

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine  
July 31, 2015  
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started. Speakers, you may begin.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, (Anna). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the first meeting of our (unintelligible) and Security Framework Drafting Team. My name is Fabien Betremieux. I'm a Senior Registry Services and Engagement Manager with the Global Domains Division of ICANN.

Before we get started and jump into our agenda and discussion today I'd like to give just a reminder to please mute your lines if you're not speaking. Please note that this meeting is recorded and will be transcribed. For the purpose of the transcript please state your name when you speak.

And finally if any time during this meeting you'd like to get into the queue to speak you can use the - you can do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect room.

I will now give the floor to David Conrad, our CTO, who'd like to say a few words.

David Conrad: Hi, Fabien. Hello, everyone. Thank you for joining this call. Hopefully this time is not too inconvenient for most of the folks here in California, right now it's 6:00 am. Looking forward to working on this framework with everyone here. I know there have been efforts in the past to establish something related to this. I saw, I guess, back in 2010 there was the Registration Abuse Policy Working Group that developed a number - wow, that was interesting - a number of recommendations very similar to what we are attempting to do here.

And I very much appreciate all the efforts that people will put forward in trying to develop this framework collaboratively and cooperatively among the different interest groups that are focused on this particular area.

I want to keep these remarks brief so at this point I will hand it back to Fabien to provide a bit of background and talk about the objectives and principles of this drafting team. And again, I do look forward to working with everyone and hopefully we'll be able to come out with a framework that - while it won't meet everyone's needs I'm sure, we'll be able to improve the situation regarding the registrations of domain names on the Internet moving forward. Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you very much, David. So as a way of background I just want to give you just a little bit - and especially for those that may be joining the discussion with this group. In its Beijing communiqué in April 2013 the GAC included security measures of one of the GAC safeguards for new gTLDs.

And in response the New gTLD Program Committee put forward a proposal for implementing the GAC advice. On the one hand it included a provision in the Registry Agreement, Section 3b of the Public Interest Commitments

Specification, or Spec 11. And on the other hand it called for the development with community participation of a framework for registry operators to respond to security threats.

And in order to implement these things this NGPC resolution we conducted a consultation with - which involved a group of registries and GAC representatives in the end of last year. We concluded this preliminary consultation at our last ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires where registries requested that the drafting of the framework be driven by the community and registries in particular.

So this is why we sent a call for volunteers to which you have responded and in order to form this draft - framework drafting team which you are now a member of. And we thank you for that.

So that's for the background. In terms of objectives, as David mentioned ultimately the objective of the framework is to contribute to reducing the impact of security threats with new gTLDs and these - through self regulation.

In terms of the scope of the framework let me load our proposal. Sorry, just one moment. I will load the - our draft charter proposal which includes the specific language of the NGPC proposal so it is here. So it is here in the second paragraph of Section 2.

The scope of the NGPC proposal is the following, that registries - so a framework for registry operators to respond to identified security risks that pose an actual risk of harm, verification procedure and appropriate consequences including the process for suspending domain names until the matter is resolved while respecting privacy and confidentiality.

So the framework should obviously cover the scope. In developing this framework the objective of the drafting team would be to produce the substance of such framework grounded in (unintelligible) experience, accepted best practices and consultation with relevant communities. And that's what we had stated in the call for volunteers.

And finally, in terms of objectives, we are hoping that the drafting team include or as a principle that the drafting team include the element into the framework that can be mutually acceptable among the various segment of the community represented in these drafting team.

In terms of principles, the deliberation of the drafting team will be public to the extent that the recordings, transcript and a link to the mailing list archives will be made available on a community wiki workspace.

As we mentioned in our call for volunteers the draft framework will be submitted for public comment before it is finalized. And going forward the framework is intended to become an evolutionary document that will be reviewed and revised as needed.

So I am done with the introduction of the background objectives and the principles. Before we move on to the agenda are there any questions or comments at this stage? And hearing none and I'm not seeing any hands raised so I will move on with our agenda. We are now reaching - (unintelligible) Number 2 of our agenda which is a summary of the participation in the drafting team will suggest to give you a few elements here.

As of yesterday we have 38 volunteers in the drafting team, 25 registries, 25 representatives from registries, 5 representatives from registrars and 8 representatives from either the GAC and/or its Public Safety Working Group.

In terms of geographic representation, we have 15 members from North America, 2 from Latin America and the Caribbean, 12 from the European (unintelligible) Africa region and 8 from the Asia Pacific region.

