'll just be stuck in the middle of you and someone like the information commission for which - they're almost as scary.

Mike Zupke: Got it. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Anyone else on this topic before we move onto the next (pleasure)? No. Okay. Thanks Mike.

Mike Zupke: So I'm really sorry that (Cyrus) is not here yet, but I think he probably will still pop in just (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Ok, we'll believe that. Next up we have Marika who's going to be talking to us about the wonderful world of policy development.

Kelly Salter: Hi Mike, can I ask another question? It's Kelly from Dada.

Mike Zupke: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Kelly Salter: You mentioned you were going to be talking to the European Commission later. Can you (unintelligible) what happens in that conversation please? Yes? Thanks.

Marika Konings: Good morning everyone. Thanks for inviting me over to talk a little about the policy development that are currently taking place in the GNSO. I brought some slides with me.

Mike Zupke: For the people that are participating via Adobe Connect they'll have the slides up in just a minute for you.

Michele Neylon: We're just having a couple of technical difficulties with the slides here, sorry.

Marika Konings: Right, it's not (unintelligible), but I think it should be, hopefully, okay for everyone. And so the topics I've brought some slides with me on are the following ones which you see here on the screen which I think are probably the most relevant for what you're interested in. And also how to find where some of the other efforts are ongoing so if you have any questions on those and want to talk on all the topics we're working on, I'm more than happy to do so as well.

But I thought I'd focus on some of the issues where I think you may see some changes coming your direction relatively soon, which well you may not be too happy about. But I think with the discussion you've been having about change management and making sure that's done in a coordinated manner I think that part of that discussion, how really we can manage that in an appropriate way.

So first looking at the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings - I think I've come already a few times here to talk about where that effort stands. We're actually now at the stage where a final report has been submitted to the GNSO Council for consideration.

I think the last time I spoke to you that report was actually out for public comment. As a result of that public comment forum we actually received two substantive comments that required changes to the initial recommendations that the working group put forward.

But we're now actually at a stage where we have 17 full consensus recommendations and all of these are really intended to clarify and standardize the process being used for the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings.

And I thought it may be helpful to actually quickly run through these recommendations as I said because I think it will directly impact and hopefully facilitate your work at the end of the day when you are confronted with a UDRP proceeding.

So basically what the recommendation is trying to do is really clarify in a step by step way what you're supposed to do as well as the other parties involved. It may be worth to mention as well that we have actually a very collaborative effort in common to these recommendations with participation from many registrars, several around the table here.

We'll also give you IT providers, IPC community end-users. So I think we have - knowing that these are full-consensus recommendations I think shows that the group really worked hard to come to a common understanding and agreement on those.

So the first thing the book report actually does and maybe just to frame it for those they may be less familiar with this that actually UDRP doesn't define what locking means. It only talks about maintaining status quo and it basically has been interpreted by many as meaning you need to lock your domain name and prevent certain changes, but there's no further clarifications as to when that needs to happen, or how long it needs to happen or what needs to happen.

The first thing it does is raise - provide a clear definition of what lock means. So basically lock means that you need to prevent any changes of registrar or registrant, but this shouldn't impair the resolution of the domain or prevent the renewal of it.

So then it talks about the problem of recommendation (unintelligible) of obligation for the complainant to notify the respondent at the time the filing is removed and was identified by the working group as one of the main causes probably of cyber-flight. If you tell someone that an EDRP has been filed before they can actually make any changes they may just transfer the domain name out and it may be very hard to track them.

But as a result of public comments received there was also a realization by doing that there may be less time on informal notification time for the respondent to actually start preparing response or retain legal counsel. So it also was decided that it actually would be good to add an automatic extension of four days to the response time upon request by the respondents, which does not preclude any additional extensions that may be possible on the EDRP provider roles.

The following (recommendation) talks about that the registrars is not allowed to contact the registrant until the lock has actually been applied, again, to prevent that any changes are made before the (mainem) is locked down or as soon as the lock is applied there's no longer a problem, and (unintelligible) requires the registrar to apply the lock within two business days following the request for verification that is received from the EDRP provider.

It also talks about having some better practices or recommending that registrars, as well as EDRP providers, post on their Web sites what they consider business days so that it's clear for parties that are involved in the process what they can expect, because as you all know business days are not the same depending on which jurisdiction or country you're in.

It also specifies or clarifies that registrars are required to confirm the lock and verify the information in response to a verification request that they received from the EDRP provider, and if the EDRP provider then determines that the complaint is compliance the EDRP provider notifies the parties of the commencement of the proceeding no later than three business days. And here the change that is made is that it's in, I think, in the EDRP and the EDRP actually talks about calendar days. But to bring this in line with the other requirements there was agreement to also change it to business days to really make it clear for everyone what the - what that means.

But to bring this in line with the other requirements there was agreement to also change it to business days to really make it clear for everyone what the - what that means. Basically if the complaint remains non-compliant the registrar, following notification from the EDRP provider, will unlock the domain name then within one business day.

So as you can see it basically follows a little bit there the process of the EDRP, all these steps. So basically, then, if the complaint is compliant the EDRP provider notifies the registrar as well as part of that notification that any

updates to contact information also need to be communicated by the registrant to the EDRP provider just basically to clarify that, you know, certain information to contact data may need to be made if data is incorrect. But this information also needs to be communicated to the EDRP provider because otherwise they may not be aware.

Again, the notification should also include information that if there are any changes as a result of the listing of privacy and proxy services after the lock has been applied that it will need to be reviewed by the EDRP panel directly because it's basically - I think there's a discussion on who is the real respondent, but that's actually a decision for the EDRP panel at that stage if that information has not been updated before the lock has actually been applied.

And there's also a suggestion that this should be for the review that's part of the discussion on the privacy and proxy accreditation program in the working group into - within their (remit) to talk further about that because, of course, you're still in the question of, you know, who's an accredited privacy proxy provider so that question will first need to be addressed in order to be able to define rules about what needs to happen in those circumstances.

So basically once a decision has been rendered the registrar must communicate within three business days to all parties the dates for implementation of that decision and needs to implement it immediately after ten business days, if the complainant has prevailed, and after 15 business days if the respondent has prevailed. Different than those dates, it's actually within the EDRP is not something that the working group has defined but it's something that's already in there.

