

**ICANN MEETING
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA
REGISTRIES STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

19 NOVEMBER 2013

MORNING SESSION (PART I)

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.

Keith Drazek: Okay good morning, everybody. Let's go ahead and take our seats so we can get started please.

Cherie Stubbs: Good morning, everyone. My name is Cherie Stubbs and I'm the Secretariat for the Registries. And we're ready to get started. And can we start the recording, please? Good. Thank you.

Keith, would you like me to - should we do a quick call of the members that are in the room? All right. If - those members in the room and the NTAG officers would please introduce themselves.

Josh Zetlin: Josh Zetlin, Secretary.

Liz Sweezey: Liz Sweezey, Treasurer.

Sarah Falvey: Sarah Falvey, Vice Chair and Acting Chair.

Cherie Stubbs: While the microphones are being fixed on that side of the room I just wanted to remind everybody of a couple of housekeeping details that when you are speaking please be sure to announce your name prior to speaking for purposes of those who are participating remotely as well as for the transcript. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...it was very hard to hear so just a suggestion there. It'll help all of us and it'll certainly hope those that are listening in remotely or listening to the recording later. Thanks.

Cherie Stubbs: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, my name is Ken Stubbs. I'm with Afilias.

Mike Palage: Mike Palage, dotCoop.

Ching Chiao: Ching Chiao, dotAsia, Council representative.

Jeff Neuman: Jeff Neuman with Neustar, Council representative.

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan Robinson, Afilias, Council representative and Council Chair.

Paul Diaz: I'm Paul Diaz from Public Interest Registry and alternate Chair.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Keith Drazek, VeriSign, Registry Stakeholder Group Chair.

Krista Papac: Krista Papac, ICANN staff, Registry Services Group.

Wendy Profit: Wendy Profit, ICANN staff, Registry Stakeholder Group - Registry Services Group - sorry.

Reg Levy: Reg Levy, Minds+Machines and NTAG Treasurer elect.

Yasmin Omer: Yasmin Omer, International Domain Registry.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin, International Domain Registry.

Jon Nevett: Jon Nevett, Donuts.

Carolyn Hoover: Carolyn Hoover, dotCoop.

Byron Henderson: Byron Henderson, dotTravel.

Liz Finberg: Liz Finberg, PIR.

Man: (Unintelligible), PIR.

Vladimir Shadrinov: Vladimir Shadrinov, (unintelligible) digital.

Cherie Stubbs: I think that's it for the Registry members. Oh, sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Statton Hammock: Statton Hammock, United TLD.

Don Blumenthal: Don Blumenthal, Public Interest Registry.

Ray Fassett: Ray Fassett, dotJobs.

Woman: ([Becky Burr](#)Unintelligible), Neustar.

Jordyn Buchanan: Jordyn Buchanan, Charleston Road Registry.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes, VeriSign.

Woman: ([Cherie Stubbs](#)Unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: All right thanks very much, Cherie. And thanks to everybody in the room. Sorry for the technical difficulties here. Hopefully we'll get those worked out so we can have a little bit more free interaction. Yeah, thank you, no worries.

Okay let's go ahead and get started. So we have the recording going so this is Keith Drazek, Registry Stakeholder Group Chair. Welcome to the gTLD Registry Stakeholder Group meeting of Tuesday, 19 of November, 2013.

At this point I'd like just to open up and ask if anybody has any additions, amendments or edits to our agenda today. Anything that we'd like to add in? And I should probably, right at the top here, note that the Registry Stakeholder Group list received an email from Jeff Neuman announcing that he is actually going to be stepping down as one of our councilors - as our North American Council rep to the GNSO Council.

So I wanted to take this time actually to acknowledge Jeff and to thank him for his incredible service over the last several years. And just as a side we need to probably put something in the agenda to talk about how we're going to

adapt to that. But, Jeff, you know, heartfelt thank you for your service and, yeah.

And, you know, really important to say that, I mean, Jeff's work on our behalf - on our behalf in the Council and within the stakeholder group over the years has been exemplary. The level of effort and focus and dedication, commitment, all of that and passion has been, you know, really remarkable and those will be big shoes to fill if even possible so thanks, Jeff.

So at some point we need to figure out, Cherie, where to put in the agenda our conversation about next steps but let's just - let me open it up now. Does anybody have any additions, anything else they'd like to add to the agenda?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Barbara Knight from remote participation. And she said, "Keith, you may remove the IRTP update as there have been no meeting since the Registry Stakeholder Group last met.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much. Thanks, Barbara. Okay any other additions? Anybody else have anything they'd like to add or adjust on our agenda today?

Cherie Stubbs: This is Cherie. Were there some discussions late yesterday about other issues that did not need to remain on the agenda? Or are you just going to touch on them as we go through?

Keith Drazek: Yeah, I think - so thanks, Cherie. Under the discussions with ICANN staff I think there were a few adjustments that we need to make but we can get to that I think when we...

((Crosstalk))

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks. Okay, nothing else to add then let's go ahead and move on. So our first agenda topic is really the agenda review. We have three main sessions or three main segments to that first being the stakeholder group meeting, the second being our meeting with the ICANN Board. We need to review and prepare for that and then prepare for our joint meeting with the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

So rather than spending time on each one of these items now I would ask everybody to take a look at the agenda items that are in the agenda and start thinking about that so we can have that conversation particularly if there are any developments that we've had over the last, you know, several days that would change what we want to talk about with regard to the Board or the registrars. So - and we'll circle back to that.

But for now what I'd like to do is to welcome Krista Papac who's here from ICANN staff. Krista has asked for some time to sort of give us an overview and a description of sort of the way that the Registry Services Team is currently structured, sort of the view of how they're going to be engaging with us. So with that I'll hand it over to Krista and, Krista, welcome. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: Thanks, Keith. Good morning, everybody. I feel like I should be on the stage when I'm holding the microphone. So I thought it would be helpful to - as ICANN is growing and the industry is growing so is the organization of ICANN. And so I thought it would be helpful to maybe just take a couple

minutes and step you guys through what the Registry Services Team does and - hello? I'm not known for my grace.

Step you guys through kind of what the Registry Services Team today looks like. A lot of you have been in the Registry Stakeholder Group and interacting with ICANN for a long time but I think that that's evolved over the past couple years and thought it would be helpful just to take you through that.

So I put together a couple slides. Cyrus was going to be here to present this to you guys but unfortunately he has the stomach flu. So the part of - the role of Cyrus Namazi will be played by Krista Papac today. Next slide.

So under the Global Domains Division we have the DNS Industry Engagement Team, sometimes referred to as the DNS Services Team which is headed up by Cyrus Namazi who I think you're all familiar with and who's my boss.

We have Winnie Yu, who you may, from time to time, see emails from or who may be in contact with you and she's the administrative assistant to Cyrus and to the rest of the team.

So underneath Cyrus we basically have five different groups that have, you know, a primary focus on a specific area of services. The first one is Registrar Services which is headed up by Tim Cole. Tim currently has four people on this team that support the registrars and is actively looking for additional headcount.

