

MONTREAL – Registry and Registrar Roundtable
Thursday, November 7, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

[DENNIS CHANG]: Please, come on in. Sit at the table. Okay, let's get this started. Cyrus?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Hi, Dennis.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Let's get it started. What are we doing today?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Well, from the way you're dressed it looks like an EPDP meeting.

[DENNIS CHANG]: What? Can't have that!

CYRUS NAMAZI: Get that tie off! Anyone wearing a tie in here, please take it off. If you've got shoes that you don't want to wear take those off, too. This is the un-conference. Day 432 of the ICANN meeting. Thank you for your time.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay. This is not the EPDP team?

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Not anymore.

[DENNIS CHANG]: What is it, then? What are we doing here?

CYRUS NAMAZI: I thought I was here to find that out, too. I guess on the door it said “Registry and Registrar Round Table.” This is the un-conference where presumably they get to say things and so do we? You tell me more.

[DENNIS CHANG]: That’s true. I don’t see anything round but I guess that’s okay. Let’s get us started. This is the registry and registrar round table. It used to be a registry round table but now we’ve combined registries and registrars in one big happy family. Come on up. Sit down at the table. I’m having to repeat this. Let’s get every seat filled in this table. Come on, Edmon. I have a seat right here reserved for you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: First base, open for you.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Thank you for coming, by the way. The way we run our un-conference is this. We don't have any agenda for you. I don't know what it is that we're doing. You're going to tell everyone what to do. Right?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Yeah, whatever you want it to be.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Exactly. The first thing we do is we raise our hands. After you sit down at the table we raise our hands.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Seats available in the front. Come on up.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Right. Just a topic that you want to discuss after this whole week of meetings. You may have questions. You may have suggestions. You may have comments. You may have things that are still lingering that you want to talk about. What are those things? Let's find out. Raise your hand with topic suggestions. We're going to collect all your suggestions. Then, we're going to vote on them to see which topic it is that this group wants to talk about the most.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Dennis, can I go first?

[DENNIS CHANG]: You?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Yes.

[DENNIS CHANG]: You have a topic?

CYRUS NAMAZI: I do, yes.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay, what is the topic?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Naming Services portal. Good, great, or greatest, please?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Naming Services portal, otherwise known as NSp?

CYRUS NAMAZI: NSp.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay. That’s what you want to talk about? Okay, that’s fine. It’s a fair game. Everybody can suggest topics. Nothing is barred at this point. Later on, you may not get any votes but you can still suggest things. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can we get a nicer moderator?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay, nicer moderator. Put that on the topic. We’re going to talk about that as a vote. Can you use the mic?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Registrar primary contact changes?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Registrar primary contact changes. Who else?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Karla?

KARLA HAKANSSON: I would like to ask the group about the contracted party survey that GDD puts out. The annual survey.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Changes to the registrar updates e-mails that come out on Thursdays.
Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: All right, registrar update e-mail. RDAP. Anything specific or RDAP generally?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The RDAP about, for example, the implementation of SLA and this kind of stuff.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay, thank you. One back here?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'd like to discuss SLA when contracted parties contact ICANN in any way.

CYRUS NAMAZI: SLAs for ICANN for contact with customers or contracted parties? Yes.
Okay.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Reg?

REG LEVY: Having multiple logins and multiple direct e-mails so that not all communications from ICANN are going to one single place.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay, channels of communication with ICANN, multiple versus single point.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Topics back there? Anybody back there? Want to throw out a topic of interest you want this group to talk about? What would you like to see us talk about? Anything you want. Go ahead.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Welcome, come on in.

[DENNIS CHANG]: A private tip for me. Coffees and donuts for 8:30 meetings. Put it on the topic. We are going to talk about it or at least take a vote on it. I think it's important, actually. I would like that. Come on up. There are empty chairs, here.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Two at the front, there. Welcome, come on up.

[DENNIS CHANG]: More? Any more? So, you're here? Welcome. What do you want to talk about?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Registrant identification.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Registrant identification? Okay. Fine. Topics? No? Is that enough? Okay, so we have how many?

CYRUS NAMAZI: One from the back?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay, go ahead.

CYRUS NAMAZI: The threat of being made to sit at the table in this un-conference. Yes. You want more of that? There's one available, Lemar.

