Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
CPH Membership Meeting
Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 14:00 AST
Note: 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.

The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Graeme Bunton: All right, guys, we're going to take some seats and we'll get going. We've got an hour, right? We've got one hour, all right. Are we recording at the back of the room? Thank you kindly. All right, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the joint session between the registrars and the registries.

We've got the agenda up on the screen, update from NomCom, transfers, RAA amendments, and then prep for the board. I would like to get through those first three relatively quickly because that prep for the board always takes a bit of time and I want to make sure people are prepared for that, for the people that are going to be put on the spot.

So right, NomCom leadership. Who is doing this? Wherever you can find a free chair and a mic.

Zahid Jamil: Advance slide. I'll try it again. Let's give it one more shot and see. No, advance slide. Okay, advance slide, advance slide, advance slide, advance slide. Thank you. Thank you very much. Hi, guys. I am Zahid Jamil. I'm the Chair of the NomCom this year. I am joined by my associate chair, who was chair last year, Hans Petter Holen.

What we're doing is basically doing some outreach with different groups and we've been going on to literally everybody. The ASO never had outreach from the NomCom ever or apparently at least not for the last five years.

So we're going around basically getting our message out and the first thing we're trying to do is ensure that folks know that the deadline for applying to slots the NomCom needs to fill is the 19th of March, which is in the next seven days or so.

Now, one of the seats we need to fill. I want to clarify. We have three ICANN board seats we will be filling this year. There are no geographic limitations on any of those three seats so we would encourage you to apply, have folks that you know or suggest, get them to apply. You have very limited time left of course.

Also on the deadline, let me just clarify that on the 19th is the deadline for expression of interest. You get access to your application but you have a week to complete it by the 26th of March. So there's a little bit of leeway there.

On the GNSO, we have a non-voting one seat that we need to fill. Some folks feel that when we spoke to candidates said why would I apply for the GNSO because they will not recommend me or I need to be a part of the GNSO in some way. Actually, the answer is you don't need to be anything related with the GNSO. Don't worry about it. If you are or are not, it's not a qualifier or disqualifier.

We have two seats on the ALAC but they are geographically restricted, one for Europe, one for North America. Sorry, there was one last bit. CCNSO, can we go back? Thank you. There are two seats for CCNSO. It's very important that we clarify, because we got into trouble last year that we cannot fill anybody into those seats who happens to belong to, affiliated with, or is

working in the CCTTLD in any way. So it has to be somebody completely separate or different.

This is basically what it looked like last year. We did well on diversity from 19% in 2016 we got applications up to 36% (unintelligible) women and so we're hoping to do better this year. That was all because of the guy on my left here. He made that happen. Also, there were 29% candidates women who filled seats in 2016. This year, or last year, 2017, we managed to get that ratio up to 50%.

Let's look at what the board looks like and who's coming off on it. HP, do you want to take this?

Hans Petter Holen: Sure. So basically, if you look at the yellow frames here, you will see which candidates who have terms that end on this -- at the end of this year. So NomCom is not replacing all of them but (Lito) from Latin America and (Lucivus) from Europe, their terms are up. Of course, both of them can be renewed. George Sadowsky, however, his term is also up and he's served nine years on the board. That's three terms so he's term limited.

So that's basically what the NomCom has to work on, on the board this year. So if you have good candidates, especially from Latin America and Asia-Pacific and probably also Africa, depending on where the new CCNSO representative is coming from, that's where we're looking for.

You look at the composition from North America, that's probably not the region that we need to find. Because NomCom has geographic restrictions. We can appoint a maximum five from one region to get with all the other appointments and we need to make sure there is a minimum of one from each region.

Zahid Jamil: As you can see, we never used to have four registrars. It will be pretty funny. We always used to have a link that said ICANN.org/nomcom2016, or 2017, of

2018, or 2015, or 2014. So for Google search, people trying to find us, it became a nightmare. We have this year decided that we're going to have one basic simple website address, nomcom.icann.org and that will be the permanent one so it won't change. SEO will work well for us hopefully because of that.

As you can see, the dates are up there, until the 19th of March deadline. The 26th is when you have to complete your application by and get your references in as they roll in. If you think you want to suggest a candidate you can do that too. Speak to us. If you want someone to be sort of mentored through the process, speak to us. We're open to talking to them. Just because we're going to be selecting does not mean we don't want to encourage folks to apply.