So let's now move on to Point 3 of our agenda which is the working method that I'll propose for this drafting team. So I'm scrolling down to the relevant section in our draft charter proposal. And, again, please raise your hand if you'd like to come in and ask any question as I proceed through our proposal.

In terms of deliverables and timeline, as you may recall from the call for volunteers, here is the timeline we're targeting, the schedule and the deliverables we're targeting.

So we would basically proceed in four main steps, the first one would be to have an initial draft framework to be shared with the relevant communities for their consultation and (unintelligible) this would be by the beginning of September.

The second step would be that we would have a revised draft to be discussed during ICANN 54 in Dublin. We would then propose for public comment a final draft framework by November and eventually this would be after the public comments are considered and input - considered into the framework, the first edition of the framework by early next year.

I saw a hand raised by Richard, I believe. Did you want to ask a question or make a comment, Richard?

Richard Roberto: No, I just dialed in to the software and I don't know how to use it, apologies.

Fabien Betremieux: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Richard. So this was for our targeted deliverables and timeline. In terms of the drafting team leadership, we would like to suggest that the - that each community segment is represented in this drafting team elect a co-chair and then the co-chair will decide how - determine how they would like to conduct and lead the efforts.

Ideally those co-chairs would be elected by our next meeting. And in terms of nomination so far we have received a nomination for a possible GAC co-chair and that is for John Flaherty and who would be assisted with Ezekiel Salas.

And we have also received a nomination for (Al Bolivar) as a co-chair for registries. We haven't received proposed nominations for the registrars. So let me stop here. If anybody would like to share a nomination or self nomination? I'm not seeing any hands raised. I see there may be - in the chat so, yes, Elaine, I will repeat the nominations so far.

For the GAC co-chair - the GAC community segment co-chair John Flaherty was nominated assisted with Ezekiel Salas. For the registries we received a self-nomination for (Al Bolivar) from VeriSign. Those are the nominations we received so far.

So what we suggest is that each community segment determines before our next meeting who will be their co-chair. You should have received in the material sent with this invitation the list of each of your membership, participants in the drafting team. So please proceed to this election of your co-chair and let us know if you need any assistance with this.

As far as the ICANN staff is concerned in terms of the role for - in this drafting effort, we - as we indicated before, would be generally available to support this work as appropriate and upon request by the leadership of this

drafting team. There will be a staff dedicated to support the leadership of the drafting team in any of their needs related to the running of this meeting.

And finally, unless the drafting team decides otherwise, ICANN will be providing technical capability to assist with the drafting of the framework document.

In terms of decision making we suggest that the deliberations are conducted in the spirit of mutual agreement. And we have suggested in our draft proposal - our draft charter proposal a few principles that we will let you consider.

I see a hand raised from (Min Jao). Do you want to go ahead? Okay that might have been a mistake. Please raise your hand again if you would like to comment or ask a question.

So in terms of - in terms of meetings, I see - so before I proceed I see a - that (Ditmar) has raised his hand. (Ditmar), you want to go ahead? Oh okay so might have been as part of the process of (Ditmar) joining the call. Okay. Sorry for the interruption.

So I was going to discuss the principles of the meetings this drafting team. We expect the meetings to occur once a week via teleconference like today. As mentioned the transcribing and recording. We have this challenge of organizing a meeting of a very wide spectrum of time zones and it's certainly a challenge.

We currently have proposed this time but we are hearing that it is quite challenging in particular for participants on the West Coast of the US. So going forward if the drafting team wishes we can certainly organize a rotating

scheme where, you know, the unreasonable hours would be on different regions of the world.

At this stage I would like to suggest that we possibly consider shifting the time zone of an hour if that's possible. And I'd be interested to hear what are participants from Japan or Australia in particular, think of this idea because it would certainly make for a very - an even later meeting for them. So if you would like to - if you are on the call participants from Asia, particularly Japan or Australia we'd be interested to hear what you think about a proposal to shift this default timing we're using right now by an hour. So just give you a few seconds.

So we have a proposal to shift by two hours in the chat. I see that (unintelligible) and (Yasmin) are typing so I will wait for their answers. So we were suggesting one hour later. I would just - so we, okay so we will take into account your comments. I see that (Yasmin) would prefer not to shift this meeting. And we will discuss this again in our - when we come to organize our next meeting.

So in terms of mailing lists and community wiki workspace, I've mentioned this, so we've - repurposed the mailing list that existed already that you are now subscribers to and we will be using a specific community wiki workspace.