Then one of the - I think the new elements that has been introduced, and in the final (record) as well, is the set - a process for how to deal with the settlement, basically, so in case of suspension to agree on a settlement the EDRP provider informs the registrar that the suspension has been requested

and should also include the expected duration of that suspension, and if the settlement is reached the lock needs to be removed within two business day.

And as I said, there's a defined process for settlement and I think there's a change where at least I think that's something that was very much supported from the registrar community that is actually the EDRP provider that will from now on, once these recommendations are documented and implemented, would confirm to the registrar which settlement has been reached.

And the current way this was working, I think it was the two parties that would actually contact the registrar and tell them this is the settlement which we've reached. I think there was some concern that for registrars it wasn't always clear if the parties were really the parties that needed to contact them so it's actually the EDRP provider that's going to do that from a - it's easier (back in the nations) are adopted.

Another thing then, too, recommendation as well, basically talking about the implementation and the need for developing educational informational materials that assist in the implementation of these recommendations and I think, you know, as part of the record you'll see as well we've defined - we've introduced or included a process flow that really tries to explain, like, the step-by-step works that one needs to do within this process.

And I think at least how I would envision it as part of the implementation there will be a kind of informational package that would go out to the different parties and saying, well, when you receive an EDRP, you know, Step One, this is what you need to do. Step Two, this is what you need to do, and Step Three and so on, because I think some of the feedback we've received as well in the working group is that, you know, for some registrars it is really, you know, very obvious what needs to happen because they may receive many EDRPs as part of the volume of registrations they manage, but for others, you know, they may get an EDRP once every, you know, five years and it

may not always be clear what needs to happen, and having something like that may facilitate that.

And then there's also the suggestion to actually create an implementation review team that would work with staff again on the development of the implementation plan and presumably any discussion on, you know, timing and making sure that, you know, there's not too much happening at the same time would be part of those discussions as well.

So actually the adoption of this report is on the agenda for the (GNSO) Council at this meeting on Wednesday. Discussions we had on - over the weekend, there seems to be support for the record of this but of course we need to see what happens on Wednesday. Should it be adopted then, or if it's otherwise adopted at the next meeting which is in September, probably common forum would be opened prior to board considerations, a required step that needs to take place.

So based on comments received either - or will be forwarded to the board or if there are any significant issues raised and they need to go back to the council for consideration, but if things proceed as planned it would go to the board for consideration and then it moves into the implementation phase basically.

Man: Okay, I think before we go any further does anybody have any questions on this? Do they need any clarifications? Go ahead.

Man: If the board would approve this recommendation on Wednesday, what would be the timescale for implementing all these processes?

Woman: As Marika said, it's not the board considering this on Wednesday. It's the GNSO council. So basically the GN - it's, you know, should they adopt on Wednesday then shortly thereafter we would open the public comment forum, which would run for a minimum of - for 21 days, and possibly plus 21 days if

there are comments received and we need a reply period and we need to prepare board papers.

So Friday, roughly estimating, you know, maybe at the earliest we would come before the board and September, October timeframe and again this is if there are no substantive comments, no need to go back. So if the board adopts them in October, November that - towards that timeframe, we would need to start discussing (internity), form an implementation team as well as community team, and start discussing that.

So, looking at (Mike) and his full plate of work, should this be adopted in October, what is your estimation of what type - you're also looking at some of the other changes, although I think you have to note as well that this is kind of a separate - I don't think this will require -- maybe I'm misjudging this -- but too many operational changes on the side of the registrars.

I think it's more for (Mike) (inside) developing those materials and making any changes in the form of advisories and possible changes to the new EDRP rules to implement these and then basically just communicating that (unintelligible) may be part of outreach efforts to really make sure that everyone understands what is required. But I'm looking as well. Maybe there's (Mikayla) (sharing) - I don't think there's a common operational aspect. I think it has a huge impact on the registrar, (though).

Man: Well, no, I mean, from my understanding of it is that it's more a question of changing the rules, what we're allowed to do, what we're meant to do. For us as a registrar operationally it makes things significantly easier, at least that's my view of it. Others might have some different opinions. (Okre), you were in this working group. Do you have any thoughts?

(Okre): I think most of it has already been mentioned. The main goal was to have processes in place that would clarify in the current existing processes and make it more equal across the bank of registrars, give us more security back.

For example, changing the days to business days to take into account all operations and how we work and give the complainants a little more security of how lock will actually be handled, what it actually means because the definition of that will (happen).

Man: All right, thanks, (Okre). (Kelly)?

(Kelly): I'm (Kelly), (data) group. The only question I think I'd ask you to consider with all of these, even small quality changes, is to maybe look at doing the registrar training guide just after they're announced, before we've got to implement it, because I think that from a registrar's perspective if you can have that training ready when you announce it that we can go straight in and get our staff up to speed, you know, quicker the (unintelligible) rather than after it's implemented for us to find out we've interpreted it slightly incorrectly and having to redo some of, obviously, what we've already done. So it's just a request. It seemed like it's taking notice.

Man: Yeah, I think, you know, we could probably do a webinar like we did for (ERRP).

Man: And preferably with scheduling it - some of us who didn't get available night for Europe. Anyone else on this topic? No? Okay. Marika?

Marika Konings: All right, moving on then. Takeaways is another PDP that's currently underway and they're actually at the stage of initial report so they published that for public comment on the 21st of June and that forum is still running. We had the initial period potential closing on the 14th but the (single) working group already said we're just taking the whole period for those that are interested in wanting to submit comments so it was running until the fourth of August. And there's actually also a workshop planned on this topic tomorrow from 12:30 to 2:00.

So the initial report, like, the charter for this working group, actually outlined the overarching question is should takeaways be required for all (TTLD's)? So in making that assessment the working group was asked to consider a number of topics in the ones you see listed on the screen in further detail so to really determine what is the impact of requiring takeaways on these topics? Is it a good thing, a bad thing, no real difference?

But it looked - and a lot of detail adding different questions. They found the number of sub-teams, and you'll see that in the reports they basically make an analysis of all these topics and come to preliminary conclusions for all these ideas. And basically overall based on the assessment of all these elements as a package the working group actually concludes or has a preliminary conclusion that takeaway should be a requirement for all detail (data) registries.