So if you want to come and talk to us, feel free to do so. And basically, in Panama, in June, we'll be making our final selections. But between this stage, which closes basically on the 19th of March, and in June, you'll be surprised to know ordinarily we've never met face-to-face. We've been using online calls, et cetera, to basically do our work, which is where we do our selections. And that's important because we're coming to some improvements we're trying to do or have done this year.

So with great responsibility, really comes absolutely no power to the NomCom. NomCom's destiny is predetermined before its birth so we believe in God and faith. We can't change -- and then there's groundhog day because literally every single year, we aren't able to change any of this stuff. Let me explain what we mean by that. The recruitment firm, we have an option, either we hire them or we don't because there's no other options. That's what we're faced with when we come into existence every AGM.

Our budget was never known to us. We had no idea, no visibility into it. The assessment firm was again a binary option of either you get this one or you don't get anybody. Our schedule, our meetings, our operation planning were

not up to us and staff used to basically set our budget into stone 11 months before we were birthed. So basically, when we used to come in we got told, this is what you can do. There's not much else.

We've tried to change that and I've got to say we have Tom Barrett here who's also on the review team and did a lot of work in the previous year's recommendations. So what we're about to show you is not what we came up with this year but is built on recommendations, experiences that Hans Petter Holen in his year and Stephane Van Gelder, when he was chairing, and Tom Barrett, when he did the recommendations. He did a lot of work on trying to get this evolution to take place.

So here we go. We were able to implement a decision on the first day we came into existence. We were prepped a lot beforehand so that we didn't waste weeks, et cetera. So staff got all instructions on day one. We forced a partial budget reveal so we got to know what our numbers were on certain vendors on how much they got paid and what we could do, and how much money there was to move around, which was not easy because apparently, you can have a budget but if you want to move it around, it's a whole process and it can't be done easily.

We did manage to convince ICANN that we needed a second recruitment firm, which we have gotten from them and we want to thank ICANN staff for that. We changed our assessment firm. We now have decided -- this is probably the biggest change -- that instead of doing just online calls or online ratings where people click buttons and gives numbers we are going to select board members by looking at every single application face-to-face, by meeting face-to-face and considering those applications. And this is something we would like to thank staff for the enormous work they've done to help us make that happen.

We for the first time got a job description and we've asked the board to vet it. So that was not there before. So now, we have a job description, what it

means to be a board member, vetted by the board itself. And we have criteria. We're not just going to wing it when we go into the interviewing process by saying let's see where we get to. We actually have specific not just guidance, which you get every year from the board, but quality and scales we've come up with in the last four months in our subcommittees, along with the job decision.

And as I said earlier, we're going to do in depth, face-to-face meetings for deliberations in order to select candidates and be more deliberative. And that is a big thing for us because it took a lot of effort to try and get approval to move our money around to be able to do that.

Again, zero extra money for that. Doubling the recruitment capacity, and in the long-term basis, we are now doing an RFP this year. So we have options beyond just two. So next year, Damon, who's on my right, is going to be the chair elect. He's going to have a list of people he can choose from about who's going to be the recruitment firm or the assessment firm.

Now, the biggest criticism we used to get in the NomCom was the black box. I applied and I don't know what happens. I never hear back from them. No idea what they're doing and so what we've done this year is make sure that there's greater transparency in communicating with candidates at every stage.

When you are not selected, you will receive an email letting you know that thank you for your application. You are not going to go through the next stage. So you don't need to plan and keep sitting and waiting for maybe you'll be invited to interview in Panama. But you'll be given that information and that was one of the greatest criticisms. We've improved that this year.

And we want to know our customers. So we want to know when we're appointing people to the GNSO, we want to know what it is to be in the GNSO. So folks from the ALAC or folks from the CCNSO who may not know

what the GNSO is or how it works, they got specific training. We also got specific training thanks to Damon on my right here on interview training. He got a really good firm to give it to us yesterday. There was confidentiality training, board governance training. So we're trying to basically make sure that we understand how boards work.

And we had a problem last year. We discovered that every time you select somebody in ICANN, you need to send it to legal so that they can do due diligence, which makes sense. The only problem was when we met at our last meeting last year, suddenly imagine that there is somebody who doesn't pass due diligence, what do you do then? We can. We're not going to meet for another meeting. We have a deadline.

So we've changed that process and streamlined it to make sure that we do due diligence before our candidates arrive.   For instance, in this case, the Panama meeting. So when we select, that selection is done. It's not subject to due diligence. It's a final firm selection.

And of course, as you know, the website is now solid nomcom.icann.org. We also have asked for guidance. We have not received guidance from the GNSO. So we sent a letter out to the chair of every SCSO asking them for that but we haven't got guidance yet so if there's anything you can do to help with that.