This is - this completes my addressing of Point 3 of our agenda which is the working methods of the drafting team. Does anybody have any general comments or question about this? David, do you want to go ahead?

David Conrad: Yeah, sorry, took myself off mute. Yeah, one thing that we want to make clear here is that this is a draft - a proposed set of principles. You know, our goal



here is to facilitate the community to develop this framework as was requested by the various - and we will do, you know, staff will do what we can to do that.

So if you have specific changes or interests in modifying any of this draft charter and objectives and principles please let us know and we will do what we can to accommodate.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, David. So we will - unless anybody else would like to ask a question or make a comment I will - we will move on down our agenda. So the next step - next item on our agenda is a discussion of the framework.

So we have in the same spirit as David just mentioned, we've prepared a draft outline as a conversation starter for the drafting team to consider. We shared this with the meeting in - I will load the document in a minute. This is - the document begins - is only meant to be a discussion starter.

We have proposed a very general structure to the framework so I'm going to quickly go through to give you an overview of this draft outline. Obviously the document would contain a section on providing an introduction in the background of these efforts, addressing objectives and principle of the framework. We've added here some proposals for consideration including some suggestion we've received during our preliminary consultation.

And in particular suggestions in terms of principles for this framework. The framework would also contain possibly a threat (unintelligible) assumption and risk model, that's our proposed Section Number 3 here. We've also received input in the preliminary consultation on this.

The framework would ideally also contain (lettering) and detection models. And, again, here are some suggestions of definitions to address and input that is received in the preliminary consultation and then just going to go through in detail.

We've mentioned - so Section 4, sorry, didn't mean - backtrack, the (lettering) and detection model. Section 5 would be a reporting model. And finally an (motivation) model, obviously. And to close this proposed draft outline we've also included a suggestion to consider adding elements about consultation that will be conducted with the relevant communities. And finally we've listed here some of the material that the drafting team may want to consider in drafting this framework.

This completes my overview of the framework. And I believe we now have a little less than half an hour to discuss whatever we would like to discuss in terms of developing this framework for registry operators response (unintelligible).

So I will stop now and open the floor for any questions or comments. Maxim, would you like to go ahead please?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually it's a request to add an item to our list. All these activities would require registries to spend additional funding. There's programmer's they want salary, registries will have to use services of security companies which they don't offer for free. So these will incur in rise of prices for the customers and on the current construct registries have to go through the public comment period to rise prices. So the request is to let these changes to the prices caused by Spec 11 changes to pass without public comment space so we can start (unintelligible) for example. Thanks.

Fabien Betremieux: Maxim, this is Fabien speaking. I just want to clarify one element, this framework we are considering would be a best practice framework that's not intended to produce binding requirements. So I'm not sure I understand your comment on this context. Would you mind clarifying? Go ahead, please.

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, Spec 11 is an addendum to registry agreement, yes? And thus it can describe changes of other parts of the same registry agreement. That's why I asked to provide clause (unintelligible) saying that price changes of domains caused by security - additional security costs could pass without public comment space required for all other price changes. Because we are talking about security addendum Spec 11 which is a part of the contract. We shouldn't forget about it. Thanks.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, Maxim. We'll look into your request. Alan, would you like to go ahead?

Alan Woods: Sure. It's Alan Woods from Rightside Registry. Just one thing reading through the proposal - the draft outline for discussion just especially in Number 2 and I suppose the last bullet point - and Point 2 there on that draft, so I think it's Page 3 if you want to - it's just where it says, "Recognition that registries capabilities are limited."

I think it might be helpful, because I didn't notice a huge emphasis on how we can be limited - I suppose legally as well, I mean, we are talking about getting into the nitty gritty of dealing with abuse and matters of abuse but we're not actually looking at the point that by doing this we are opening much more I suppose liability to registries. So I definitely think that that needs to be a core consideration going through the best practices as well and a little bit more emphasis in this document. Just again, liability of registries is another limiting factor in this that needs to be considered.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you very much, Alan. And I do remember these comments you made during our preliminary consultation. Thank you.

Alan Woods: Thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: And, Krista, I see you joining the queue.

Krista Papac: Yeah, thanks, Fabien. It's Krista. I was just going to respond to Maxim's comments about Spec 11. And - Krista Papac, ICANN staff by the way. I think you already said it, I was just going to sort of reinforce your comments about Spec 11 that this framework is not a modification to Spec 11. Spec 11 is a part of the contract, not an addendum but an actual specification to the registry agreement.