The report does recognize as well, of course, the implementation of this would require the transition over of all the current (unintelligible) registries, which is, you know, over 120 million domain names, so that should be carefully thought through and implemented and make sure that there are safe-guards in place that may need to be considered.

So I think that this is where the working group is currently at so we'll just encourage you if you have any views on this or if you feel that any issues were not taken into account or are wrongly assessed, so please submit your comments or come to the session on Wednesday.

Basically the next step on this is that the working group will review the comments received, adopt their report, if - or as needed and then finalize it to record for submission to the GNSO council for their adoption, basically, on that. (The long data) would go for the same stats as I just explained and the other one would go to the board and the implementation basically is if they're all adopted.

Man: Anybody have any comments on this one? Questions? Monsieur Frederick?

Frederick Feldman: Merci, Monsieur (Unintelligible). A two-part is (what we worked.) It was nice working on this, but then when I heard about the working group for, like, remodeling (unintelligibles), I had maybe the impression that it was - (unintelligible) was a, like, (unintelligible) work (unintelligible) when it's going to change. It isn't a question. It's just a feeling.

Rick Wilhelm: Yeah, so this is Rick. So that's, indeed, it's separate. I think you're referring to the EWG, the extra work group that I think is coming to present to you, (Ashe), but it's no...

Man: Okay.

Rick Wilhelm: Yeah, exactly, so basically that is a separate act that is taking place and has a separate track that will eventually go into the (Polish) development processes as well but, so, all of the records we've received (I think) are from board (unintelligible) and management (assets). All the efforts looking at who issued and stuff because we don't know yet what the outcome of the other process is going to be, and, of course, one of the questions you may ask is if there is a transition to a new model is it easier to make that transition if everyone is already on the same model or not?

So I think at some point when this moves up I think that question probably will need to be asked and there may be an assessment that says, well, if everyone is already on the same model, to whatever model we change then is going to be easier instead of having different models already in place that that needs to converge to one system. But I think for now we're operating on the basis these are separate efforts and are moving forward as planned.

Man: Anyone else on this? Thanks.

Marika Konings: If we're out of time I can maybe just highlight which topics are there and then you can just maybe ask me questions on it. (Unintelligible) (RETP) (Bar D), they actually have an open working group meeting on Thursday morning. I don't know if that's mentioned here.

They're looking at a number of questions related to the transfer dispute resolution policy and actually the chair of that working group, or co-chair of the working group, is (Jane) so if you have any questions on that effort talk to him. But that's one of the elements you're looking at and where you may potentially see, as well, changes in a certain amount of time.

They're actually aiming to have initial reports out by early August, which may be a little bit ambitious but, well, but, again, that will go out for public comments at that stage. We encourage you to provide input.

The other thing I wanted to highlight is policy implementation. I'm sure you're aware there has been a lot of discussion around these topics and what's policy and what is implementation, what kind of frameworks do we have in place, make sure that in the implementation phase people will know what to expect when the (R) questions are come up and they have policy dimensions so the (genus) accounts actually start in (unintelligible) and after working groups start preparing a charter.

That charter is now up for a vote on Wednesday as well. You see on the screen the different questions that working group is expected to start looking at. One of the questions is - and, again, it maybe be relevant to all of the discussions we're having on implementation is, you know, how should those implementation review teams function in practice?

And we have operated a couple of them already but there are no real formal rules around those and, you know, how they should consult or how that should happen. And, so, if the charter is adopted on Wednesday we'll form a working group and a call for volunteers will go out, so if you're interested in

this topic, you know, please, when you see the call for volunteers sign up and join that effort.

And then just maybe to mention that just a few of the projects that are going on, we have a number of other efforts that are on the way or will start soon. One particular one we wanted to mention maybe the (RAA-PDP) because as you may recall a policy development process was started on the (RAA) and basically at the end of that final issue report we basically said, well, we're first going to await the outcome of the (RAA) negotiations and at that point we'll determine if there are any issues that are remaining from that whole list of items that was submitted by (Barry's) group at the start of the process on which we need to initiate a policy development process or continue the policy development process.

So where we're at now is staff is actually preparing a record on identifying those remaining items. I think one of the obvious ones is privacy proxy accreditation, so I think that one is relatively sure that that will commence relatively soon after this meeting, that we hope to have a staff report or paper on that that will basically kick off the next steps in the policy development process and then there's some - there may be some other topics that we need to see if indeed there are still other remaining items that need to be addressed maybe to already prepare the ground floor for the next group.

There's also the (purple) of registration day, a data policy development process that basically is the starting point for when the EWD finishes its work those recommendations will then comp into that policy development process and will be further addressed as part of that effort. I don't know if there are any questions on any of the other efforts that are up on the screen?

Man: Do you have any questions? No? Okay, thank you. Marika? Oh, oh.

Marika Konings: I still see I have a couple of minutes so I don't need to rush, but maybe to highlight as well there is a couple of initiatives here. Like, for example, the

first one, translation and transliteration of a PDP that's taking off. It talks about whether or not contact information and how it should be translated and transliterated and asking questions like if so, you know, who should pay for that, who should bear the cost.

So the effort is just kicking off and we're actually not having too many volunteers yet so we'd really like to encourage you to, if you have an interest in this topic or expertise in this topic, to sign up for that. And similarly, for recording and metrics, it's an effort kicking off looking at how we can get better data and metrics that help inform policy development.

That's a non PDP-effort, and we may be exploring other ways of doing that instead of having to go through a full working group, but again, you will be, obviously, one of the groups that we would be reaching out to to get further information or insights on that topic.

Man: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead, (Urop).

(Urop):   So as I told you earlier this week I'm going to join this group but it would be very helpful if I wasn't the only one in (relations).

Woman: And just (to check), I think, (Urop), you're referring to translation and transliteration?

(Urop):   Yes. Yeah, exactly (unintelligible).

Man: Bob, go ahead.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, thanks, (Nicayla). This is Bob Mountain. Marika, did you mention the IRTPC implementation team in your topic?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, because that's actually now with (Mike), so basically I'm listening in a bit but at this stage the implementation review team is basically

as we envision them and then when it moves over to - not the other side of the fence because we're all part of the same team, but they see it as (part of) the ownership of (Mike) and his colleagues to support that effort.