Or if you want to write us a letter saying what the registrars/registries think should be the kind of people we appoint to any one of these positions, you're free to do so. Please send that. It will be helpful.

Last biggest change, which is getting a lot of press or not in the community is that we've basically become law abiding this year and we're applying our bylaws strictly, which means that term unlimited non-voting liaisons don't get to vote or make outcome determinate decisions this year.

And so they only participate in the deliberation, suggesting anything, recommending. Also, a part of straw polling. That will also be something they will continue to do but when it comes to a vote where a person moves from stage one to two or then to three that will be done after the straw polling only by voting delegates in the NomCom.

And that's my presentation. Sorry, I may have gone over time. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you very much. There's someone in the chat and I've got Stephane first I think.

Stephane Van Gelder: Stephane Van Gelder. Thanks guys for coming in and an impressive amount of work that's been going on already in preparing for the real work that now will start at the end of March for you guys. Just a couple of things on the -- I don't know if we can go back to the board map that you had but Hans Petter mentioned the CCNSO seat. That as far as I know has already been selected so Mike will be replaced by Nigel Roberts, who's from Europe. So you can update your map with that if you need to.

On the improvements that you mentioned, the web address situation, nomcom.icann.org was always there but it previously pointed to a main page, which then pointed to each specific page. So just to clarify that the improvements you've made there is to have that address point directly to the active NomCom of that term.

And on the -- you had a slide on the voting/nonvoting members. I don't know where that was. Just to clarify that the nonvoting liaisons will continue to participate in the process. So it's not an exclusion. It's an improvement on past misunderstandings. Thanks very much, guys.

Hans Petter Holen: So just to add to that one, since I was chair last year, I will be very careful with saying that we did something wrong last year or previous years in the

voting/nonvoting things. My observation from being on the NomCom for five years is that we've come more and driven to make decisions in the process.

The first year I joined, the rhetoric was that the NomCom could bring back anybody from previous places at any point. But then we developed a process to bring us forward to say that, okay, we reduced the pool of applicants from 100 to 50 to 20 and to the final selections. And these are in fact becoming more and more decisions that determine the outcome.

And when then talking to previous NomCom members and board members like Ram Mohan, it was quite clear that straw polling as they do in the board, where nonvoting members take part is something that you do before you do a final vote. And then the final vote is not only the final vote at the end, but all the decisions that excludes people from moving ahead.

So this is a result of several things being changed in the process over years in order to make the process more efficient. So I think it's the right thing to do. I would also point to Zahid's intervention in the public forum yesterday where he said that, well, it's really difficult to have two classes of people in the NomCom. So we would really encourage the board to look at changing the bylaws so that we have term limited voting members by both SSAC and RSAC.

Now, that may have some other consequences but I think that's the right place to fix it if somebody thinks that it's wrong to treat people different. And there was a comment from the RSAC representative in our meeting with them earlier today that he was really surprised that he got to poll when he joined the NomCom two years ago.

So I think getting this on the table and now, placing it where it belongs in the review and with the board to change the bylaws or clarify the bylaws, that's the right place to do it so there is no confusion in the future.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Hans Petter. Just a quick follow-up on the due diligence. The fact that before, due diligence was only done on successful candidates, also for a cost issue. So if you're doing it on the final slate, does that mean that you are increasing the cost of due diligence?

Zahid Jamil: So you're right, it does increase the cost of due diligence but it does not increase the cost of our overall budget?

Graeme Bunton: I had a question from Chris Pelling on the chat, which he was asking if any of the people nominated either on the board or GNSO are people coming through the NomCom have disabilities? He's interested in making sure I think ICANN accommodates people with disabilities and he's curious about that.

Zahid Jamil: So we haven't had anybody in the few years that we've actually been on who's actually identified themselves as having a special disability or special needs and then we are not actually in a sense actively looking for that but that's an interesting point. We will take that back to our NomCom. So thanks for making it. However, we try to make sure that that does not become an obstruction to anybody applying at all in any way. Go ahead.

Hans Petter Holen: I just want to stress here that the only hard limits we have in the bylaws are the geographic diversity. We're striving for equality on gender and other topics, but that's not a qualification criteria. We're looking for the best people for these positions, disabilities or not. That's not the criteria we're looking at and we're probably not allowed to use that criteria under laws in most countries anyway.