And that this framework is, as Fabien said, a best practices framework that we would hope, you know, registries would adopt and utilize and, you know, we're getting lots of positive comments and participation from folks like yourselves on this call. But this framework does not amend the registry agreement and impact Specification 11.

And then the second piece I think, Maxim, you made a comment about putting pricing changes out for public comment which is not something that is with new gTLD registries, at least, something that's typical. So I just wanted to clarify those two points. Thanks.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you. Maxim, do you want to go ahead?

Maxim Alzoba: Oh short question to Krista. Am I understand this right that we're creating the framework which is just something like the best practice set of documents

which might be used by registries? And is not going to be (unintelligible) by ICANN audit? Am I get it right? Do I get it right? Thanks.

Krista Papac: Yes, it is a best practices framework. In order for this to become something that's contractually binding something else would have to occur. So that's correct, it's a best practices document, not a part of the registry agreement.

Maxim Alzoba: Thanks.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, Maxim and Krista. Would anybody else like to comment? Elaine, you want to go ahead, please?

Elaine Pruis: Yes, so I thought I saw somewhere in one of these documents that the framework we developed could be a starting place for a policy development process which does have greater implications that maybe we want to adhere to it or not. So just want to keep that in mind as we work on this. And also thank you for sending these documents ahead of time, it was really helpful to prepare.

Fabien Betremieux: I'm sorry, Elaine, I couldn't catch the end of what you said. Can you just please repeat?

Elaine Pruis: Sure. I just say thank you for sending these documents ahead of time, it was very helpful to be able to prepare for this especially early start for us.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you. And to your comment, Elaine, regarding the fact that the output of this work could be a potential element to consider later in the policy development process, this is, again, a proposal as part of the drafting of the charter so if anybody would like to make amendments to that I think this should probably be discussed. Thank you.

I saw that Richard raised - you raised your hand, was that a real hand or a mistake hand? Okay sorry, my bad. So please, (John), you want to go ahead?

(John): Yeah, thanks. It's just to make comment on the cost. It's definitely a concern and I think the liability is as well. Something in the UK that we've been meticulous on in terms of the law enforcement drive in the UK to do mitigation at scale with ISPs in particular. So in terms of outsourcing security or costs we're looking at best practice. And I might be able to bring some of this to the table in terms of a GAC consultation for free feeds from industry and maybe ways to automate and mitigate.

So we've got some ideas that are going for implementation in the UK to try to make it mutually beneficial for all parties to participate in security. So there might be dependent on the distribution pages that you've got. I can maybe upload some of the UK consultation with industry today and maybe you want to - you might want to mirror that as some best practice for this group.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, (John). And I think to your point about, you know, considering existing material and work that have been completed in various arenas and from various perspective I think your concern may be helpful I believe to the building of the framework.

For instance ,we mention in our draft outline that one source of - body of knowledge was registry abuse policies. So this is an element as well that the registries may want to share and consider as existing practices that may be worth incorporating into the framework.

Are there any other comments? David, you want to go ahead please?

David Conrad: Yeah, I just wanted to reemphasize what you just said. You know, given the timeframes that we're looking at for the development of this framework one of our assumptions has been we'll be able to rely on bodies of existing work that have been developed by registries, anti-abuse folks, law enforcement, all of the various players in the space.

One of the desires obviously would then be to be able to collect that information and be able to aggregate it in some way in order to identify the - sort of the common best practices around this space. So one of the perhaps homework items that might be applicable here would be to identify various external documents or best practice statements that people are aware of and share them among the group.

Fabien Betremieux: I see that there's been a few comments in the chat. To (unintelligible) comment suggesting that we - this collateral damage is a response to threat as a useful thing to do I just want to mention that I think this was discussed in the Registry Abuse Policy Working Group's final report which we've used in our draft outline so there are certainly substance to be - to serve as inspiration there as well.

Richard, would you like to ask your - to discuss your question?

Richard Roberto: Yeah, hi Richard (unintelligible) from Google. Yeah, I just - I'm hearing the conversation - and maybe I'm filtering it the wrong way but it sounds like there's a deadline that's a little bit aggressive and we're talking about developing best practices. And I wonder if we're not letting expediency become what we're developing rather than best practices. I think expedient practices are almost never going to be the best. So I just wonder why we're on such an aggressive timeline if what we're looking for is long-term guidance on something that's very crucial to Internet security.

David Conrad: This is David Conrad, ICANN. So one of the issues here is that the development of the registry abuse practices that occur - or policies that occurred in the past did set up a set of recommendations that - and that was back in I believe 2010. There has been ongoing work since then, the development of the RAA and the RA and, you know, obviously the Spec 11 stuff.