Under the Registry Services Team that team is headed up by myself. My currently have three people on the team who, I think most of you know

Wendy Profit who's been around for a while and who's been helping run Registry meetings for some time.

We have a new member to the team as of yesterday which is Ann Yamashita who's here in the audience. And, excuse me, Ann has actually been with ICANN for a couple years now.

She worked on the New gTLD Operations Team which is the team that processed applications and basically dealt with the New gTLD Program on the implementation side really from the beginning so has some depth of knowledge on the new gTLD stuff as well as some pretty deep understanding of the Registry Agreement and having dealt with contracting and some of those items recently.

Then there is the star - we also have a new hire that started on October 1 who I want to introduce to you guys a little bit later when he can get here. He had a conflict this morning. This name is Han Chuan Lee. He is based out of Singapore so he's there to help support the local market, first of all, and of course all Registry Services across the board.

Han Chuan is from dotSG, he worked there for a number of years and has an incredible depth of knowledge about the registry business itself on the CC side, which of course translates very nicely as well as just a working knowledge of the industry.

Then we have a Technical Services Team, which is a newer form - that just became formalized I think November 1 actually. It's headed up by Francisco Arias who I saw here - he's right over here. I know most if not all of you probably know Francisco.

And then on Francisco's team he has Gustavo Lozano who would be here but he had his baby - yes, well his wife did actually, he did not have a baby. That's how rumors get started. Yes, exactly.

Sorry, I forgot to mention an important thing. And then the Registry Services Team we're also trying to working to grow the team and to fill some slots. One of them we absolutely want to put in the Istanbul office to make sure we can serve the European market as well and better serve them is probably a way to put it and, you know, have people from that local market that can interact with the registries in Europe and the surrounding areas.

So the Technical Services Team really what they do is they support registry and registrar and really the IDN Team on technical aspects of what we do. And I'm going to get a little bit more into what Registry Services does in the next slide.

Policy and Research Team is Karen Lentz which I'm pretty sure you might have heard of before. Karen I think is sitting back here behind Becky, yes. And then Karen also has - is looking for - has an additional headcount on her team.

And then lastly - and Karen, I don't even know just Karen can do anything and she does policy and research but she does like amazing things so I don't even know how to define what Karen does other than support us across the board on research and policy matters and, you know, communications that need to be pulled together for the community, for the board, things like that.

And then the IDN Team, which I think IDN kind of speaks for itself but there's the variant project that's going on which is a significant undertaking

that's headed up by Naela Sarras supported by (Nicoletta) - I can never say her last name right, (Nicolau Motaneu). Next slide, please.

Yes, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Krista. It's Jonathan. Just one quick question on the previous slide. I mean, I notice immediately that the Registries and Registrars have ultimately the same size team supporting them. I just wonder what the thinking behind that is, if you know what - why are they the same. Is there any sort of...

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: ...mics in here. They're effectively going to be the same size pool of people and I think they roughly have similar number of products, which I'm going to get into, or services that they support. So I think, you know, from our perspective it's generally going to have the same size group or same amount of constituents at least at this point.

And, again, when I talk about - a little bit about what we do I think the Registrar Team, the number of things that they do is, give or take, fairly equivalent. Also we're doing a little bit of tea-leaf reading right now as you can imagine so we're trying to sort of predict what we think the future looks like.

And we're basing a lot of that off the learnings of the Registrar Team because they scaled over time and they know that they need a couple more people right now to support a size of constituents, give or take, going to be about equivalent to ours.

So what Registry Services does - this is just mean to be a conversation-starter and not list everything explicitly. Excuse me. So registry relationship I think, you know, I hope that you guys understand that piece at a very minimum. We're really your relationship management team.

We're the people who communicate both to you and for you inside of ICANN to help, you know, as ICANN does its cross functional teams to address different things. It's really the Registry Services Team that will communicate and represent the things that you - that are important to you guys and sort of how things may or may not impact registries, etcetera.

The Registry Agreement overall we're ultimately responsible for the contract. Certainly that is - has a lot of legal input because it's a legal agreement. But ultimately we oversee the contract and anything that sort of comes off of that, right? So if you need to make an amendment to your contract or if you're renewing your contract all of those sorts of things fall into the Registry Agreement and the Registry Services Team ownership of that.

Registry onboarding is currently being performed by the Registry Services Team. And so any new registries, as they come on and they go through the onboarding process of becoming a contracted party, that's being managed by the Registry Services Team. And I know there's a lot of interest around this topic for the newer registries.

I think everybody knows this but just in case, there's a session tomorrow at 10:30 on contracting and onboarding where we're going to get into some details about that topic.

New services implementation, so when we talk about services in a regular company you have like a product and services team and they develop the products and the services.

In ICANN the Registry Services Team it's somewhat like that. And what the products and services are are a lot of the things that you guys as registries have to do so it's the RSEP process. Sorry. It is things like the RSEP process, it's things like the PICDRP, the PDDRP, the URS.

So as these things come out of a policy process or whatever process that they come from they need to be implemented and designed and how does that really work and, you know, how does a registry submit a registry services evaluation procedure request, you know, how does all of that work. So those products or services are owned by the Registry Services Team.

New registry services evaluation, they are set, contract changes and renewals I covered. Publications so the publication of agreements, the publication of documents and things that pertain to registries are also owned by the Registry Services Team. Those - so like your registry page where your agreement is posted those pages are ultimately owned by the Registry Services Team.

And then inquiries, so as we've - as ICANN has grown over the past few years many of know this, if not all of you, we've, you know, we have a CRM system that we use and we have a large majority, if not all, for new gTLDs we've had this, we will be doing this across the board with our communications of registries.

Inquiries get submitted to the customer support center. We use that customer support center, or often referred to as the CSC, as a - it's a log. It's a repository of our communications with you. And so what happens - and what will

happen in the future going forward - is you would submit your cases and your inquiries and then they get routed to the appropriate place and oftentimes that's the Registry Services Team.

So we're subject matter experts on the products and services I referred to. I mean, there's just a number of things that go on as you're a registry that interactions that would come to our team as well. But if you wanted to know if we got your invoice payment that would actually probably get routed to Finance. So your different inquiries come in and they - eventually the ones that require input from Registry Services would get routed to us.

Next slide. So here's just a little bit of a high level update of what we're working on. And I was, you know, right now we have 22 existing registries and 144 new registries as of November 15. We have 22 existing TLDs delegated and 24 new TLDs delegated as of November 15. So we're growing a little bit every day and our pool of constituents is growing as you guys are as well.

For onboarding we've completed 94 onboarding data collection exercises. And this slide is a little bit ahead of tomorrow's presentation so I apologize if it doesn't quite make sense yet this section of it. We have 144 registries actively in onboarding which is because there's a second piece - I actually realized that numbers not correct so I apologize.

And one of the things that we're working on - I know that some people have alluded to this over time and I know that there's people looking for it is self-help materials. I think some people call it a welcome kit. I've heard it called a couple other things. So we are working on pulling that documentation together and at some point want to, you know, have a repository of documents that you guys can access.