Zahid Jamil: But again, it's important to stress it's not an obstruction.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. We have a couple more questions. I want to keep this really brief because we need to talk about other things between now and I think we've only got another 20 minutes or so.

Jon Nevett: I just want to announce that I'm the rep from the registries and Theo is the rep from the registrars. If you have any questions or issues, bring them to us and we'll bring them to leadership. And thanks for coming.

Zahid Jamil: And can I just say that your reps have actually been extremely helpful in certain processes we can't talk about, which are crucial to our working internally in the last four months. Thank you.

                 Did I see one more? Tom, real quick.

Thomas Barrett: Yes, real quick, you guys have made a lot of progress, which is fantastic. I know you're getting into your busy period, coming up to the Panama meeting. But it strikes me that the Panama meeting might be a great time to make sure we can continue the progress we've made into the next year. So we need to probably get it on the radar of the board, the BGC. So I definitely want to work with you on that as well.

Zahid Jamil: And Tom, you will remember that the largest set of recommendations we ever had was when you worked on this stuff. So thank you for all the work you did that helped us make this happen. And we look forward to working with you, because you're on the review team, to find a way to make sure that whatever recommendations or whatever comes out of the review actually does get implemented. So let us know how we can help. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. Thank you. What is next on our agenda? Where do I have that handy? Domain transfers after GDPR. Great. So joint tech ops wrote -- worked together. Really great, worked together, wrote a letter, have sent that to staff. It has not been published yet as far as I know. It proposes a model for how transfers are going to work post-GDPR. It's not perfect. It has its risks. I don't think anyone is in love with it and I think that's in a sense good because it still provides impetus for us to blow up and fix transfers as a whole. And we talked about this inside the registrars earlier today, so that we

can survive post-GDPR but still get some work done to fix them in a larger sense.

I don't know if we have anything for the registries on this. If people have more to add -- James is at the mic. James, please.

James Bladel: Thanks, James. Just a very quick question. Can someone give me a 30 second overview, having not read the letter yet, 30 second overview of why they believe the existing transfer process is not compliant with GDPR?

Graeme Bunton: I think it's not that it's not compliant. It's that there's no public email address to (unintelligible).

James Bladel: So it's not as simple an answer as we've always -- I've always assumed that registrars would have a purpose to get behind the gated public WHOIS and that that would work and we would use radar or some other ICANN service and IANA IDs or something for that.

Graeme Bunton: Someone from tech ops.

James Bladel: I want to make sure we're not making this super hard and putting a whole bunch of work in between us and May 25th. There already is but more.

Tobias Sattler: Tobias speaking. So James, the thing is with (unintelligible) you mentioned, the thing is that all registrars should provide their IP addresses. The thing is that most of the registrars are not providing their IP addressed or keep them updated. Another thing is there is no possibility for registrar to know when another registrar updated their IP addresses.

So this process might look interesting but it's not actually practically working.

James Bladel: Understood. And can we take this opportunity to say registrars, please go to radar and update your IP addresses using standard notation. And also,

please check it regularly. That's going to have to be a good practice going forward. If folks are just -- because we see so many of them.

Folks will say, well, I can't get in and it will say null in their radar, white list. So we check it. I don't know, Jody, we check it irregularly let's say. But we're probably trying to get better at that and ask others to follow suit. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, James. Good note for people in the room. Anybody else have thoughts or questions on transfers? We need to begin socializing this with the rest of the community. We need to get ICANN to bloody publish the thing so that anyone knows it exists. Looking at staff in the room. Go poke some people.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele for the record. I just emailed ICANN's current head of communications about that to see if I can get an update. I emailed Duncan Burns to see if I can get an update.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. Moving on from that to RRA amendments. This was brought up in our earlier session. I think we've actually talked about -- sorry, and I'm talking real quick. Apologies to non-English speakers in the room or non-native English speakers in the room because I want to make sure we've got time for other stuff.

RRA amendments, there are going to need to be an awful lot of them post-GDRP as all of you registries are going to need to incorporate language to address the GDPR. For better or worse, the policy has registrars in that workflow of approving these RRA amendments. We are terrified that we're going to see 1,100 of them on the 20th of May and we can't possibly get through that many. Even the big registrars with a couple lawyers on staff aren't going to be able to cope with that.

So I think we sort of bounced some ideas around. There were two. The biggest one was that perhaps there is some boilerplate language that we can

work no that so long as the RAA amendment includes only that boilerplate language change then they can be essentially auto approved. Any deviation from that means it's not and it sits at the -- we basically reject it until after May or it goes to the back of the line where we can actually look at it substantively because we're just not going to have time.