[DENNIS CHANG]: We have two chairs up front, right here. Two chairs. The gentleman who made the threat, I invite you to sit here. Come on up. Come on up. There are two chairs here. How are you?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay. You have something you want to discuss?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Abuse?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Abuse?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: DNS abuse.

[DENNIS CHANG]: DNS abuse! Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, I have to say something?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Do you have a topic you want to discuss?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can you come back to me?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Come back to me? No, I can't. It's closed. I think we have enough on the list. What do we do next, Cyrus?

CYRUS NAMAZI: I think we probably need to delete the donuts and the ...

[DENNIS CHANG]: No, that's not for you to decide. What we do is we vote. We actually have to vote, okay?

CYRUS NAMAZI: We have a very easy mechanism for that.

[DENNIS CHANG]: I'm serious. There's nothing trivial ... I'm not going to pass any judgment about the topics that you throw out here, and put it on the list, because—

BETH BACON: I rescind my comment. It was a joke. It is trivial. I vote against myself, Dennis.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay, well you can't have a negative vote. Sorry. It's on there. When the time comes to vote you don't have to.

[ANDEE HILL]: It's good to mention anything for a topic because other people might not be interested in bringing it up. Nevertheless, they want to speak to it at length.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Yes. I think it's something that is on your mind. That's what we want to find out. It may be very important because ... I'm sorry. The next thing we do, Cyrus, is that we vote.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay. How are we going to do that?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Let's go from the top and you read out one at a time. You count the votes. You tell [inaudible] what the number is. Go ahead.

CYRUS NAMAZI: We need crowd participation, raising hands. Is that right?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Yes.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay. Only one hand per person.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do we get to vote on all the things, or we can only vote once?

CYRUS NAMAZI: All of them.

[DENNIS CHANG]: All of them.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And one vote per person? Is there any other kind of granularity here?
You just trust us on our honor if you want [cross talk]?

CYRUS NAMAZI: [If you want to use] two hands, you can try.

[DENNIS CHANG]: One vote, one person. One vote. Bring your friends if you need support.
Lobby. Start lobbying right now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What if I have a double personality?

[DENNIS CHANG]: [cross talk]. Sorry. Still one.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Alright. For the first one, then, hands up to discuss the naming ... My first joke, which actually made a [different board]. Not really a joke. Naming services portal. Anyone want to discuss that? Two. Three. Alright. Nicer presenter. This one, I fear, if going to get a lot. 365 for that one. It was five. Registrar primary contact changes?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Raise them high so Cyrus can see. It's kind of dark back there.

CYRUS NAMAZI: It's about 14. 16. About. We're ball-parking this, right? I'm going to waste my time counting all ...? No. Contracted party survey. You guys are making it easy. With no one voting I can ball-park it. Okay, five. Changes to the weekly registrar notification e-mail. Alright, more hands coming. Alright. 13. RDAP and the implementation of SLAs around it?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Interesting.

CYRUS NAMAZI: That’s about 20. SLAs for ICANN with contracted parties? 14. Channels of communication with ICANN. This is Reg’s question about multiple points of contact. Seven. Coffee and donuts for all, 08:30 meetings. 25. Registrant identification. That was the question from this side of the room. 20. DNS abuse, the last topic. Zero. That’s about nine or eight. Now, we’re going to re-prioritize this through the magic of [Ishegal]. Thank you, [Ishegal].

[DENNIS CHANG]: Line them up. Let’s see what comes out the top and how much time we have. Based on that we will see how many topics we can get through. The highest-ranked topic is donuts and coffee for 08:30 meetings. We’re going to start with that one. We will not allocate equal time for every topic. I’m saying that if you get through the discussion quickly we can end and proceed down. Let’s open it up for discussion right now.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Registrant identification looks like the winner.

[DENNIS CHANG]: What happened to coffee and donuts?

CYRUS NAMAZI: I thought we had [delivered] that. Okay, coffee and donuts. Apologies.

[DENNIS CHANG]: [inaudible]. What is the discussion? Go ahead.

BETH BACON: Dennis, we're thinking of you. I've got to tell you, IRT was not your best crowd. We were sleeping. Really, take it off the list.

[DENNIS CHANG]: I think you were sleeping, Beth.