Some of this stuff is already out there, again, for existing registries, you know, the RSEP process, that's also to be used by new registries. But the vision is really to have them all in one place. Right now they're kind of littered throughout the ICANN Website. So, A, the development process of the materials is underway. And, B, having that be more centralized and easy to find the different bits and pieces that apply to both existing and new TLDs is on the radar.

One of the big things we've been working is ICANN readiness for implementation of services. So we've implemented all these services. And throughout the week you've heard presentations on different things, you know, the URS is operational, the PDDRP is operational, etcetera.

But the actual implementation on the back end of that - which, you know, a lot of that is Compliance-driven but, you know, Registry Services works with the Compliance team to help them understand what the services and how it was developed and things like that. And so we've been busy working on those things.

Servicing registries, there's lots of activity going on with the new registries right now and so there's lots of servicing, if you will, that goes on there.

And then one of the things that we're working on right now that I'd like to - I'd like to have ready hopefully by the Singapore meeting is it's a little dependent on - I need to fill these open slots too.

But I want to have a relationship engagement and management strategy so give you guys a sense of who covers what arena has our team cover part of the world or types of TLDs or a number. It's kind of hard to figure that out

without having a little bit of a better sense of what the team's going to look like.

So - but so it's really what's the management strategy of you guys, who works with who and then the second piece is what's the engagement strategy; how can we, you know, help you guys be better informed or does there need to be other ways of us having a dialogue and things like that.

And I think that's it so I think went too long. I'm sorry, Keith.

Keith Drazek: Yeah, thank you very much, Krista. That was very informative and I really appreciate you spending the time with us this morning. So let's just open it up for questions, feedback, anything from anyone in the room. Questions for Krista or her team? Donna, yes.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin from IDR. Krista, it's just a question, I understand at the moment that you're involved in some of the new gTLD processes. So at what point does your role stop there and start with Registry Services? So you just - you seem to be working with Christine's team at the moment so is there a kind of a crossover there or is there kind of a clear separation?

Krista Papac: So working with Christine's team you mean like if tickets come in through the CSC is that what you mean or - maybe you can give me an example of...

Donna Austin: One of the people that's always part of the new gTLD explanation with the contracting and I can't remember what other stations you were doing yesterday. But just to understand where the kind of application process stops and where the registry becomes a contracted party.

Krista Papac: Okay, thanks for the clarification, Donna. Yeah, so we're actually not part of like the New gTLD Program process so much. We feed into it. And, again, the - where we come into play is we do own the contract. Contracting is now administered by the Operations Team so - because they - that's what they do, they operationalize things so that they can be - efficiencies can be recognized and we can scale it and manage it. But ultimately the contract is owned by us.

We get involved in contracting when needed so if there's a negotiation or code of conduct exemption requests, you know, some of the more specialized things the Registry Services piece - so what's listed on Exhibit A that actually comes from our team. That happens behind the scenes.

But so our role there is, again, we really own the services so we own, you know, the things like the trademark PDDRP and the URS and the PICDRP. But the - and those came out of the New gTLD Program but they're not part of that like application processing if that makes sense and really getting people to delegation. I hope that answers the question.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Krista. Thanks, Donna. (Michael).

Michael Palage: There we go. Thank you. Quick question. And this has to do with RSEPs and Patrick Jones used to handle that before he left and that's kind of been in influx and historically if you looked at the number of RSEPs they were beginning to increase with the legacy TLDs. And I'm sure that number will increase exponentially with the growing membership so a couple of questions on that.

Within this team what types of resources, who is that going - who's going to be handling them and what type of resources will they have? So that's Part 1.

Krista Papac: Okay here's your answer to Part 1. So there's a couple things there. Yes, we realize that that needs to be scaled. So that's one of the things that we have on the roadmap to scale. We - the RSEPs are actually - one of the things - I actually meant to mention this earlier.

One of the things that we're trying to do right now, it's 90% finalized, is with the current team assign all of the different - what we believe are all of our products and services, we assign ownership to different members of the team and they're responsible for covering those. As we build out the team we'll spread it out again. So you guys may experience some change over the coming months with that.

So the RSEPs, they come to our team - they actually go to multiple people inside of ICANN and Han Chuan, who unfortunately can't come in until later today but is the owner of that particular process. And we have, you know, we can support it definitely across the team, it's not just Han Chuan that handles it. And then we're also supported by Francisco's team as well as Legal and, you know, there's a number of other players inside of ICANN that work on those.

Michael Palage: Okay, thank you. Part 2. With regard to RSEPs, there's kind of a bifurcation between the legacy operators that get - still get their RSEPs for free and the new contracting parties that have to pay on a cost-recovery basis so there's kind of a differentiation there. Will there be any type of differentiation in service and processing between those registries that are paying versus those that still get that service for free?

Krista Papac: I don't think so. You're asking if you're paying do you get better service than if you're not paying; is that the question?

Michael Palage: Well, it's a combination because if you look at it - that's part of it, so yes. Will there be a differentiation between those registries that get that service for free versus those that have to pay on a cost recovery basis?

A follow-up to that is if you look at this historically if one - when Patrick Jones was doing a lot of the allocations with regard to the two letters there was a lot of work and research by ICANN. After one registry got that service approved subsequent registries that came forward in the process it was a much quicker process. It was more quickly approved.

So I guess the question, as someone who works with many registries, both legacy as well as - new gTLD registries as well as new gTLD applicants, it might be beneficial if there is a new registry service to go to a legacy operator, have it done for free and then have a new applicant that would theoretically have to pay on a cost recovery basis to follow in someone's footsteps and therefore not pay. So there actually is a cost consideration.

And, again, as you go back to your previous point about trying to operationalize certain aspects of this - so, again, I'm not trying to pin you down or - this is just really an operational question that really does have a financial impact and consideration on legacy as well as new gTLD applicants.

Krista Papac: Thanks for the clarification and thanks for not pinning me down. So I just want to make a couple clarifications then I'm probably going to ask Francisco to expand upon it a little bit.

So there's two different processes in there and they actually get mixed up quite often, probably inside of ICANN even, by the people that don't deal with them. So there's an RSEP process which is really the process of - when a

registry wants to add a new service they submit that to ICANN. And there's no cost of that service for new or existing TLDs.

The RSTEP - so the addition of the T which is a technical evaluation, is the one that works on a cost recovery basis. And that applies to all TLDs so it's not - the age of your TLD is not subject to - has nothing to do with it.

Michael Palage: So perhaps, Byron, if you're here. When dotTravel had - that went through the technical - correct? You were one of the first people that did the technical team with the wildcard and that went to the external team. Was Travel required to pay for that?

Byron Henderson: Okay, is this working? Yeah. As I recall there was no cost. You're right, we were one of the first, there's no doubt.

Francisco Arias: Oh here it is. Hi, this is Francisco. The cost recovery is only for the new ones, it's in the new daily contract; old ones, as Byron said, I believe there is no cost.