Jeff Neuman, who I don't see, maybe he's still in the room, be hiding over there, was hypothesizing a mechanism where we could put something in the RRA and then RA -- the RA -- the RAA, sorry, yes, right -- and then reference that inside the contracts.

But no one wants to stomach opening that up either. So we don't have a ton of time for a super robust discussion about this but that's kind of what we're thinking. We can take a couple questions and/or you guys can take that back and mull on it a little bit and we can have some more discussions in our respective houses and bring that back to our leadership.

And if anybody else has suggestions to prefer how we might proceed around those, getting through those RAA amendments, I'm super interested in hearing them. Thoughts from anyone around the table? No, you love it. Everyone is at least terrified by this idea as well and thinks that boilerplate language might work. I saw a hand from Beth.

Beth Bacon: I actually like the idea but I could ask because we have the same terror of we have to send out changes to 700 registrars and it's not pretty on either end.

But I was thinking because not every registry and every registrar looks the same from a business model perspective, perhaps we could consider breaking that boilerplate language up into boilerplate A, B, and C, and we could say this amendment will include A and B and then maybe not C and make it really easy, a little more flexible so you don't have a pile just in case there is some variation. Not all but some. So maybe we can just think about that but I like the approach.

Graeme Bunton: Sure. We can work out those details. We need to work out those details six months ago -- today minus six. But I think we can work on that. Anybody else have thoughts on RRA amendments before we start prepping for the board?

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Graeme. It's Paul for the record. Just to underscore the importance, if you mull this over or have to go back and talk to other colleagues back home, this is another priority or a genuine sense of urgency. We don't have a lot of time to sort this out. This is not something to be, oh, we'll deal with it at the summit in mid-May.   That's just simply too late.

So by the time everybody is done traveling from this and when we realistically have to figure out what those A, B, and C boilerplate options look like, we've got a month, five weeks maximum. So please treat it with the sense of urgency it deserves and we can pick these discussions up on our list and then the ExComs can work together to find consensus compromise.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Paul. All right, preparation for the CPH meeting with the board. We have that coming up. We have some topics. I think most of them came from the registries so I might punt over to you, Paul. Do we have those, Zoe, do we have those on a slide? Are they further down this sheet of paper?

Paul Diaz: Zoe or Sue because I can't remember them all off the top of my head.

Graeme Bunton: So one of the ones that I don't think is on here but I would like to address with the board is going to be around fixing these joint meetings with the board. We were talking about this with the registrars. Most of those don't enjoy these interactions. It's really hard to get engagement with the entire board. We end up with a lot of people on their laptops not paying attention and they have no expertise on an issue. And it's frustrating and I think we all want to figure out a better way to do these things.

So I think we can put that to the board to see if they have not just questions for us but a mechanism for interacting with us that they think might be more conducive to having better broader discussion, as we also think about this. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Graeme. Michele for the record. This came up as well when the board met with GNSO Council at the weekend for those of you who might not have been around. And I think over the years they've tried different ways of interacting with different groups and they don't like the current setup. They've told us they don't like it and I pity Graeme chairing it, but at least they won't snore loudly or anything.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks, Michele. Did we find the other list? I think I have it. I can read it from my -- I have it in Skype somewhere. Right, so discuss the budget and the reluctance to turn any of the excess application fees. I think this is around the TMCH double dip. Does someone on the registry side want to tackle that one personally?

Paul Diaz: Yes, I'm prepared to introduce it and I've got colleagues that will jump in. Just to let everybody know, we've been working behind the scenes in the weeks leading up to this with staff, with board members, et cetera. This will not come as a surprise to them and I am cautiously optimistic given the feedback I received to date that they are willing to finally listen to us and come to some sort of solution.

So we can lead with that one simply because it should be quick and hopefully a positive path forward. If you can all see now, so next thought around budget. Putting pressure on better use by (Ken's) existing budget as well as the reverse replenishment without taxing us. Folks probably saw coming into Puerto Rico that the document was published by ICANN had a number of ways that we could consider -- that the community could consider finding ways to replenish the reserve fund.

One of them was new fees on contracted parties. In no uncertain terms, Goran said that is there just to be comprehensive but staff is not prepared to recommend that at all. So that's important for us, no more fees but we'd like to get some directors' perspectives on spending priorities and how they might go about the reserve fund. Certainly a possibility on the ladder is raiding the big piggy banks, plural, the excess application fees and/or the auction fees funds. And both are fraught with challenges.