BETH BACON: You're just all against me. You're teaching me to think before I open my mouth.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay, fair comment. I'll keep that in mind. If I have another IRT meeting at 08:30 at our next ICANN meeting I am going to personally promise you there will be coffee and donuts. Okay? Is that good enough? Oh, yes. Now I have to estimate the number of people coming for coffee. Maybe I shouldn't have said that just then.

BETH BACON: [inaudible] nine people. I think that if everyone comes now we're going to know why. It's not for the policy, it's for the donuts. That's garbage.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I assumed you were agreeing only because nobody’s going to come. No, there won’t be a meeting, then. You’ll be done.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Any follow-up comments?

CYRUS NAMAZI: They agreed, excellent. The next one is registrant identification. Why don’t we have the person whose idea that was maybe explain a little bit more about the topic to discuss?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure. I'm looking at the topic of registrant identification from many different aspects of the day-to-day experience. As an anecdote, one of them, and this is actually rather surprising, actually ... I'm involved in the .board top-level domain where we have what is supposed to be a strongly verified TLD. Also, an expensive one. What we get, actually, and I think is just because of habit, is registrations where people went out of their way to make it impossible to know who it was that registered. It goes as far as getting a registration from a public authority, in the name of the officer in charge, with the Gmail account of that person. It goes through the whole ...

There’s no way to make it clear. Then, we also see that if somebody did the right thing ... I think we have a systemic problem. Nobody knows about it. Suppose everything was done right. This is a verified registration. Well, great. It’s a verified registration. Does anybody in the

world know? Nobody knows it. There's no proof. We could have documented it. We could have said, "This is a verified registration," if we had a place to write it. "This is a verified registration."

Specifically, we would need to get as far as that a machine could verify that this is verified. They don't have to have the whole address. They want to know, possibly, that this is really strongly verified. It's just an example that we have a whole stack of related topics. It's a big topic. Simply, in this case, it is not like people don't want to. It's just that the habits and infrastructure doesn't permit it. People would actually like to.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you. It looks like we have a response? Go for it. Or an additional comment.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN:

Not so much of a response. I just want to talk a bit about registrant identification in .dk. A lot of people talk about .dk all the time. They present a lot of statistics on how they have less abuse because of their very strong registrant identification. Yes, they do present a lot of numbers. Yes, they have done it really difficult to register domains. Yes, because of that some of their abuses go to other TLDs where it's easier.

Today in .dk it's easier to register a fully-validated domain to the Queen of Denmark, because she's already validated, than to my sister's company. They just started a company a month ago. Whatever she tries

it ends up on her personal name instead of her company name. You can do registrant identification in many ways. Quite often, you end up with worse owner data because people go out of the way to register the domain. Quite often, it'll be more difficult to register the domain with a false Whois than with correct domain information. You have to be really careful what you do.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you. Reg? Michael first, and then we'll have Reg.

[MICHAEL:]

The point of .dk ... One of the things that's interesting is about two weeks ago the European Union accepted a grant proposal that was put forward by .dk, .ee, .cz, and .nl. Part of that grant proposal that was accepted by the European Union is those four ccTLDs integrating their contact registration into [eIUS]. To the point of some of the difficulties, those four ccTLDs are actually working together. I think if you look at that some of the changes that are being made right now, with ID4me adding in an identity component, I think there it's a growing trend to increase registrant verification. Do it in a much more what I would call "friendly" fashion to decrease the friction in the process and increase the efficacy and accuracy of those data points. Again, I could send you the grant proposal that was accepted, if you're interested.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Quick reply. This would make it more difficult for Estonian citizens to register. Still, I would be able to register the fully validated domain to the Queen of Denmark.

[MICHAEL:] Part of what they are trying to do ... This is where the incorporation of identity into the ID4me protocol actually involves multi-factor authentication. It's just not stealing the credentials, but the potentially verifying. This is, again, why they are trying to integrate it into [eITUS]. This is all part of the European single digital marketplace to facilitate a trust framework. Again, if you look at what is going on across the broader C-space, I think that they have probably taken the lead on registrant verification. There's .bank. .Sport is done. .Pharmacy. Those have been TLDs that are generally smaller in scale.