Michael Palage: That actually goes to the point I was trying to make is there is a difference and how will ICANN go about this? If - I guess the point I'm trying to make is if someone wants to innovate does the legacy operators try to innovate since they don't have to pay on a cost recovery basis? Do you see the problem?

Krista Papac: I do. Thank you. Thanks for that. We'll definitely take that under consideration. It's a great point.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks. I have Ching in and the queue and then we need to - and then I see Ray and then we probably need to start moving on with our agenda so if

there are any final questions, let me know, stick your hand up, but Ching then Ray.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Keith and thank you for the update. I just need a very simple clarification. You mentioned about the hub city, for example, Han Chuan, is not based in Singapore and he's dealing with local inquiries from the region. He also need to deal with service-oriented, as you mention, RSEP.

So I just want to get the clear picture is that, for example, if this RSEP - and we are in Asia and then we talk to Han Chuan (unintelligible) others services, we still talk to Han Chuan and then he would kind of help us to guide the inquiries to other people on the team, is that the case?

Krista Papac: So with respect to the RSEP and your example, so Han Chuan owns the product but the administration of the product might be spread across several people or, you know, can be spread across several people on the team but he's the overall, you know, product or service manager of that product.

So you would still submit an RSEP the same way you do today and then it would get routed the way it gets routed. And, for instance, as we go through an exercise of operationalizing and scaling the RSEP that's what - Han Chuan would own that and that cross functional team that, you know, makes that happen.

As far as supporting the local market, yeah, so the - again we're developing - or waiting to build out the team just a little bit more and then we're going to develop a relationship engagement strategy. Without knowing who the team members are it still seems to me like absolutely you want to interface with Han Chuan.

You guys are in the same time zone, you know, probably speak some of the same languages, you know, it's just much easier. And to see each other is also easier because you're so much closer.

For inquires to ICANN you would submit those through the customer support center. And - it doesn't mean that you can't go directly to Han Chuan; I don't want to give that impression. It's - but for certain types - most inquires we also want to have sort of a log of that interaction. So you have two things there, your inquiries kind of going through the CSC and your relationship being, you know, built with Han Chuan and the local market. Sure.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Krista. Thanks, Ching. Ray.

Ray Fassett: Thanks, Keith. Ray Fassett. Krista, is this process here or your slide up there that speaks to the Registry Agreement, if an operator wants to negotiate the Registry Agreement, the perception or belief has been you'll likely go to the end of the line, so to speak.

Does this now solve that where if a registry operator - I think in the CIR is actually a question, "Do you wish to negotiate the Registry Agreement?" I'm not sure - I seem to recall that. Does this now provide the resources for an applicant to negotiate the Registry Agreement and get, you know, interaction in that regard?

Krista Papac: So this is - I mean, the answer is actually no. They're interrelated but they're not the same thing. So the contracting process for new gTLDs is facilitated now by the operations team. When people, you know, applicants respond that they want to negotiate the agreement they don't get pushed to the back of the line; it's a separate track. There's a no negotiation track and a negotiation track

if you will. And then if there's, you know, a queue of negotiation they, you know, they manage that queue.

What happens is once the operations team goes through the CIR they check to see if everything is there, is the COI compliant, you know, all of the things that they do. And once they have what they need they then pass the request for negotiation over to Legal and then the Legal Department and the Registry Services Department engage.

What you can expect is that you would probably hear from Registry Services if it's not a really straightforward discussion but can just be facilitated through an email. You would hear from the Registry Services Department and we would engage with the applicant and our Legal Department and I presume the applicant's Legal Department in that negotiation.

And then, you know, whatever the outcome of that was would then be handed back to operations and they would finish processing the contract.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Krista. Thanks, Ray. Any last questions for Krista before we move on? Okay, I don't see any. Don't believe there's any in Chat so thank you very much, Krista. Krista is going to stay with us for most of the day, which I think is a, you know, a very good thing along with some of the other members of the Registry Services Team.

Just a couple of notes; Krista and Sarah and I had lunch a couple weeks ago now. And just sort of talking about looking ahead and how, you know, we can better integrate and better engage moving forward. So I know at least for the Registry Stakeholder Group and I think also for the NTAG, I'll defer to Sarah on that, is that Krista will be invited to participate in our biweekly meetings,

which of course if we have Registry Stakeholder Group and NTAG biweekly meetings on alternate weeks then Krista is going to have a weekly meeting.

But - so I want to encourage people to think ahead and to plan ahead for the stakeholder group calls every two weeks, you know, and we can start thinking about, you know, engaging more directly like this and asking these kinds of questions on a more regular basis.

So I think that's an extremely positive development and thanks to Krista for sort of committing to do that. Okay thanks, Krista.

Now that we have I think a little bit more full room - I see some additional faces. I wanted to take a note before we move on with the agenda to acknowledge the new members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. I think this is, you know, a very exciting development, a continuing development and one that I hope will ramp up significantly as we move towards Singapore.

But I think, as everybody knows, we added, you know, three registries just prior to Durban and one just after. It was International Domain Registry, Charleston Road Registry, CORE and Donuts. And since then we actually have five new full voting members of the Registry Stakeholder Group, dotBerlin, United TLD, dotRegistry LLC, dotKiwi and dotClub Domains LLC. So I just wanted to welcome all of you and congratulations.

And as I said I hope that come Singapore this part of the conversation will take a lot longer, right, that the list will be much longer. So, again, welcome. And I have to say personally I'm very excited about the continuing - I guess infusion of energy, new faces, new blood, new perspective and contributors to our process here in the Registry Stakeholder Group so thank you.

Okay let's then move on with our agenda. We probably should move to GNSO and ICANN updates at this point. Actually, one moment, see the agenda. What time do we have ATRT2 coming in? It's like five minutes, right? Ten o'clock? All right we've got five minutes.

So we really have five minutes so let's circle back to the agenda and are there any - having asked for any further input or feedback on our agenda with the Board or the agenda with the Registrars is there anything else that folks would like to add or discuss, you know, in terms of those two sessions that we don't already have on the agenda?

And, Cherie, maybe we can - is it possible to scroll down so we can have folks review those? Okay so there is - so topics with the Board. What we have right now talking about the Internet Governance Coalition so this is, you know, I guess a discussion around sort of the new news that we've received from Fadi and from the Board, you know, the - sort of the engagement around Internet governance.

We have, on the agenda, the multi-stakeholder model and top down management versus bottoms up; IGO INGO PDP Working Group update; auctions and the reconsideration process. Anything on there that we want to remove, adjust or anything to add? Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: There we go. Thank you. Chuck Gomes. The first agenda item on Internet Governance Coalition, obviously if there are people that a really want to talk about that again but that's been talked about so much all week I think we're just going to hear repetitions of what we've heard in a variety of sessions. Again, if there are people that really think that's important to talk about in that session I'll support it. But if there are not I would say we delete that one.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Chuck. Okay, Ken then Mike.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, this is Ken Stubbs. First of all I think the most important thing is to take the topics we have here and stratify them because you know as well as I do we're going to run out of time. So what is the most important thing that we want to be discussed?