We can introduce that and I would look to Jonathan perhaps to help us just because he's our lead in paying most attention to budget stuff. It's just to begin the conversation, welcome everybody to jump in. Don't necessarily want to make it a huge debate on the budget alone and all the details, the line items, but we're just trying to make the point that as contracted parties, consistently frustrated with the way ICANN is managing the resources it has available.

Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: So Paul, I wouldn't mind some input here and people just think for a couple of minutes about -- it's Jonathan for the record, just about what specific questions we'd like. One that's come up earlier for us this refrain that says 85% of the budget is essentially somehow cast in stone or fixed and there's only room to move with around 15%.

So I think that's one question we'd like some more expansion on. But to the sort of overarching (unintelligible) points from Graeme, and Michele, and co, how do we make this a little bit more dynamic? Because this is a perfect topic to throw in a couple of questions, rather than just me say, look, you saw the public comment we wrote on the budget.

I think it's much more about trying to talk to them about financial thinking. So if anyone's got any specific thoughts or ideas that we can discuss that would be great.

Paul Diaz: James, you have thoughts. Go ahead.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. Thanks, Jonathan. We submitted our comment on the budget as well. I think it aligns very closely to those of the registries. We're also in the process or will be once we get out of Puerto Rico and drafting our comment on the reserve strategy.

I think that -- and this came up earlier in our session -- I think that we're being given some false choices and I think to Jonathan's point, some of the more pointed questions we can ask is if you're talking about raiding these various funds or raising transaction fees and you have this objective to replenish your reserve fund then you have not sufficiently cut expenses because you need to allow for a surplus. So spending every dime that you take in, in funds, is not congruent with your desire to replenish your fund.

I think the next question would be why the reserve fund is set against one year of the full budget and not the caretaker budget. It might be I think contextually appropriate if you're living off the reserve to drop down to the caretaker budget as opposed to keep all the bells and whistles running and all the different programs operating.

And I think the third one is just this general -- when it comes to the budget and to Jonathan's point about presenting a more financially -- raising the financial awareness of ICANN is to have -- developing the budget is a community exercise but the funding aspect of the budget really should be in close consultation with the folks in this room and talking about our projections for the upcoming year and what we see as overall trends in the industry, and maybe some things that were one-offs in previous budgets that seem to be finding their way in multiple years.

So those would be just my thoughts or comments and I think they were included in both of our comments and be happy to speak to those as well when we're with the board.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you, James. That sounds like you and Jonathan are on the hook for tackling this guy. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Graeme and thanks, James. I do have a follow-up question to what James just said about the expectation setting as it relates to the market interest terms of projections and what people anticipate coming in terms of domain name registration volumes over the course of a future year or years.

I did get an email from a board member in the last couple of weeks sort of asking, hey Keith, do you guys have any resources that you could point me to, either something that VeriSign produced or some third party market analysis about the marketplace. Because I think they're struggling with the same thing, either at the staff level or at the board level certainly not having that visibility.

So it's sort of an open question, are there resources that we could point them to? Are there resources they should have in terms of reports and trend lines and things like that? I think we just need to think through that a little bit before we just say, well, you should have a better understanding of what the marketplace is going to be over the next year because I don't think it's really that obvious to them.

James Bladel: Yes, Keith, I agree and I think that one of the things we've said and that we mentioned in our comment is that they should work with us on that and that we would help provide them with the data that we could share. Some of this I think public registries and registrars gets into a little bit of trouble, as Ben pointed out in our comment.

If we're saying something in our earnings calls or on our public statements and ICANN is saying they're expecting 4% growth then the question comes back to us, why aren't you hitting the 4% growth that ICANN is foreseeing for the industry.

So we have to be very, very careful about making those kinds of public statements. We have to make sure that they're singing the same tune that we are.

Paul Diaz: This is Paul for the record. I might add there's an ad hoc mechanism to do this now. Xavier and his team invite folks from across the community at the AGM meeting, the fall meeting, to go over. They've got a tool. They use a model to project whatever it spits out. They ask what do you think. In past years, optimistic numbers, we've been able to say, whoa, you might want to temper that a bit and they have and that's what we would then see in the subsequent budget.

This year, for a variety of reasons, schedule conflicts and whatnot, I don't believe they got registry or registrar input. I know I wasn't able to attend the Abu Dhabi session. And so we find ourselves in this situation where they publish something. We now comment on it.

I guess the key takeaways, I think ICANN needs to come up with a more formal way to share those inputs, fully taking on board what James is saying, recognizing publicly traded companies in particular have certain requirements but there can be a more collaborative nature to all this and it just needs to be part of the formal scheduling and process.