If you look at the C's, they're actually doing it on scales upwards of one million-plus names. Hundreds of thousands/one million-plus names. This is something where I think we could potentially learn. I believe the growing pressure from governments and other external forces is something that ... I would rather cooperatively engage in that as opposed to having it imposed upon us. Just my opinion.

CYRUS NAMAZI: We'll go to response before to Reg.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: My name is [inaudible]. I'm with a registrant in Denmark. .Dk is our second-largest TLD. I see the problems that we get with the registrant identification. The idea is fine. The everyday for the customers and the registrants is horrible. It's so difficult for them, regardless of which TLD. Also, .uk did something. The verification people have to send in papers and stuff. It should be easily accessible for people. We make it so much harder for the everyday person that just wants a domain name. We really should also think about that. It feels like the political pressure is so big. We're doing everything for the police and the human rights people.

No one thinks about the customers. I represent the customers. There should be better ways to do this than force them into some horrible – and it is horrible, trust me – verification system. Even though the Danish system wins a prize or whatever, “We're the best registry in the world,” it's not working. You can just put in a different country and then, whoopsie, you're through.

[MICHAEL:] Wow. If I could respond on two points. One, it's not “whoopsie, you're through.” If you use a non-MID for a non-Danish citizen they actually have a separate manual process. Yes. This is where ... If I could finish real quick. We can sit there and argue whether this is a good thing or a bad thing. I always try to approach this as, “Do you want to be part of the problem or part of the solution?” The governments are not going away. The lawsuits from third-parties, such as Facebook's, they're not going away. Just like when there were multiple lawsuits against the

industry in connection with domain name tasting. That is probably going to see itself replicated by other companies against other peoples. Those people may not be sitting in the room. Other contracting parties.

The point that I would like to put forward for consideration is, is there something that we as a community could do to perhaps standardize the verification of parties? Right now, if you have each registry ... To your point, Nominet may do it one way. .Dk may do it another way. Can we perhaps talk about how we can come up with a common EPP extension to standardize this? This is something that I have put forward to the four ccTLDs that got the grant. Are they willing to work with other registries and registrars in the eco-space to come up with a standard EPP extension or a framework? If we can do that then we can begin educating the community so there is less friction. I agree. We want to remove friction from the marketplace. At the same time, I think we collectively want to be increasing the KYR. We need to be knowing who we're dealing with because of the external private sector, as well as public sector, pressures on this industry.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

We'll go to Elliot, and then I'll get back to you.

ELLIOT NOSS:

Elliot Noss, from Tucows. Mike, you did three things, there, that I really want to object to. The first was you told this experience .dk registrar how .dk registrations work. I'm going to go with her version. The second is you conflated identification for domain names with lawsuits against

bad actors. Those are two very different things. I applaud that litigation that Facebook brought against OnlineNic. I think that was great to try and do what, in my opinion, Compliance should be doing around things like that. That has nothing to do with this issue.

The third thing is, it could have been public forum 1999 to say, “Hey the governments aren’t going away. They’re coming!” We’re here 20 years later. They haven’t come yet! We should on this issue, as opposed to dealing with it as a threat or a fear, did into the nuts and bolts of what’s good about it, what’s bad about it, what it doesn’t cover. “Hey, if we don’t do it, governments are going to club us over the head,” is tired. I really want to keep this discussion where it needs to be. Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Okay, come back to you.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN:

If you made a system where you really needed fully validated identification to register a domain, and you could not get around it, then you’d have fantastic registrant data. The problem is that in .dk today it’s easier to get around the validation system than to actually get a validated domain. It’s the same in many other registries where they require validation. You can see .no, where you can only register if you’re a Norwegian company or a Norwegian private person. It’s the most easy thing to get around. With .cn, where they have verification, as well ... For example, if you want to register .cn to a Danish company, they would require a company certificate for that registration.

The problem here is that those company certificates are online in the Danish government database. You can just go in and download it, register .cn. It will be fully validated. As long as there are many ways to get around this registrant identification you only end up with worse data rather than better data by doing it too difficult to register the domain. It's still very easy for criminals to get all the domains they want.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Actually, the point I was trying to make was we should encourage registrant identification not by requiring it, at least, not ourselves, but by in a sense remunerating. Not financially but at least by showing that it has been done and by whom. We don't have to publish the identity, depending on the purpose. It could be simply that this has been that, "This has been verified by ...", or, "by a party this is endorsed by ...", and so on, so people know that this is a certain quality of registration that can be distinguished from ones that don't have that. Slowly, basically, if he needs it, a domain name for critical things where that's useful. Of course, you're going to get it. If it's just a domain name for something that is not so critical then you could just live without that identification.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

We're going to go over to Reg and then Jody.