In response to what Chuck said, I know we've heard a lot about their plans but I have not heard anything yet about how they expect us to fit into their plans. There are concerns I have about participation by contracted parties, by people who are going to be affected by these relationships in the future and concerns that I think we need to surface and let them know that this is extremely important that we be given the opportunity to participate from the very beginning.

So stratification and that, in my opinion, are the two issues.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Ken. Jonathan, did you respond to that?

Jonathan Robinson: I guess it is pretty much a response. It's - happen I'm surprisingly supportive. And just a little bit more color, I think I heard something - and I - someone may be able to help here - about a 10-person board or committee to deal with the Inet initiative. And there was business but no sense of domain name industry/contracted parties, you know, participation. So that's one sort of linked point.

And the second then in relation to all of these - so I don't come back to the mic is it may link to auctions, it's something that concerns all of us I think is ensuring that while there's all this work going on at the Internet governance level and all the stuff up in the clouds that we get as participants in the new

gTLD process a predictable, reliable, trustworthy partner in ICANN that we can work with.

And I think a lot of these issues, whether you're a small player or a big player, cause significant concern in terms of - and we really need a business partner in ICANN for people who run business in this sector.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Jonathan. Ken, back to you and then over to Mike Palage and then Chuck.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, here's my concern. Next time we meet in Singapore much of what is being discussed with regard to Internet governance in terms of mapping the plan is already going to be a fait accompli.

And I'm hearing lots of discussion about it including commercial interests and business and stuff like that but if we don't get the opportunity to participate in helping develop and work these strategies we're going to end up in a situation, somebody is going to walk in a room and say, "Here's the way it is." And by then we're not going to be able to.

So I think we need - actually I would go one step further. I don't care whether we bring somebody like Fadi into a conference call in a month or something like this; we need to sit down as a group and discuss - develop some strategies for positioning ourselves if anybody is really interested in doing that. I mean, that's all.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Ken. I've got Mike Palage, Chuck and then Jeff.

Mike Palage: I'll keep this real quick. I fully support Chuck in striking, number one. I've already heard the talking points twice. We don't, I think collectively need to

hear it a third time otherwise we'll consume most of the substantive portion of our time.

Chuck Gomes: So I'm going to modify my suggestion. Sorry, Mike. A little bit - because I don't have any problem with us asking some very specific questions like both Ken and Jonathan mentioned. But I think we ought to change the title or at least the way it's managed in the meeting, because like Mike said, I can name - and I won't - at least three Board members who could go on and on about this and will.

And I'd really rather not that happen because I don't think that's effective use of our time with them. So if we can - and maybe we change the - whether we need to change the title or not I would just - instead of making it a general topic I would say some questions about contracted parties participation in the Internet governance activities that are happening. It's not just the coalition, by the way, so we would be careful there. And then we should be prepared for, I don't know if it's Jonathan, Ken or somebody to ask those questions specifically.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Chuck. Mike, did you want to respond quickly? Okay, Jeff and then I've got Reg in the queue.

Jeff Neuman: That's okay. This is Jeff Neuman. I'm going to make the same point I made to the Council which I think needs to be made to the Board. I'll give you the answer that they gave me and then I'll tell you what seemed to go against that answer.

So on Saturday or Sunday when the Council met with the Board I raised the point - I said, look, I'm not a specialist in Internet governance, most of us here aren't. There's a lot of people that do that but that's not one of my focuses.

The most important thing to me is that the very actions right now of trying to preserve ICANN in this Internet governance debate may be the very same thing that will distract them from actually achieving their mission. And my deep concern is that we're all going to, as a community, become so distracted by that that ICANN will fall flat on what it's supposed to be doing.

And I raised that point and I got a superb answer from both Fadi and Steve saying, no their number one focus is in operational excellence, that's always going to be kind of their key and core focus. That was on Sunday.

Yesterday they issued a press release and the title of the press release was, "Internet governance takes center stage at ICANN 48." That to me is completely against everything they told us it wasn't going to be.

And that's just, again, probably nobody thought of that; maybe that was just a press angle. But it is one of my deepest concerns going forward and should be all of ours. There's a lot we're going to expect from ICANN over the next few years. And to get distracted by this while it is important, we have to make sure that for us we need to hammer down on the point of operational excellence.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Jeff. I've got Reg in the queue then a quick intervention from Jonathan and then we need to move on to welcome our guests from the ATRT2 team. Thanks.

Reg Levy: Reg Levy. I like the idea of having Fadi in a meeting but he has a very strong reality distortion field. So I think we need to be careful about keeping him on track and giving him - not asking him questions that he can answer but telling him what it is that we as the community require of him.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much, Reg. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Keith. I think my point is probably quite similar in a sense to Reg in that I think the answer will get to Jeff's point is Fadi's got tremendous energy, tremendous drive, tremendous capacity which is actually, in my opinion, true. But nevertheless the way in which to highlight our concern is ideally with some specific examples and specific concerns. And I think if we can be specific then we can anticipate specific answers.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Jonathan. And thanks, everybody, for that input. We're going to table the discussion about our topics with the Board for right now. We will come back to this but I want to now move to welcome our guests from the ATRT2 team so welcome to you all. Thank you for joining us and spending your time with us today.

And so I guess the question is who is taking the lead?

Alan Greenberg: As soon as someone plugs my computer in I will take the lead...

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Excellent, thank you. All right very good so just let us know when you're ready and then we can get started.

Alan Greenberg: Not quite ready but I'll start talking.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Not quite ready but I'll start talking anyway. We published our interim report, our draft report a few weeks ago. And our intention - there is a comment

period open until I think the 11th of December, or somewhere close to that. We acknowledge it is called the reply period; we are quite happy to receive input of any form, new or otherwise, up until the end.

If you feel merciful towards us you'll do it earlier rather than later because we are committed to getting the final report out by the 31st of December. It's going to be interesting.

The report, we believe, has some interesting recommendations in it. What we're looking for today is identification of things you think we forgot, things that we really got wrong and if we recommend this this will do a disservice to the organization or anything in between.

The physical form of the report it was a real struggle to get it out and we are well aware of the fact that the numbering system is confusing, the formatting could be better, we have - the intention is to fix all of those things so we apologize for the form that it took but that will be corrected before the final version comes out so we would like to focus on substance.

We can either quickly review, go through the recommendations one by one or we can simply open it up to any comments or questions. And that's your call which we do.

It's understood that in a lot of cases people haven't had much time to focus on the report. So perhaps going over what the general issues are might be useful but we'll play this whatever way you want.

We're really looking for input. We're looking for either agreement that we're in the right direction or telling us where we're in the wrong direction so that we can issue a final report that will serve the organization well.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much. So I would like to just, first, thank you all for the work that you've been doing on this. It's been - I know it's been an incredible amount of work.