Bob Mountain: That's it. Okay. Thank you.

Man: Volker?

Volker Greimann: Yes, Marika, you mentioned that the privacy proxy accreditation PDP would kick off very shortly after this meeting, however we have now just ERA implemented, no, let's say, a model for such an accreditation program, and wouldn't it make more sense to first see how it was (hand off) for the registrars that implement this and then actually viewing that, watching the (PDP)?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. This is a very good question but I was understand the thing that the specification and outlines that already has an expiration date on it, and I think as well there were quite a number of issues or questions that were raised as part of the comments that were submitted. I don't want to mischaracterize it but I understand it's kind of a minimum bones or a bare-bones framework that currently is there so of course that may be a consideration to see how it works but if we already know that work needs to be done the PDP may already start to look at some of those other questions.

                  You can then still say, okay, let's assess on those that the minimum standards or criteria that are currently in there, if that is already working and intended or, you know, have the working group focus on some of those other questions that will need to be addressed in any case, but I think it's a very good point and we'll definitely look to, you know, colleagues that are more familiar as well with the - with what is in the (RAA) inside - we are preparing, like, a staff paper on that that will hopefully include as well that there's an analysis saying this is what is there.

But these are some of the elements that have not been discussed or have not been addressed and will need to be considered in any case. But I think it's a good discussion to have.

Man: Okay. Thank you, Marika. Yes? (Jean Francois), you're up next. And just a reminder for those of you speaking, would you please state your name for the transcript. While (Johab) is unique, there might be another (Johab) out there somewhere. Okay, so next up we have (Jean Francois Beribe) and he's going to be speaking around the EWG, the next-generation directory services.

(Jean Francois Beribe): Thank you, (Nicayla) and thank you very much for this invitation and opportunity to expose the EWG model (to this) community of registrars. That's a real pleasure because in our journeys we are not totally (follow) on our progress, even if we have made a bit of - a huge progress and the benefits of the overall internet community.

With me I have the pleasure to have (Cesar), (Stephanie), Michael. Of course, your German, (unintelligible) (very precious), and in the back of the room we have (Marty) and (DeChala) and (Denise) who are hiding behind - oh, and (Liza), also, very (model) person to do this one.

So I'm sure you have been very excited to go through these initial reports that have (commissioned) on June 24th. You have been part of this webinar on July 8th and you had yesterday a lot of questions, at least there was one person asking a lot of questions regarding the EWG effort.

So, as we have basically 30 minutes together I would much prefer to have kind of intimate discussion if you would like me to (work) on what is concerning more - most of this registrar community and not - I will get to work also on (unintelligible). Okay.

So just to make sure that we are capable to capture as many remarks, as many inputs, and many concerns you may have on this (individual) report that we have got, I think it would be best position of our time rather than just getting once again to the report that you have and it is already posted everywhere.

We are going (with the) timeline. On August 12th we expect that we have collected most of the input in such a way that we can prepare our primary report to the president of ICANN and the board by October. I hope it will be early October, not late October, such a way when we are in the next ICANN conference for the (eight) then most likely - most of the elements that we have (baked in this) report will be ready to go to the next step in terms of (more) (limitation) with the (unintelligible).

With that I open basically the floor for remarks, questions, concerns. Very much focus on the registrar community and having the spirit of we have many debates and this has been, you know, for many years has been not working for everybody and is challenging but we are now really speaking for constructive feedback such as you are part of the solution. We don't want you to be aside. We are here to facilitate and help the community to find the solution or the best solution.

Man: (Okre)?

(Okre):   Just a question from the (standing), what made you decide that it would be preferable or desirable to take another layer of - or institution where the data should be stored when the data could be, for example, just retrieved from the registry's (unintelligible) of data?

(Jean Francois Beribe):   This was not a destination. This was a means to achieve what we wanted to have in terms of accuracy, basically, and to end up with accuracy when we examine different use-case you end up with it's probably easier if

you have a uniform way to deal with the elements. But maybe some other comments from my dear colleagues.

Rod Rasmussen: This is Rod Rasmussen. Do I have to do my affiliation like I'm...

Man: No.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay, all right. Yeah, this gets back to how we actually develop the paper, the recommendations, the model, et cetera and we really started with a use-case basis and how different people are using different - the registration information for the various - there are many varied purposes out there and some of them really do need - require, if you want to, fully support them, the ability to have the data together so you can do various kinds of use and I refer you to the report on just taking a look at - through the whole series of use cases but that is how we ended up with that model to answer your question, and very directly on that.

Man: Go ahead, Volker.

Volker Greimann: Maybe just as a follow up, the thing that I think that I'm concerned about is that this creates yet another opportunity for cross-border transport of private data of the registrars, for example if they are registering with a German registrar, with a German registry, which is (I believe) is entirely possible, and suddenly you have a repository in the United States, that might not be desirable for the registrant or (their data) considerations.

(Stephanie Perrin): (Stephanie Perrin). I think this is a really key consideration and certainly one of the rationales, sort of counter-intuitively, for centralizing is that data protection is not being, in my humble (too), particularly well-managed as it is and if you put it all in one place it does give you the opportunity to centralize, to harmonize the approach, to set standards and to actually monitor and audit whether, in fact, the data is being properly managed.

It also gives you an overall view of some of the complaints that might have been lodged under the Relevant Data Protection laws so it could, if properly administered, A, make life a lot easier for the registrars in terms of universal application of the various different data protection laws -- and that aspect was brought up a few minutes ago in the discussion -- and, B, from the point of view of the registrants actually ensuring that their rights are being maintained.

And since you're coming from the render in Germany, they had a very good model many, many years ago where an organization that had so many employees would have to have a data commissioner internally to administer the data protection laws.

That would be, for instance, I'm not saying the EWG has even got down to the nitty gritty of discussing these models. They want to be a great model because then you'd have a proper interface with the data commissioner.

Man: Michael, go ahead.

Michael: Just to - it's quite clear there's a lot of that. This is not kind of - as ICANN data protection law through the back door, but in the cases which you are mentioning, the German case, it's quite a question that suddenly there's a data protection (of all) these people before them.