REG LEVY: I'd like to back the conversation up a bit to whether or not registrant identification is something that is even desirable. The Internet was built on anonymity and there are still extremely good reasons for people to be able to remain anonymous. Just bowing to pressure that we think regulation is coming is not a relevant argument to me when there are human rights abuses happening around the world that people are objecting to with domain names. They're doing great activism. They're using anonymity in the way that it should be used.

Yes, there are also criminals that take advantage of the same thing. I don't think that that means that we need to start requiring identification for every domain name across the Internet. If .dk wants to do it and it works for them, .uk wants to do it and it works for them, great. People have other opportunities. This is not something that we need to start doing at the gTLD level.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thanks, Reg. Jody?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm just going to add on to what Reg said. This is a business differentiator. You're talking about a business product. Go ahead and make it. Pound the walls, advertise it, and say, "Your domain is certified by X." GoDaddy did have a certified domains product. We did sell it for a long time. It didn't get the uptake. It's a business. If you want to create something like this go ahead and create it. Sell it. You've got to get the public behind it to say, "I want to prove that my domain name is

verified,” or got a little check on it, or whatever. It’s a business decision.
Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you. Anyone else want to speak on this topic? No? I see Dennis saying go to the next one. Okay. Thank you, everyone. RDAP. Implementation of SLAs. Who brought that one up? Who wants to open us up? Yes? Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

The RDAP was to be implemented on August 26th for registries and registrars. We know that there are other obligations that will follow. It’s a question of putting into place an SLA. There are also some policy adjustments that will apply to RDAP. For example, the IRTP for the changes in registrant data or the Whois accuracy specification program. That will probably apply also to the RDAP in the future. Also, the unified access model that is to be planned for next year.

We know that there are several topics around RDAP in the future. I wanted to bring this topic because I think that in my own experience there is a lack of visibility about all these various topics that will arise in a short time. Here, I speak as a web project manager. It’s important for us to have visibility on these various subjects because they imply some web development. I wanted to know how the visibility on these various topics could be improved to clarify/anticipate it more.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Anyone like to comment? Russ?

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: Cyrus, I just want to make sure we're talking about the same thing. This is about upcoming contractual amendments to the RDAP? Okay. Your question was, you're trying to understand better visibility of what's being negotiated or timing? Could you help me understand?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. It's about the content, of course. I don't know if it's already possible to know the content. It's currently in the consensus process. It's more about timelines.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: In terms of their content I think we identified a high-level content being implementing the SLAs, which it sounds like you're understanding. Then, in terms of detailed negotiation, the contracts describe that we negotiate with the registry and registrar stakeholder groups. I don't know if you're a member of those but you can definitely talk to the secretariats of your respective stakeholder group and look at joining either as a participant or observer, I believe.

Just to reassure everyone who's not either part of the stakeholder groups or part of the active team negotiating before we move forward we'll put out the whole amendments for public comment. That'll go through the standard public comment phase. Then, based on the public comments and if we have to do any final reconciliation we will go to a

contracted party vote. Each of the registries and registrars will get the opportunity to vote on the amendments.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Hey, back in the corner. Jumping the queue. This is Graeme, chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I see faces I didn't see in stakeholder group day in the room. I'm sure that's true on the registry side, as well. I know that in both stakeholder groups e-mails went out to the list looking for volunteers for the negotiating teams. Those processes are going to be as transparent as possible. There are notes going back, the transcripts are going back to the SGs. If it's not something you were paying attention to before but you would like to start doing that then ping Donna or myself and we can look at getting you tied closer into that. Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thanks, Graeme. I think I say a hand over there.

BETH BACON:

This is Beth, the Vice-Chair of Administration for the Registries Stakeholder Group. I was going to say, similar to Graeme, if you would like more information I'm happy to help out and either forward you the right e-mails or point you in the right direction. I'll hook you up with the team. Just find me later.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay, great. Thank you. Anyone else like to comment? Okay. Then, we'll jump right into the next topic. Registrar primary contact changes. Reg, I think that was yours. Do you want to explain ...? Whose was that? Yes, okay. Go for it.