So I think the budget will probably go.

Michele Neylon: Just briefly, Michele here. For the registrars, we've been circling a drain in the proxy privacy IRT and one of the areas, which is contentious for some of us, or a number of us, or quite a lot of us, I'm not sure what the exact number

is but it's not something that a lot of us are happy with, is that ICANN wants to charge an initial accreditation/setup fee to become accredited as a proxy privacy provider and then an annual fee for that.

From what I've been able to tell, the economic rationale behind this is a little bit ropy. It's not as if they're going to be doing anything that they aren't already doing or adding a higher staff headcount and I think some people pressed on this the other day and didn't really get anywhere. So the question I suppose really is are they trying to come up with new ways of taxing us indirectly in order to replenish their coffers while they continue to spend money on projects for which they have absolutely no measurements and which aren't related directly to the mission?

Paul Diaz: Okay. Thank you. So going through, I've gotten a head's up that the wording on this next one about IGO identifiers, this is old language. I'm hoping that staff received, there were additional tweaks, right? Okay. But ultimately, the issue is still one that we want to bring before the board because it directly involves them.

This special amendment expired quite some time ago and there are several registry operators that have been working with non-government or IGOs that supposedly the reserve list was there to protect and we're in this purgatory stage again. They can't register the names for those IGOs because ICANN has not updated or asked the board to clarify its position.

We discussed this somewhat briefly in session with GDD staff this morning. Not really clear what staff's position was other than they seemed to say, well, bring it up with the board and take it from there. So I will do so, keep the pressure up.

And with IGO, Jon, are you on the hook to intro? Thank you. Jon will introduce it for us and others please feel free to jump in. And obviously, with

any of these folks we identify it's just to introduce the issue. Everybody is welcome to pile on.

And I don't know, assuming we can get to the fourth bullet, the last one -- sorry? Yes. The fourth bullet here. I'm not going to read the whole thing out for you. Just getting to the idea of what exists now could be called a regulatory framework are the ways to lighten the regulatory burdens with a specific view to making participation more attractive to folks coming out of the developing markets.

And Rubens, I know you came up with the idea. So did I capture the idea, the essence of it all?

Rubens Kuhl: Yes, it does. I think it becomes lengthy due to explaining what regulatory framework is so we should probably just read regulatory framework (unintelligible) more lightweight and someone wants to know what that means that's explaining in the text.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Sam?

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Paul. This is Sam. I'm actually going to make a request to not dive into this today and I hate to always bring us back to GDPR but we have a lot of really immediate concerns around the regulatory framework and how that's going to change in light of GDPR and ICANN doesn't have answers for us at this point as to how agreements may have to change if they're going to be supplementary agreements or processes put in place.

And I just don't think it's a good use of time today to go down this path. I think it's a worthwhile topic for future discussions but there are more immediate pressing concerns.

Paul Diaz: How do folks feel about that? And if we have the time, what specifics will we raise? How do we prioritize all of our amongst the long list of concerns about

GDPR, which ones do we put forward? Knowing also that this is going to "be new to the board" because they've received all this stuff about a month ago. Whether or not they really looked at it and prepared answers is another question.

But I think usually, we kind of flippantly say we're sick and tired of talking about GDPR. Let's talk about something else. But fully take on board what you're saying. It's just critical and this is our only opportunity face-to-face with the board as collectively as the stakeholder groups. So if we drop four and shift to it, what do folks think? What would be the very top things to raise to the board that we might be able to have a discussion and not just, okay, we say it, they nod their heads and nothing really changes.

Any thoughts? Beth?

Beth Bacon: I agree. I think it's a very worthwhile conversation to have but I do think the more pressing need is to cover those things with GDPR. And I don't think it's super difficult to identify the things that are missing. We can point to the cookbook. The first thing, can we stop calling it the cookbook? That's the first thing I'd like to change. It's the worst name.

And then second just look through there. They continue to promise the waiver, the agreement to the amendments. They don't even use the same terminology as to how they're going to implement and operationalize the changes and the policies in the cookbook. So quite frankly, if we could simply ask, what can we anticipate from you and when with regards to implementing this in the RRA and other data escrow, other associated agreements. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Sam?

Samantha Demetriou:Maybe it's simply putting the question to the board of as it relates specifically to the regulatory framework, have there been conversations up at

your level? Is there board action that's anticipated? There are options that involve the board taking action on this. What kinds of conversations are happening? What can you share with us? Can you give us any indication of what direction this is heading in as we start to prepare?