While the timeframes may appear aggressive we actually think that, you know, in consultation with others, that they're a reasonable estimate for when we should be able to get a reasonable set of best practices out as a sort of a first draft. As Fabien mentioned, we actually expect this to be an evolutionary process with, you know, additional modifications to those best practices over time as we learn more.

So it doesn't seem to me that it would be inappropriate to have that initial best practice set of practices done within the timeframe that we've specified with the understanding that things will evolve over time.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, David. Before I go down the queue would you like to respond, Richard?

Richard Roberto: No, I don't think I need to respond to that. I just want to make sure that expediency does not wind up trumping the long term objective that has a big impact on people. So it sounds like you don't believe that it does and I'll make sure that you I keep that in the forefront. (Unintelligible) thanks.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, Richard. Elaine, would you like to go ahead?



Elaine Prais: Yes. So is this the time to talk about the content of the - this document that I think you're suggesting is where we start or what we work from or do we do that on the mailing list?

Fabien Betremieux: No, no we could -I think we should use the time we have so it's easier, absolutely go ahead.

Elaine Prais: Okay so I just have a couple of notes and this is more for background information. So in Number 6, the mitigation model, is language here about suspension processes as per GAC advice and holistic measures. And I'm not really sure where that's coming from, if you could give me some background on that or what the ideas there are be helpful.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, Elaine. So I think to the suspension process as per GAC advice, this refers to the actual GAC - the actual security check element in the GAC safeguards which - where the GAC advice is that there should be suspension processes implemented, you know, when dealing with security threats. So this is that the reference is, I believe.

In terms of holistic measures I'm hoping that we could have somebody from ICANN staff to jump in here. But I believe the idea was to look beyond suspension as measure to deal with potential security threats. And I will yield the floor to potential ICANN staff to contribute here (unintelligible).

Elaine Prais: Thanks. So the first part, the suspension processes per GAC advice, that's not new, that's just referencing whatever is in Spec 11 right now? They didn't issue some other advice or some contribution to this framework already?

Fabien Betremieux: I believe that's accurate, that's true.

Elaine Pruis: Okay, yeah, and if anybody has anything on that second bullet point there I'd appreciate some background.

Fabien Betremieux: Elaine, if not during the call in the case we will get back to you on this point and then follow it. Is that okay with you, Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Yes, that's totally fine, thank you.

Fabien Betremieux: Thanks. (Kath), would you please like to go ahead?

(Kath): Hi (unintelligible) make a suggestion. It seems that Section 6 regarding mitigation model is likely to be the most controversial and going back to the kind of timescales where, you know, they're fairly aggressive. So I wonder if we should debate taking out Section 6 because as Maxim pointed out, you know, the different legislation across countries is going to be very difficult to pull in particularly when we're not covering all the countries. So maybe we take that one out for a further review. Thanks.

Fabien Betremieux: Maxim, would you like to comment on this?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think we could use more neutral language saying that registry operator should at least try to establish a contact with the law enforcement agency in charge of this kind of cyber security or something in their own jurisdiction and that's it because you can't go beyond. We have few hundred - something like 200, okay, 100 countries with registries in, I'm new talking about new gTLDs.

So we cannot describe it because in one country it's branch of police, in other country it's branch of some security agency, especially devoted to that. We cannot be precise here because too many different models. Thanks. But we

should mention that registry operators should at least try to establish contact to be able to report findings, etcetera, etcetera. It doesn't hurt and it's not obligatory but it looks (unintelligible) I think.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, Maxim. And I see that (Megan Richard) is contributing in the - contributed in the chat saying that let's keep Part 6 in so if there is difficulty in reaching the time periods proposed at a later date. I think in our - in our approach to this draft outline, which again was only a suggestion to start the conversation, the mitigation model was fairly central to the purpose of the framework.

It recognized the complexities of the variety of jurisdictions that are involved in the abuse and security threat issue. But we - we think that there is relevant discussion to be had here in this area with respect to mechanisms and instruments that are available in registries and registrars hands to deal with those security threats and that may not necessarily involve instruments that are tightly linked to local jurisdictions.

(Kath), is your hand raised again or is this an old hand?

(Kath): No, it's an old hand. But I'm happy with (Megan)'s proposal that, you know, we see how it goes.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you very much, (Kath). We have 10 minutes left for our first meeting. We - we'd like us to take a few minutes and discuss the planning of our next meeting. But before we do that we still have a little bit of time if anybody would like to suggest or any approaches or discuss any parts of these draft outline proposal or anything else. Please go ahead. I see that there is some activity in the chat.