[KRUPA:] Hi, this is [Krupa], I'm with Afiliat. I brought this topic up because historically, for the past 15-plus years, ICANN has been providing to registries a weekly announcement e-mail. I think it comes out on Thursdays, as someone there said. That e-mail has, amongst a bunch of other useful information, any changes that may have occurred to a registrar's primary contact. Registries such as ours take that information and update their contact databases to ensure that the primary contacts as listed with ICANN as well as the registries that are at least in-sync ... Other contacts could vary but at least the primary contacts are consistent.

I think about a week or so ago ICANN stopped providing this information to registries. Registrars now have to contact individual registries to ensure that the primary contact information is updated. The primary contact itself is an important one. That's the contact that's likely not going to change as much as other contacts. As engineers move in and out of the organization those contacts might change. A primary contact is likely someone who's seen here enough/who's not going to change as often. I'm bringing this up here to hear from other registries what their thoughts are on this whole thing, from other registrars as well, and to hear from ICANN on an explanation of what

you folks are thinking and what the thought process there was. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, good question. Catherine?

[CATHERINE MERDINGER:] I have a cough problem and my voice is a little creaky. I'm sorry in advance. As a registry, that's not what we do. If that's what you do, great. As a registrar, our primary contact with ICANN should not be, and we don't want it to be necessarily, the primary contact with the registry. Those are very different departments at Name.com. We prefer to be able to tell you directly who the primary contact is. That's just our opinion on that.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Thank you. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: ICANN stopped that. Was there a replacement service so that registries can know that there are changes from the registrar? Was that provided? Did I miss how to get to that information based on the discussion so far?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Go for it, Russ. Thanks.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN:

What we had been doing, and we continue to do, is ... I think it's still on Thursdays. We provide a weekly e-mail to registry operators. That defines new accreditations, renewals of registrars, transfers, terminations of registrars and who the gaining registrar is in cases of de-accreditations. We had been including primary contact information for the registrars in those cases. We'd also been providing the information when a registrar had indicated a change to their primary contact to ICANN. We'd pass that information along to our registries on a weekly basis.

We're doing that all in a text e-mail that came out. As we were moving the registrars from the old RADAR system to the NSp system we had an opportunity to automate building those reports, something that was prior a manual activity. We also had an opportunity to look at, "What are we doing?", and why we're doing it. Me being new to the registrar space, questioning, "Why are we providing the registrar's contact information for who ICANN should contact on a primary basis? Why are we providing that to the registries?", for the logic Catherine explained. As we moved to NSp we switched from the text format to now we provide a CSV in an Excel file format. We still give you the same date other than the contact information.

Mea culpa, here. We did not do a great job of providing advanced warning of these changes. I think that's definitely something we can do better. It seemed to be something we knew we were thinking about and missed getting communicated out in the process of leading up to going

live with NSp. I apologize for that and hope I didn't create too much consternation or challenges on the registry side.

The general logic was we didn't think that the registrar primary contact to ICANN was necessarily the right information to be providing to registries on a weekly basis. Registries and registrars are already doing business with each other, have business relationships, and can manage those contact informations on their own. It's something that if there's consensus there's an opportunity for us to make adjustments to those reports. Like I said, we've been able to provide more automation into that, now.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thanks, Russ. I think we have Reg next.

REG LEVY:

Speaking as a registrar again we also prefer to have a different primary contact for ICANN than for registries. For registries it's primarily a sales and business relationship. With ICANN it's more of a compliance relationship. That's just a different perspective. I'm sure we could do a better job of keeping you up to date of who our primary contacts are, as well.

I also want to express to ICANN about the CSV Excel format. I know this was not an e-mail that was directed at me but I get other e-mails from ICANN with attachments. Man, if there is a surest way of making sure that I don't read something, put it in an attachment. E-mail works. It is

designed to have content right there in the window so I don't have to click anything else. I don't have to wait for something else to open. I don't have to wonder. I can search it in my e-mail inbox. Personally, I would love to have fewer attachments in general.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thanks, Reg. Catherine?