Man: All right, I've got James in the queue.

James Bladel: Thanks, (James Bladel) speaking. And I think we have an opportunity to think back yesterday in your group. I think that I've been thinking about this and strongly favor the more distributed model for a variety of reasons, mainly because it creates the jurisdiction (unintelligible) authoritative data problem and I think that those are addressed by the distributed model a little bit better.

But just kind of raises an overarching issue that may be expanding and beyond the scope of this group which is that ICANN is sorely in need of a law

enforcement clearinghouse, some place where any kind of request is routed through an organization or a body or something that we know it's a legitimate request that we know that they are legitimate law enforcement and this idea would have maybe some sort of jurisdiction matching that they believe that they are some sort of an appropriate law enforcement body so that we don't have the, you know, some - we don't have to test the credentials on a case by case basis, and that enforcement judgment doesn't fall onto private organizations like registries and registrars.

So I think, you know, that would be one thing perhaps to consider as maybe a side note or an asterisk or footnote in your report, but I do think that more and more as you dig into the model approach the, you know, running to big data to solve problems is, I think, the wrong approach. So I...

Man: Well, you have an (align) - we have an (align) huge case and we think that there's some issues if we are not having (unintelligible).

Rod Rasmussen: Yeah, well, you know, there's several. Speaking of (unintelligibles) - I'm sorry, Rod Rasmussen. So and one person (unintelligible) is we brought this up in the report that this is one of the things that would be - I think you brought it up in the report, and then (unintelligible) I know that...

James Bladel: I'm sorry, Rod, I can't hear you. Can you make sure you're speaking into the microphone?

Rod Rasmussen: Oh. Okay.

James Bladel: Thank you.

Rod Rasmussen: I'm sorry. I can hear me. So in the - I believe we have in the report that we mentioned the ability to have basically what you're talking about, a clearinghouse for law enforcement requests, but it felt like requests but I guess it does because it's part of the system, this is a request for

(unintelligible) information or registration data information per se where you would be credentialed, right?

So you would be - there would be a facility for getting credentials as law enforcement and then when you need to make a request for information around registration data for law enforcement purposes then you would access the system and have your stated usage for whatever the purpose was.

James Bladel: Yeah, thanks, Rod. And I was just thinking that this could actually be - this idea of accrediting law enforcement could actually be expanded beyond just requests for registrations.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay, oh, okay.

James Bladel: I mean, all kinds of types of issues where, you know, hey, I've got a guy on the phone. He's says he's a cop in some place I've never heard of and he says that he has authority over this domain name or this registrant. So I think that, you know, let's build on that idea. It's good that you're starting that process, but we can go further.

And I think that the other missing component is that jurisdiction-matching. You know, we want to make sure that there is some - I'm going to use the wrong term, for all the lawyers in the room, okay, but there is some nexus of jurisdiction that says that the person who is making this law enforcement request is somehow related to the domain name or the registrant or something. It's not just, you know, someone in my country visited this Web site and was offended so now you in the United States or in Europe have to take it down. You know, let's maybe look at all the, you know, things that could flow through that.

Man: (Stephanie), do you want to...

(Stephanie Legner):   Not to belabor my suggestion about having a data protection authority within whatever this clearinghouse is, but let's be clear. We used the words law enforcement to denote police forces generally speaking and other police agencies.

Data protection commissioners are enforcing law, data protection law. And that particular law is central to the whole question of whether these law enforcement officers have the authority to access personal data under whatever jurisdiction.

And the data protection experts, commissioners, that whole field of study, which isn't particularly well represented at ICANN I would submit. They have expertise in these matters.

So the logical way of handling this - and I - my heart goes out to you trying to figure out who's authorized to get the data because if you're not an expert in the data protection law and jurisdictions it's a (unintelligible) game and you must be paying an awful lot of legal fees.

But that kind of thing - the whole goal would be to streamline that function and get an area of expertise that sorts these requests. Yes, sorry, my name is (Stephanie) (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible)?

Man: Yes, hi, (unintelligible) from (unintelligible). I also want to stress my concern of having one central database for these - as a solution. And the one thing that was not discussed here is what is the additional cost that this - with this solution will actually create to the industry now.

Many times that these costs somehow end up on our table as the registrars and even if they're not they end up on the registrants, you know, paying. So has this been considered in any way?

Man: Yes, this is very important topic. We have unfortunately not been able to have had enough time to have the overall - overview of this cost element. But we are building this value chain from A to Z, from the registrant - from the registrant to the people who are going to use the data and so forth.

And we need to consider the overall ecosystem, not only the transaction from registrants to registrars and registries and so forth. There is a huge amount of money which is billed or used on an even side by either companies or people who wanted to access information, which are - because they're not correct. They're not having the level of integrity that is needed or accuracy. Then they spend much, much more money than they need to have.

So we believe that - of course, building this new model will be necessary - will have the necessity to have some - there's some (unintelligible) at the beginning, of course, but how we map it correctly this is still under construction within (EGW).

At the end of the day I believe it will be seen as quite positive for the overall community. I don't expect - we are not a commercial, right, organization. We - (EGW) are not having in mind to make money from this aspect - of this aspect.

And as such, we are very conscious of making sure that the cost of using this system and the ease of use is going to be such that the overall system is going to be much better than today.

How much better it's going to be, I think we need to put much, much more thought. This is one point that from this community particularly we'd like to have your input and not only concern but I think also suggestion on how to make it happening.

Man: (Rod)?

Rod Rasmussen: So one thing that would be - Rod Rasmussen, sorry, I'm addressing these cost issues here too is we are discussing this within the group. Obviously we're not ignoring cost. It's a major consideration.

One thing that would be helpful from the communities out there is - probably be doing some outreach on this but might as well mention it now is the ideas of how much it's costing you to run your current Whois servers, right, your current infrastructure that you have to do - deal with complaint issues, you have to deal with your compliance issues.

And a lot of what we're proposing here would probably relieve a lot of those burdens from registrars. So it's - that - which would be obviously a positive for this community.

So it would be helpful to be able to base that, you know, kind of analysis at least on some of the - some real data from the effected constituencies.