And it's a very important topic. Accountability and transparency are two just key things that are so important to all of us, including as registries and contracted parties, applicants, so thank you for your time and effort on this. And we will certainly commit ourselves to providing substantive comments, you know, as quick manner as possible.

With that it'd like to open it up to the room and ask anybody if they have some feedback, thoughts, questions, anything at all for the ATRT2 team. Thanks. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. First a general question: With regard to the study that was done on the PDP process how is input to their draft report right now going to be handled?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I believe what we have right now is not a draft report but a final report. We're talking about the consultants' report, not ours. If it still says Draft then there's a problem there but I believe it is the final report. We'll look into that if there's a problem on that.

So we certainly will welcome input pointing out that if you think there are errors in fact or things that we should not base recommendations on in that report we certainly welcome that kind of input.

We are using that report. But as you'll see that we're not necessarily, you know, taking everything they say and creating a recommendation out of it. But it has formed part of the input that we are using so if you think that's mistaken, please tell us.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. I should also note - just as a side note - that we do have some draft comments to the ATRT2 that we're going to hopefully discuss later today in a very busy schedule and hopefully get in by the initial comment period the end of this week. So that remains to be seen but we are working on that, that's just information for you.

One of the things noted in the study of the PDP was that - how the three geographic regions are - there are three geographic regions that are not well represented. One question - and, by the way, I think that's a good thing to point out so don't misinterpret what I'm going to say next.

But I guess I wonder whether the group that did the study went a little bit deeper to see how the geographic regions are represented within SOs and ACs and the ALAC and things like that because some of that doesn't show up as directly as what it appeared to be what they looked at.

Now, again, I'm not saying that that's still not an issue. In fact I've even thought of an idea, that I won't bring up now, that - where the GNSO Council could be structured in a way that might help deal with that issue. So I'm actually trying to think constructively.

But I just want to - I don't know - and you probably don't know either, I understand that. But I think that's an issue because it's not just a matter of what you see on the surface in terms of direct participation even within the

Registry Stakeholder Group whereas we don't have a lot of registries from those three regions, in fact none in two of those.

But still we do have participation from some of those regions in other ways, maybe not as much as some others but that is there. So I just want to - I guess that's more of a comment unless you can respond to it.

Alan Greenberg: That was exactly the first issue I raised when I saw the draft report. They did not try to do a study of either the representation of those other regions in the GNSO stakeholder groups or in ICANN in general. And, you know, my gut feeling is there's a linear progression of decreasing participation from those regions from ICANN in general, you know, the people you see at these meetings, to participation in the GNSO, to participation in working groups.

So at each level we lose some people. But we didn't start off with that many to begin within the widest community. So part of what we're seeing is, indeed, simply the community that we're drawing upon but even within that we seem to - we do seem to be losing some participation.

Now Fadi made an announcement yesterday, which was the first we had heard about it, they're opening a center in Korea which will look at addressing language and cultural issues in the policy representation of different languages and cultures in the policy development process and that wasn't a GNSO PDP necessarily, that was just the policy process. So maybe he has some ideas that we don't know about yet for addressing it.

And as you'll see from the draft recommendation we are not saying fix that problem within three years and have equal representation from all regions. What we're suggesting is the problem needs to be looked at and better understood.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. And I know you know this as well as I do, the word "equal" is a dangerous word there. But we'll never achieve that if we really use the definition of equal.

Another comment, in the study of the PDP they noted that - they suggested the idea of mandatory participation by stakeholder groups. And I think that made it into your recommendations too. Was there nothing in there? It didn't. Don't worry about that; we don't need to belabor that.

My point is - or points - you can't force people to participate. You can strongly encourage; you may be able to even come up with some incentives or disincentives for not participating. I was in conversation yesterday where we actually came up with some of those.

But there are examples in the policy development process where broad participation and certainly unequal participation of the groups didn't happen but the results were very effective. And the classic example there, in my opinion, is the IRTP, the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy PDPs that have been going on for a while, several of them.

And very limited participation, it's primarily registrars and a few registry people and a few other interested parties, many of the GNSO groups are not even represented because they don't have a big interest in it, because they're obviously busy like all of us. But in the end they were able to comment and provide input.

So I think we have to be very careful about making things mandatory although I will help create incentives and disincentives maybe for not being active when it's really essential. And certainly we have an example right now with

the IGO INGO thing where that has happened and it has been a real problem here at the last minute because of lack of participation. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Avri first and then I have a comment.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I wanted to come back to two of the things that you had pointed out before. First of all the final report from ICC is actually what's attached as an appendix to the report that we put out for review so I just wanted to make that point.

And within that report, I think it's 5142, they actually have a graph of working group participation by region. So while it's true, and it's probably worth doing to check the - and bringing that back to see if they actually - they have a lot of statistics that they actually haven't brought forward so we could certainly ask them to go a little further.

But what they did do was look for geographic representation in working groups and given the degree to which all GNSO PDP working groups are open to all that that was considered a fairly decent measure of the participation across regions whether they were in GAC - well, we haven't had much participation in GAC - that's another issue that's in there elsewhere.

But certainly we have had from At Large groups and such. So while it's not in there explicitly as in which groups are in ICANN there was an explicit measurement of - for working groups what regions did they come from.

Chuck Gomes: Since Avri mentioned GAC - this is Chuck again - I just read the missing language or the added language recommendations with regard to GAC participation this morning, early. And, you know, I suspect the GAC may not be totally thrilled with all of them but I thought there were some pretty solid

recommendations, helpful recommendations that we can explore further and maybe refine them to work with the GAC in that so thanks for that.

Alan Greenberg: Just one follow-on comment. I don't think any of us are trying to have enforced slavery and forced participation. And as you point out there certainly have been working groups where there has been poor participation from some groups and things worked out just fine.

I think the situation that we need to try to build around is the situation where people don't participate and then vociferously disagree with the outcome.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan, Avri and Chuck. Any other questions, comments, feedback from the room?

Paul Diaz: Yeah, it's Paul Diaz. I'm in a kind of awkward position so I assist Brian in his role as Chair of ATRT. I think you all know that. And I'm privy to some of the conversations that have been had and whatnot. So I won't color this too much.

But I know an interest - a topic of interest, actually concern, for stakeholder group was the reconsideration request topic and in particular changes that were made last year the way the process went through. Becky, I guess in Durban, had raised that with ATRT2. We had provided comments, etcetera.

I know in the report that there is a specific recommendation about that process. And I was just hoping, Alan, you might give us a little - give the rest of the people a little flavor of the level of support we've already heard from the Board in pursuing that and potentially what it may require of us as a stakeholder group to help participate in moving that forward.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. The issue is a hot topic. There is general acknowledgment among virtually all parties that what we have now does not seem to be either what we thought it was or does not seem to work. And you can have different interpretations of that.

Clearly there's an expectation that we have something which does not seem to be doing what the people who are using it were expecting. Whether that means we need to fix the rules of reconsideration, come up with a new policy that is a mechanism to address the things reconsideration doesn't address is not clear.