Paul Diaz: Sounds great. Think you can say that again in about an hour's time?

Samantha Demetriou: If I remember it.

Paul Diaz: So as time permits, introduce it. Sounds great the way you just phrased it and we'll see where it takes us. As you noted, Graeme, most of these or at least two of these are very specific registry type things. More, we don't want to hog up the schedule.

Graeme Bunton: I think that's fine. I think collectively, if we get there, we can talk about structuring these interactions. Aside from perhaps what Michele was talking about, we don't -- nothing was coming out of the SG today. Oh, we might bring up our stupid nonexistent portal again.

Michele Neylon: Just to explain what we're talking about there, we got an update this morning from Chris Gift and ICANN staff on the portal, the thing you guys have that we don't have even though we pay and you pay and everybody pays but you get more stuff than we do. Come on, you do. We can continue that conversation afterwards.

So they put forward a timeline with different phases and everything else and they're adding another three years, adding another three years to the timeline, which is already four and a half years behind. And when we pushed them a little bit on the timeline, it transpires that there are no human resources assigned to the project. They have three people working on it, which we thought was a little bit strange. So just something that needs to come from further up the rungs potentially.

Graeme Bunton: Yes, I think we have -- I think registrars are collectively super annoyed at this. But probably some of the rest of this is more important, especially around that GDPR conversation and the budget. So if we get there, we can hit it. We've got five more minutes. I think we've covered the meeting with the board. We've got some people tagged to talk about some stuff so that relieves me.

Right, GDD summit is coming up. We were talking briefly about making sure that we have resources responsible for topics. We've got subject matter experts who are going to lead that. So everybody from both registrars and registries who are involved in the GDD summit, let's make sure that we're looking at what is still left to be done and engaging on that.

Both Paul and I had a semi-miserable time last year trying to chair that thing spontaneously and where agendas disappeared. So there's been a lot of pressure on us to make sure this thing works this year and really that pressure is on all of you to participate in making that agenda to drive those topics that we want to talk about and get the value out of it to make it worthwhile to travel to beautiful Vancouver in May.

So let's make sure that we're all still doing that. Registrars, while I'm still chatting, don't forget that we've invited public safety for a drink at like 6:00 or something, 6:30 on the terrace. Not for you registries.

Zoe Bonython: I might just quickly say, so at 5:00, we have the -- it's the compliance outreach for registrars. That's at 5:00. Then finishing quarter past 6:00 and then 6:30 we have the drinks -- registrars have the drinks with the public safety working group.

Graeme Bunton: We gave you drinks last time. Yes, it's upstairs on the third floor terrace, I think. Do you guys have anything for us in four minutes? I think we've already discussed everything we had for you. Zoe?

Zoe Bonython: I don't know if you saw my chat in Skype. I don't know if that's important.

Graeme Bunton: Chat in Skype. Mysterious. Oh, yes, maybe that's an interesting question. NTIA was -- we had quite a spicy meeting with the NTIA yesterday, registrars, and they were really pushing for us to ask either ICANN or the DPAs directly for forbearance on GDPR. Our uniform response was pretty much like that ship has sailed as far as we know.

Everything has been signaled that that's not coming. We don't know if that hurts or hinders at this point. I'm curious if you guys got that heat too and if anybody had other strong opinions on going down that road. I see James at the mic. James, you've got 30 seconds.

James Bladel: Thirty seconds would be I don't see any harm and although we're not likely to get any answers, if we could even crank a quick turn on a letter, at least take away that talking point, it was the same thing when we were being told that we weren't sufficiently reaching out to other folks in the community to talk about things. We did that. Not a lot came out of that but at least no one is accusing of that anymore.

So it doesn't seem like there's a lot of harm in just cranking out letters, like hey, can we have another year? Not going to get it but at least we asked.

Graeme Bunton: Okay. So I see 2:58. We've got to be at 3:15 we need to be upstairs in which room? Ballroom A. Ballroom A, 15 minutes. So with that, I think we can close this session. Thank you registries for joining us today. Thank you registrars for all your time. We'll see you upstairs. Zoe is waving her hand yet again.

Zoe Bonython: Sorry, there's one more question in the chat.

Graeme Bunton: It's too late for the question in the chat. I will look very quickly. We've moved on. Sorry, Joyce, we'll try and come back to that another time. Thank you everyone. We'll see you upstairs momentarily.

Zoe Bonython: You can stop the recording. Thank you.

END