So Maxim is suggesting that we conduct a Doodle poll for a different timeframe plus two hours, I understand, which would make it very late in the Asia-Pacific time zone. I will wait until Rubens comments - to understand whether it's related to the scheduling of our meeting or to the substance of our framework.

So I'm reading your comment, Rubens. Although these policies are not mandated by contract to be published almost 100% of them are so the drafting team can look at them whether registries volunteer for the group or not. Thank you for your suggestion, Rubens.

Are there any other comments, suggestions, questions on the substance of the framework? I'm not hearing anybody nor seeing any hands raised. So can I suggest that we move on to discussing the planning of our next meeting? I see that Maxim has made a proposal that we enlarge the range of options in the Doodle poll.

I'm just going to load what we have right now to give a sense to everybody. So we have suggested that we look at availability of drafting team members for next week already. We've suggested three days, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. We only proposed the - so this is a screenshot in the central European time zone so our UTC time is 1:00 pm. We only proposed that time.

Maxim is suggesting that we propose a wider range of times so that's certainly something we can do and reset this Doodle with actualized availability. Does anybody have any suggestion or comment? I remember reading in the chat room that several drafting team members were mentioning we should rotate calls. We certainly can look into what this would look like and send a proposal to the team.

And Maxim supports the idea of rotation. So well unless there is any - I see there's some (unintelligible) so that I suggest is that we as staff get back to the list with a proposal for rotating meetings and it will include a Doodle poll for next week as we would like to make sure that the drafting team has ample opportunities to work on the substance.

Hopefully by next week each community segment represented in this drafting team will be able to confirm a co-chair. So we've received nominations for the GAC segment, the registry segment, we haven't any for the registrars. So we will try to facilitate that happen over the next few days.

This completes our agenda for the day. We have a few minutes left. Would anybody like to discuss any issue - any topics regarding the drafting of this framework - the framework itself, the initiative itself, specific (unintelligible) with future meetings? I'm seeing some activity in the chat.

I see that Peter Green from CONAC is asking this question, "Would the framework be binding?" The intent of the framework is to include best practices and become a reference instrument for willing parties to implement if they wish. So this framework would not become binding. This could only happen if one day the ICANN community through a policy development process would consider including elements of this framework into policy recommendations that would then be confirmed by the ICANN board and further implemented.

So for now we are - this is not a policy development process. This is an exercise to build the best practices in a nonbinding framework. I hope this answers your question. David, you want to go ahead?

David Conrad: Yeah, just to add that the - part of the effort here is to help the registry and registrar communities develop these best practices for their own use. This is an attempt at working together to come up with a collaborative approach in order to meet the requirements that were specified within the NGPC.

So this, you know, as Fabien mentioned, this isn't binding, it may at some point in the future be incorporated through the policy development process. But the main goal, at least in my mind of this, is to help everyone together sort of improve the situation so it's not us dictating to you, you know, what you have to do, it's, you know, trying to help everyone work together.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you, David. Would anybody else like to make a comment, final suggestion, raise a topic? I see that there's been quite some (unintelligible) confirming support for rotation of meetings. Richard, you want to go ahead, please?

Richard Roberto: Yeah, Richard Roberto from Google. I just want to just make one comment that I think that one of the goals, at least I believe one of the goals of this is to have some clarity around this Spec 11 solution. And I just hope we don't wind up I think over-defining what those recommendations are. I think we can have something that's a practical set of guidelines for solving this without narrowly defining it. At least that's my hope.

Fabien Betremieux: Thank you for your comment, Richard. I believe the scope of this framework is certainly an implementation of the NGPC resolution that, you know, maybe you're aware that while we are developing this framework we will be working on an advisory with guidelines on the implementation of the current language of Spec 11, Section 3(b) so this is a different effort.

So with respect to the framework we're - as David mentioned I believe, you know, we're hoping that this drafting team will make it as something that is useful and can help registries and registrars in dealing with security threats.

Richard, is this an old hand or a new hand? Okay, it seems to be an old hand. It is now the top of the hour. Thank you very much everyone, for joining early in your day or later in your day. We appreciate very much you volunteering to be part of this effort. We thank you very much for your time and for attending our meeting today. And we will be shortly in touch with you with respect to organizing the next meeting. Thank you again for your time. And have a nice end of your day. Thank you.

END