Man: Sorry, (unintelligible) so I - sorry, I didn't want to say in anyway that you are looking to make money on the (EGW) but clearly if there is a provider chosen at the end providing the services (unintelligible) that would probably be some company that is (unintelligible) and will be looking to make money. So there will be some type of a cost.

Currently I think that in the end - and we have a pretty big going on in Thick Whois and I believe that at the end we will find ourselves having all the registries, including the .com and the .net, having a Thick Whois solution.

I wouldn't personally prefer to see a solution that maybe changes the protocol, maybe creates this - we call it, different authority to get the information, and things like that. But at some - maybe protocol to connect all the databases and not create an additional database outside of that.

(Stephanie Legner):   It's (Stephanie Legner), Internet (unintelligible) German Registrar. Just from my understanding, so we have a registry which in my opinion must to some extent be a center of trust. We have a registrar. We have a registrant. So what I have understood with the gTLDs is due to the fact that we have a thin Whois, we have this data (unintelligible) service. So there's another party coming in where data has to be stored.

Now with this new registration directory service there's another party where data has to be stored and we do have - we do have institutions which should be centers of trust and could be trusted. And we are creating databases around for storing data additionally. And we make this system extremely complex.

So I affirm your proposal. If you create, let's say, a unified protocol and if you create an institution which kind of connects to all the other registries for picking up these data on demand this might be a solution to make it easier for everybody.

But given all these data to a fifth institution storing it there, having all the data protection issues, is a - not a very clever way in my opinion to do so.

Man: Thanks. Okay, (Mohammad).

(Mohammad):   Thank you, (Mohammad) (unintelligible). I have two questions. The first one is - do we think that - because it's going to be a very huge data mining (unintelligible) that there will be a tendency for monetization of the user of this base? This is the first thing. And the second one is some countries have a protection of - with some registrant user data.

Some others do not apply yet. If you look the user site are you going to have some rules because we'll have two different types of users, the public - I mean anybody who can access the small information and authorization for authoritative and (unintelligible) that will get access to that.

Are we going to have authorization for country? Because specific users - if you have an authorization in one country we're going to allow you to access all the data available in that directory services because if it's going to happen, I mean you can use the proxy (unintelligible).

If you're in a country where they don't protect the users you can start giving, like, monetization services for people who are in some countries with - where people protect end users.

If you want to get access to the data in the country you just have to ask somebody - or operate in a country where they're not protecting things and get access to whatever they want, a monetization approach.

So this monetization of this space and the use of it and the fact that (unintelligible) have to be defined per country depending on the legislation, is that something you think that you have already think about it or talked about it in that working group? Thanks.

(Stephanie Parin): Certainly, this is (Stephanie Parin) answering. With respect to data protection law these are very, very good questions and another reason why some kind of central authority that figures this out is important because just under data protection law, some jurisdictions provide rights only to the citizens.

Other on the other hand provide rights to anyone. And in the scenario that you have just described where the thing moves around to the lowest level of protection, that doesn't preclude an individual as there's a nexus with another country that has stronger data protection law filing a complaint through their own data protection authorities.

I mean this would - if it's bad now this would get even worse for registrars in terms of managing these complaints. The only thing in my view that is saving

you right now is you're not getting the complaints. If you had a campaign that launched complaints you would have a major headache rather quickly.

So the thing is to be need - and (Michael) has points about it a moment ago that ICANN is not trying to establish it's own data protection law. Nevertheless, it has to establish some sort of standard treatments of personal information. You can't have a situation where an individual would request their - be able to request their own data in one country but not in another.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, I just want to follow up on the point that, you know, (unintelligible) and Mr. - I'm sorry, not Mr. Neuman, Mr. Rod Rasmussen (unintelligible) mentioned around the actual - what are we thinking about from the company running RDS.

Our recommendation is going to be - I'm sorry, I got to get closer to this thing. There we go. Rod Rasmussen speaking. One of the things that we're going to be recommending we believe coming out of this is that this organization cost recovery basis is not a for profit enterprise that is looking to monetize things as much as possible when it comes to the registration data.

Man: (Kelly)?

Kelly Salter: Kelly Salter, (unintelligible) Group. It's just a question. I quite like you to maybe liaise with some other groups so that where we are centralizing the majority of our data because when I was in the new gTLD status update meeting at the beginning of this week, obviously as part of the emergency recovery, ICANN is going to be choosing a centralized provider for all new gTLDs.

So we're already going to be escrowing all of the data for the new gTLD registrants in the event of an emergency. And here we're talking about centralizing data for the purposes - it's not called Whois directory.

So obviously we don't want to end up with multiple centralized data. So I don't know whether you may want to liaise with some of the other groups to see what they're doing.

Man: Now since we don't have too much more time I repeat that we are seeking for your input and also your comment (unintelligible) your own business on - before August 12. I think it would be very, very important to receive as many as possible - not only input but also concern on how this new proposed model will impact, positively or negatively, your own business.

And this is our expectation that what we are going to do is making your business easier. Definitely this is for the benefit for the community.

So this is a very important element. You talk about cost and I think it's a very, very important element of - and concern within the (EGW) and also we'd like to have as many inputs on this one, what is the cost today, what will be your anticipated costs in the future? Rod?

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, Rod Rasmussen. One last point and I'm speaking to (James) and everybody else has raised concerns around centralization. We would really like to - it sounds like you've done some thinking and some research around that.

I would - we would like to get your input as to what those concerns are but also how to manage to handle the various use cases and things in a way - using a decentralized model if that's what your preference is. We need to have input from you and how that would work and how you think that is actually better.

So that's - we need that - not just - we don't like it, we need some more reinforcement around how you think it will - a system should work and a better format. So we hear you and we're going to be actually responding on these issues. We're hearing that one loud and clear.

So we will be responding but we also - we ask for a response back from you as the experts yourselves.

Man: Okay, thank you, Rod. I want to try to keep us on schedule as much as possible today, which is going to be a challenge. So I'd like to thank (Jon François) and everybody else for coming to us. (Jennifer)?

Man: Thank you very much.

Man: And if anybody has any input for the (EGW) - you've seen them all here plus you've also gotten me if you want to.

(Jennifer): Just one minute. We're trying to coordinate here.

Man: If you don't mind - just for a moment, yes.