There is a significant fear among some people and certainly some Board members, that if we're not careful we end up with a process for anyone who doesn't get what they want to appeal to the Board to change it. And none of us, I think, want that.

We have a recommendation there right now based on discussions yesterday with the Board. I would not be surprised if it gets changed, enhanced, modified, clarified, something. And part of that recommendation, in fact, calls for a community working group of some sort to help formulate what this new policy is. It's not likely to come in place in the next two months.

But there is a general acknowledgment that something is broken right now either in fact or in expectation and that really needs to be fixed. It's not an acceptable situation as it stands now. So I think that's our position and I hope what will come out of it. Again, comments as to what we have there now, how you think it should be changed in the final report would be exceedingly welcome.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Alan. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. Just to add a few points to it. So the recommendation is currently 9.2 and it's part of a whole set of recommendations on the whole appeals process and all of those issues. And it calls for, as Alan said, a special community committee. And there was an expert group report that pretty much - well it was the report but nothing changed.

There's - there was also very good recognition, I'll sort of reinforce what Alan said, from the Board that the reconsideration process does need reconsideration and very strong willingness. I think they feel sometimes limited by the rules they've got that says this is the basis on which you can make a decision and they worry, you know, as many people do, about going beyond the scope of what they got.

So there was a very strong indication on their part of interest in seeing that done and such. I also wanted - I had one comment to Paul having been privy, because everything we do is recorded and open, you're all as privy as he was if you wanted to spend as much time as he's had.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. There was one thing that was explicitly brought up yesterday. It's clear reconsideration has to do with acts of ICANN, which is the Board or staff. There is obviously a very strong question in the current phase - the current, you know, set of reconsideration requests of does - can reconsideration address actions by bodies to whom ICANN has given responsibility? In this case the confusingly similar evaluators.

And it would appear that it's not 100% clear whether the answer is yes or no to that. I suspect I know what the answer would be of what should it be and you may want to have some input on that particular question.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much, Alan and Avri. All right, any other questions, comments, feedback for ATRT2 team? Okay I don't see any other questions or comments from the room. So, Alan, is there anything else that you would like to bring to our attention?

Alan Greenberg: Well I'd ask if there are any other ATRT2 members here who want to raise issues of their own they certainly can. But barring that I'm sure all of us will have...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Oh maybe our chair has some comments to make.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: He can put on either of his hats.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Alan. So we'll give Brian a moment to get settled to see if he has any comments for us. But in the meantime...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I did want to point out that the final date is the 13th of December and that so - please don't wait until that date. And also if those recommendations that you all have yet to talk about as Registry recommendations you want to sort of let us know sooner that those are just an individual's recommendations, issues that we should consider, we're hungry for comment. So even if it doesn't have the full blessing yet of the stakeholder group hearing about them anybody submitting any comment is good.

But the 13th is really a very hard drop-dead date on comments because we figure that with our required delivery of the 31st of December our drop-dead rate is pretty close to the 20th of December for finishing our final draft.

So we're allowing ourselves essentially a week after that date to process and we're not doing the differentiation, is it a reply, is it a comment; it's a comment. So please. But after that date we can point people to there were other comments but they're not likely to be able to be included.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Avri. Any other feedback, questions, comments? Brian, would you like to say anything? We had a great engagement here. I think we're getting pretty close to wrapping up.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Yeah. All right.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Great. All right, thanks very much. Okay going once, going twice, going three times. All right thanks very much to the ATRT2 team. We really appreciate your time on this and time with us today so thanks. And we will be sure to get our comments in on time.

Alan Greenberg: And thank you for giving us some free time.

Keith Drazek: Okay for the - okay so for the Registry Stakeholder Group and NTAG folks in the room we're going - we have basically just a little over 15 minutes before our scheduled break so we're going to use this 15 minutes that we just picked up to go back to the discussion of the Board topics.

And I know that Jordyn had wanted to jump in as we were discussing that last topic and I apologize for skipping you. But we're going to go back to the discussion of the topics with the Board.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah, I actually don't have a lot to add. I just think we should focus our time with the Board on topics that are specifically germane to the business of the Registry Stakeholder Group as opposed to general concepts of Internet governance.

There's other forums whereas participants in the process we can have our say on the general process and the meta issues so we should really try to focus our time on what are the Registry Stakeholder Group issues as opposed to just echoing the same thing they're going to hear over and over again in other sessions.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Jordyn. I think that makes a lot of sense. The other thing I'd like to note is that for our session with the Board I have asked Sarah, as the acting Chair of the NTAG, to join Paul and me and our councilors at the table - at the head table.

And I want to strongly encourage members of NTAG to use this opportunity to raise questions or comments and to engage in the discussion with the Board. You know, this is your opportunity as much as it is ours so let's, you know, feel free to jump in now if there's things that you think we ought to prioritize or, you know, talk a little bit more about.

So let's - so we're going back to the topics that we have. I know that Chuck, you - sorry, actually I have a question about the auctions, Number 4, under this. Is there anybody who's going to be leading that particular discussion?

Is there - if - I'm sort of curious what the issue is and what the issue would be that we would need to raise with the Board. So if anybody was planning on taking the lead on that one let's talk about it now.

So, Jordyn then Jonathan.

Jordyn Buchanan: There we go. So Brian Beckham has been leading the NTAG work on auctions. I don't - Brian's not here, right? I could - we could try to reach out to him and see - make sure that he could be available if we were going to run that topic. I think it would be helpful.

I don't know - there's a number of outstanding questions and I think there's - but I know that the staff is plugging away at the issues so I don't know what the sort of scope of dialogue is. So I guess we should probably reach out to Brian briefly offline maybe and also see if there's other folks in the room who have specific things they'd like to engage the Board on.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Jordyn. Jon, go ahead.

Jon Nevett: Having attended the auction meeting yesterday there wasn't that much being discussed as, you know, there was a lot of controversies or issues being raised so - especially at the Board level. I think it's certainly still at the staff level.

So I would perhaps suggest replacing that with, you know, the issues that were brought up the GAC meeting over the weekend, Category 1 and Category 2 perhaps issues that are still outstanding and may be debated at the Board level as opposed to auctions which aren't ripe yet.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Jon. Jonathan, did you want to engage?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Keith. I supposed it's linked into yours, Jordyn's, and the other points. I think for me I would like us to try and get down to, ideally, three topics. Ideally have broad-based contribution so it shows that this isn't - these are representative concerns.

I hear what Jon's saying. And maybe - I mean, auction specifically isn't a Board-related point; maybe it goes back to examples of trusting the process, predictability, you know, things that a business can work with to rely on ICANN to produce things.

One of the things that did strike me, I mean, just specifically on auctions and related to this point was when Christine Willett talked to the Council, for example, she said we are aiming - I didn't unfortunately come to the main auction session yesterday but she talked about aiming for an early March start. We have a target for an early March start.

I just don't think we - I think we want to explain to the Board perhaps that as one point in this predictability issue the things like targets - we've kind of lost faith in things like targets. We need to know that it's not just the target. It is their intention barring, you know, significantly unforeseen circumstances to hit the date.