(Jennifer): Go ahead.

(Silas Namazi): Thank you, (unintelligible). Thank you to stakeholder group. My name is (Silas Namazi), I'm with ICANN. First of all I just wanted to apologize for the mix up in my schedule and not being here on time.

I know my colleague (Mark Stucki) who is much more capable than I am has covered the topics that we were supposed to cover. But I'm here now and if there is an opportunity for me to respond to anything or to address any of the issues that you have or anything that you just want us to hear, I'm of course at your disposal.

I just wanted to say I'm really happy to be here. I appreciate the opportunity for us to be a part of the team and hear your concerns and questions and feedback and essentially make sure that our ears are opened, our eyes are opened to your issues and concerns to move things forward as well. thanks.

Man: (James), go ahead.

(James):   Thanks, thanks, (unintelligible). Just one of the topics we discussed earlier on and with (Mike) was the outreach efforts for the new REA and I think he was asking us for our help in making the case internally that, you know, no effort is going to be too great. There's no such thing as too much outreach on this issue.

                  A lot of us - I particularly believe - in this room believe that the problems that cause the new REA in the first place were outside of ICANN, outside of this group, outside of this room.

                  And so if we don't reach out to them we're just going to be talking about a 2015 REA or a 2017 REA and we don't want to go down that path because the dominos will fall in such a way that that will be an indictment of the entire gTLD program as a failure because the registrars didn't live up to the 2013 REA.

                  So we really feel like the outreach efforts need to be - what's currently planned, it should be viewed as, like, a baseline minimum and we need to build from there and maybe look at it as a continuation - a continual process.

                  And I think that those are dollars that ICANN will see a return on much faster than some of these strategic committees and panels that are being proposed at a higher level. These are dollars on the ground and in the trenches that will really further these programs.

(Cyrus):   So thank you, (James). This is (Cyrus), that's music to my ears as well. I'm 100% onboard with that. I'm a big fan of training and outreach and obviously sharing information. So as you probably know we already have one planned for China in the later part of August.

I don't know if we've publicized exact dates, another one in North America in Los Angeles probably shortly after that. We have webinars planned and it's - the stakeholder group thinks that other geographies need to also be addressed, sort of on the ground in location.

I'm a big fan of it. I don't think that's - every penny of it that we spend in promoting that and providing that is money well spent.

So if you have inputs, feedback just let us know. We're very much in support of it. We do invite you to come participate with us in providing the training and information wherever we go. And I know that you, yourself, (James), and others have volunteered at times when training in China and in Los Angeles.

So just to reiterate that we're 100% onboard with what you're suggesting, thank you for that.

Man: (Kelly), go ahead.

Kelly Salter: Kelly Salter, (unintelligible). You weren't hear earlier so I'll just reiterate what I said back that absolutely, we're a European registrar, we do want outreach, we do want the training.

So we do want you to arrange the workshops, webinars, as soon as possible because time is of the essence now. So we have a deadline to meet. So the earlier we have the outreach the better.

(Cyrus): This is (Cyrus). Thank you very much for that, we'll definitely plan for that. I think the month of August all of Europe shuts down so we'll probably have to do it in September but...

Kelly Salter: Sorry, can I just come in on that? So obviously, you know, we're European but I've only heard, like, China, America, and Europe mentioned so far. And we're in Africa.

Don't forget the other - you know, just because I'm speaking up on behalf of Europe, the registrars that aren't here. Three workshops won't - so you see there must be a massive outreach program on this.

(Cyrus):   Okay, thank you for that. I hear that.

Man: (Cyrus), I mean I've raised this with you directly on a number of occasions in the last couple of weeks as you know. So you know, the message from us here should be 100% clear to you at this juncture.

ICANN CEO seems to be very happy to make broad sweeping promises about engagement and panels and ICANN taskforces and God only knows what. But this kind of thing is key.

If the industry is not aware and the entire chain - the entire supply chain is not made aware of the changes in the 2000 REA you will have failed dramatically. And there's - as speaking for myself and not for the entire stakeholder group but as for me, as far as I'm concerned, I will view that as a failure on the ICANN side.

But changes in the 2013 REA that aren't - don't make much difference to my business. There are other changes, however, which will make a significant - force significant changes and will incur significant costs for us.

So from my perspective, if you in ICANN are not capable - and I'm not going to name - do serious outreach and education to registrars and the rest of the industry globally and multilingually, you will - this will fail.

And (Fadhi) has these speeches and nice pictures up on main stages will not change that. It has to be consistent. It has to be done properly. It has to be done multilingually.

(Cyrus):   I hear you. (Unintelligible) and then (Kelly)?

Man: Yes, I asked to (Mike) when we had the GNSO's session during the weekend why aren't we having one session here? I see so many registrars here. It could have been a good opportunity to have a session about REA for registrars. I mean going through the points that we need to understand, make sure that we follow them and things like that.

                So I think it's a pity it wasn't done. I ask that - whether it could be done, you know, in the last minute. (Mike) said it would be very hard. But still, it's a - I just want to stress the importance. Again, as (Kelly) said, of having the massive outreach globally.

(Cyrus):   Yes, thank you. I actually remember you making that suggestion. I did think about it but I think logistically if we had thought about it actually sooner maybe we could have actually put it on the schedule. But I don't think we can realistically do a good job of doing that during the Durbin conference.

                But as we go forward and we implement this in China and then we do it in the US and then hopefully follow it by Europe and other geographies like (Kelly) was saying, combine that with webinars and so on. I understand the sense of urgency and I understand that it needs to be a very complete training and education session.

                Right now our thinking is at least a day and a half, maybe two days of training. So to be able to actually pull that off in the last minute in Durbin I don't think we'll be able to do that.

                Now (Stacy Burnett) from our compliance team is going to do a high level overview of it later on today, I think at 11 o'clock (Mike) tells me. So that would be a good starting point but we need to obviously dive into it at much more depth as well. Thank you.

Man: So I've got (Frederick), I think you had your hand up. (Mohammad)?

(Mohammad):   So I think a good way to - a suggestion, and I know we always welcome one
                in the gTLD world but ccTLDs have usually transitions (unintelligible)
                countries. They do a lot of outreach. And I think at some point ICANN should
                - like, use ccTLDs logistics maybe to do their outreach. And because that will
                be more - I think more efficient to mix the training sessions with the ones from
                ccTLDs.

                I know it's sometimes a bad word to mix ccTLDs and gTLDs but here I think it
                would be very useful.

(Cyrus):   Thank you, this is (Cyrus). That's a great suggestion actually so we'll follow
                up with that.

Kelly Salter: (Unintelligible) has gone missing so Kelly Salter, (unintelligible) Group and
                just - I was next. I just want to reconfirm, (Cyrus), that you absolutely need to
                give your teams all the support you can give and as much resources as you
                can give because our demand has not got - has gone to the outreach for the
                new REA.

                Obviously we have new policies coming in so moving forward I think the
                difference now is the amount of change that's coming in such a short space
                of time.

                So we want registrar training programs in advance of implementation moving
                forward. So today my team have - you know, their to-do list has massively
                grown. So just to ask that ICANN and yourselves put everything behind to
                make this happen.

(Cyrus):   This is (Cyrus). I hear you loud and clear. Your demand is my command. So
                we'll definitely follow up. Like - you don't need to sell me on the concept or

the value of it. Obviously there is limitations in terms of, you know, everything else that needs to be done.

But this particular topic is really high on the priority list of my to-do items for my team. I really hear that.

Kelly Salter: Thanks. Kelly Salter, (unintelligible) Group. And obviously there is a deadline in place. If - when you look at this project it's unrealistic that you could do everything in advance of that deadline to allow the registrar community to implement and correctly. Would you consider extending that deadline to January 1?

(Cyrus):   I don't think this is something - this is (Cyrus) again, that I can commit to right now. I think it should really be obvious to everyone, and maybe it isn't, the intent here is not for us to put handcuffs on the part of the contracting parties.

We want to work with you to ensure that, you know, whatever has been negotiated and put into the REA is realistically feasible to implement.

As we go forward there is some responsibility that falls on the part of ICANN in terms of the outreach as a lot of you have pointed out, sharing information, providing the information to other contracted parties in conjunction with many of you who have the operational experience and the know-how that we at ICANN don't have. So it's really truly a team effort.

But also there's responsibility on the part of the operators so that knowing what's been coming, the REA is not a surprise hopefully. It's been, you know, in comment period and reply period for some time.

But if there is a need for any particular extension that we - together, deem to be legitimate we're open to it. We don't want to put, you know, our contracted parties in a bind so that they fall, you know, out of compliance with it for, you

know, reasons that we could have avoided. So - I hope that answers your question.

Kelly Salter: Yes, I didn't think I was going to get a definite yes.

(Cyrus): Yes, there isn't one. If there was then I would say it to you but I think it's something that, you know, "we have to wait and see" so to speak, thanks.

Man: Okay, we have to wrap this up now so I'm just going to let (James) very quickly and then (Mohammad) very quickly, please.

(James): Yes, I know we're - and I know we don't want to rehash the earlier conversations we had with (Mike) but I just wanted to let you know that one of the things I want to discuss with the Board is this backlog of changes that we're starting to experience now.

What we want to see out of ICANN - and this is something I think as your position in the industry liaison is that we need to see a more mature change management philosophy that has more of a calendar that rolls out different implementations on a predictable and regular schedule that includes a time to develop, discuss, and implement.

And then, you know, to measure that sort of thing, the same way that we do at any large organization or enterprise with any sort of change as opposed to just kind of throwing everything on to the queue as quickly as possible.

I think that that is going to serve registrars and registries but also registrants without confusing them and keep us off the edge of chaos.

(Cyrus): May I (unintelligible) respond to this real quick? This is (Cyrus). So I probably need a little more education from you, (James), in terms of what you're specifically asking. Maybe we can take this offline and you can enlighten me on that, I'm not sure, thanks.

(Mohammad):   Thank you, just a remark, the first one is since we have to make some
                change on the REA so it opens a door for - right, for registrants.

                So this also gives us more opportunity to have more partners when you talk
                about outreach program because getting these documents available in
                various languages will help also have some partner in (unintelligible) that
                have more consumer oriented or regulatory body in different countries or
                even (unintelligible) because when you start putting some provision about
                registrant protection and responsibilities I think they can help you translate
                these documents in different areas where the language barrier is
                (unintelligible).

                And I recall just in the past the cooperation that has been done between the
                cc (unintelligible) and the Organizational International (unintelligible) where
                they helped me draft a lot of important document and (unintelligible) to do
                some specific selection about - do some homework about what can be - can
                you have a summary of the key points of the new contract and also regarding
                this training program for registrar.

                I think that you need to sort of balance region that did not have many versus
                region that are really comfortable regarding the number of partner available
                (unintelligible). So we really need to look at these two aspects, more partners
                in that outreach program and more local languages available in other - to
                reach more people.

(Cyrus):   Yes, thank you, (Mohammad). This is (Cyrus) again. This is actually a great
                idea. It's actually on our to-do list and I'm actually going to go out on a limb
                and put my colleague (Mike) on the spot here to see if he has a timeline in
                mind with - it's on his to-do list.

                Let me pass this on to (Mike) to see if he has a timeline to share with us. I
                don't have the timeline right now. It is on our to-do list. It's a great idea. We're

in full support of it. But let's see if he has any new information that he can share with us on that.

Mike: So in terms of the documents themselves - I'm still struggling. I've got to get the English language posted on our website but, you know, when it's in kind of a very final state we can put it online. It's going to go straight to the translators.

So in terms of the REA, we're working on the policy documents. The (ERRP), we sent out for translation three months ago. I don't know why it takes that long. You know, if we don't get good service through our own translation resources I'm going to propose that we find our own within our department.

But you know, I'm with you. You know, I think it's very important that people can understand it and, you know, that means at least having a - you know, what we call a courtesy version in other languages.

And so fully support that and, of course, you probably know we've got the training program is already in - I think six languages. You know, obviously we can't cover the entire world but we tried to go at least, you know, a couple languages past the UN languages. So hopefully that's answering the question.

(Mohammad):   Thank you.

Woman: Thank you for your time. I believe we'll take a five minute - real quick five minute (unintelligible) break, come back right into the SSAC presentation. Thank you.

END