Now I know they've been burned by targets. And I have some sympathy with that. But the reality is we need to plan go-to-market strategies and preparation work that rely on specific dates insofar as it is possible to hit them.

And we, with our customers, will commit today - so on the back of those. So I think that's really - I think - I fully understand that we need to get above the point of raising something like auctions which they'll just say well that's up to

staff, it's not really a Board issue. It's - the Board in its supervisory role can focus on things like what we've been talking about.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Yeah, thanks Jonathan. I had Jon Nevett in the queue and then Ching.

Jon Nevett: Thanks. Jonathan, just in reply to that, one thing they did mention yesterday for the first time that I heard that there was going to be an auction agreement as part of the auction process. And we haven't seen that agreement yet. So I'm a little reticent to argue that we should have a fixed date.

You know, having the history that we've had with the RPM document and the RA agreement that we negotiated over some time I don't want to have our words used against us for - I don't want to say use the term railroading but, you know, we don't want them to push through an agreement that we haven't fully recognized, seen, negotiated because we've asked for a firm date, you know, during the process.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Jon. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Keith. I actually just want to follow up what Jonathan has just mentioned. And actually I - we have already talked about maybe one year ago about how the Board is kind of putting together a strategy for auction proceeds. I think we haven't really heard back from them seeing, I mean, previous, you know, many meetings ago that they talk about this. We haven't really hear a kind of a plan whether the proceed would be using for outreach.

Maybe it's good that one - I know the (few) topics that we can have, I mean, just to tag on this particular, I mean, issues.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Ching. I think that's a great suggestion actually. I think, you know, sort of a timely suggestion now that they're approaching. And certainly if there's going to be a community input process into the disposition of auction funds, as has been stated for, you know, from the beginning, I think it's appropriate those conversations start now. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. I'm looking at Agenda Item 5. And first of all I think there's an error in it. The Expert Working Group is working on directory services, not accountability so I don't think - I think we probably mean ATRT2.

And considering what was just discussed with the representatives of the ATRT2 team and if you look at their recommendations they have some really good recommendations with regard to reconsideration process. So I'm not sure - I mean, it'd be nice to hear what the Board thinks about that but - if we want to thin out the agenda that might be a place. But if we do leave it there let's correct the reference to Expert Working Group.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Chuck. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, sorry - jumping - I think Chuck's point is good. Just jumping back to some of the other points that were raised and by Jon trying to think of the way to kind of group this all together and it's sort of similar to what Jonathan said, we need finality with discussions with the GAC.

You know, the longer it goes on the more and more groups that lobby the GAC for whatever interest whether it's in this region of the world or whether it's wherever, I mean, the more and more it drags on the more people feel empowered, more letters that ICANN gets on doing all sorts of things.

So I think this is the meeting. Just so you all know when the Council met with the Board I had asked Chris Disspain, in the Council Board session, I said, so what's going on with Category 1 and Category 2? When are you going to resolve that? And the answer I got was, barring consensus advice from the GAC at this meeting the NGPC considers it work on Category 1 and 2 done.

I like that answer. I want to make sure - but that was before they met with the GAC and the GAC said, well, no now we want financial and doctor and dentist, and, you know, a couple others added back in. And so I think the overall point is with Jonathan, predictability, reliability, certainty and finality.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Jeff. I think that's well said. So if I could just recap where we are I think now, adjusting the topics to the questions about Internet governance and the plans for ICANN and the community to engage, to contribute, take our leadership role back, if you will, GAC advice, IGO INGO, which we can talk about a little bit more, and auctions. Did I miss anything? Was there something that I skipped?

I mean, I know we have a line item there about multi-stakeholder model and top down management. You know, we could talk about that but I'm not sure that that's necessarily something for the Board right now with the importance of some of the other items. But I want others' views on that. Statton.

Statton Hammock: Statton Hammock, United TLD. I thought we were asking what the issues were around auctions and whether that needed to actually be on there - a topic. I didn't hear what the issues were around auctions.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Statton. It was - Ching had recommended that we actually ask the question about auction proceeds and the process for - so, yeah, but thanks for the clarification. Jordyn, go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: So I'm just going to opine to this actually not particularly useful to raise that question. I mean, it gets raised basically every ICANN meeting and they have a response all ready which is they're going to spend it in ways consistent with their mission as a nonprofit. I don't think they're prepared to answer that question.

I don't think we're going to get anything - I mean, so if we want - if we have suggestions about how we want them to proceed and planning for it I guess that's a separate topic. But I think if we just say, you know, you guys should think about it, they're going to say, yeah of course we're going to.

Keith Drazek: So thanks, Jordyn. Yeah, I think the point is that there's an expectation that ICANN will end up spending the money based on, you know, something that fits within its mission or its mandate but that there's a process for the community to provide input into making that determination.

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: And they committed to that a long time ago. And with this latest statement, which sounds good and noble, if that's a way to get around that community process that's wrong. There needs to be a community process to decide how the - what those things are.

Keith Drazek: Yeah. Thanks, Chuck. Okay Jon Nevett then Jonathan.

Jon Nevett: So that's perhaps the request is to kick off the community process to get the ball rolling. If we're looking at auctions in March it's going to take some time and the next ICANN meeting isn't until March so, you know, if we kick off

the process here we could do some intercessional work and maybe even make some decisions by the March Singapore meeting.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm just trying to think, a bit, Keith and perhaps try and help you and us how we pull this together. I mean, it seems to me like there's two or three thematic topics that we've got. And then things like this point on the auctions, I'm not sure there's a whole lot of discussion to be had. There might be a handful of points that aren't really discussion points but say in discussing our interaction with the Board these handful of topics came up.

We would like to understand and we don't expect that we can necessarily understand it now your plans to deal with the auction proceeds and kicking off a process. But it may not be that there's any scope for discussion so it's slightly different to, you know, the more thematic points like predictability and reliability of working with them on the final steps to new gTLDs.

Keith Drazek: Yeah, good point, Jonathan. Jordyn.

Jordyn Buchanan: Yeah, so to that point just very briefly maybe there's two or three concepts here that we just want to write up as brief statements that we want to make to them as opposed to sort of whole - setting up as whole topics for discussion just to keep the agenda of interactive points a little bit more crisp.

Keith Drazek: So thanks. Yeah, so I guess it's a question of, you know, how do we, you know, in the next hour or so, you know, sort of identify what the themes or the topics are, the general topics. But I think having bullet points that are a little bit more detailed actually help, you know, sort of keep us on topic or on, you know, focused discussion.

You know, I'm certainly happy to take whatever input folks have. But it's important that I think we send the Board our updated list of two or three whether it's themes or specific topics, you know, sooner rather than later certainly before the session at 1:00.

Any other thoughts or feedback with regard to our session with the Board? We've got five minutes before we break. Why don't we break now then so all right. So let's be back in 15 minutes so 5 minutes to 11:00. Thanks.

Cherie Stubbs: We can stop the recording until we resume. Thank you.

END