[CATHERINE MERDINGER:] I was just going to say that that's what my suggestion was about. We also prefer not to have it in an attachment. If you could at least have it in the text? Maybe for some ... I forgot the word. Yes, things. Make it so the system can pick it up better or do something with the technology things. It might be easier to just at least put it in plain text.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you. Yes, go for it.

[REG LEVY:] I just wanted to [second Krupa]. I note that if the registrars do prefer to have a different contact then that's something we can easily get together on and figure out how to do that. I will say that for PIR we find value ... Especially when it's a newly accredited registrar. We don't have an ongoing relationship. We're not already on-boarded. We can reach out and say, "Hey, we exist," to establish that contact. That was really helpful. If there's a way that we could figure out a better way to do that

then I'm certainly open to it. I really appreciate understanding the registrar side. I think we can figure out how to either update it more regularly or find a different solution. I do want to underscore the value of it to registries. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

At GoDaddy, when one of these contacts changes, and I can imagine other registrars feel the same, you have to reach out to 50-75 registries. That's going to be kind of a pain. It would be nice if it was in one centralized location that could be downloaded somewhere. Maybe e-mail is not the best. Is there a different way to do that? That would be very nice, especially if we have new gTLDs coming on in the next few years and it's a couple hundred registrars. It's going to be pretty rough. Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Okay, thank you. Another hand?

RICK WILHELM:

Rick Wilhelm, Verisign. The challenge that we have is it opens up a social engineering or security issue when someone calls up and says, "Hi, I'm the new contact from registrar X." Then, we need to go validate who that is. It's sort of like when your bank calls you up and says, "Hi, I'm from your bank." You don't listen to them. You call the 1800 number. The reason why having that contact information as provided by ICANN is it provides an easy way for us to validate. What we can do then is

record that information in our database straight away. It sounds like there's a need.

I'm empathetic to the point of wanting two different contacts, a contact for ICANN and a contact the registries. It sounds like there's a need for a different contact type in whatever database it is that ICANN's maintaining to allow for that separation to continue.

As far as attachment versus not, we're fine with just plain-text e-mail. We don't really want it in an attachment. We wouldn't want to process inbound like that anyway. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thanks, Rick. Anyone else? Edmon? Edmon and then Reg.

EDMON CHUNG:

I just want to add to a couple of comments, there. It's very important for registries to have that information as mentioned. For the time being, as I understand, that information is no longer provided. Is there anywhere that we can get it? If there's not anywhere that we can get the updates then we should probably revert to having the updates first. Then, figure out how to have multiple different contacts that the registrars can provide. At that point, make the further changes.

For example, having a central ... Maybe at the NSp or wherever to retrieve it. For now, the question is since this has been the mode of operation and it was stopped abruptly, as I heard and understood, then we should probably revert back first. Then, figure out how to go forward

rather than wait for the solution and not having that information at all.
Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thanks, Edmon. Reg?

REG LEVY: Thanks. One of the things that I've been asking ICANN for, for a long time, is multiple different types of contacts. ICANN tends to ask for the CEO's information so that they can go to the top and get the best possible help. We actually know how to triage. It's easier if compliance requests actually come to our Zen desk directly instead of to me masquerading as the vice president. That was what was demanded. If ICANN actually allows us to have those different contacts I would be happy to have a registry primary contact entry so that ICANN can then distribute that down to the registries. That would be so much easier for us as well. Trying to change and update our primary contact information with the registry usually very correctly requires multiple-factor authentication. Sometimes, we're like, "When was the last time we even talked to this registry? Who might have that information?" Yes, violent agreement.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thanks, Reg. We've got on more here, then over to JC.

JAMES GALVIN:

Jim, for those who don't know me, also from Afilius. I want to bring this conversation around and separate a couple of pieces, here. I want to tease back the original point that we had when we brought this up and asked specifically for comment from ICANN. This has been a great discussion. It was very helpful to hear the multiple views from registrars. I think that we very much appreciated that. Let me reframe the question that we're putting out on our side for folks to think about, in addition to all the other suggestions that have come from here. Clearly, this business of controlling different contacts is an important thing. There's a role for ICANN to play, there. I think as registries there's a role for us to play there, too, in giving you the opportunity to have different contacts. We'll certainly take that back as an action to follow-through on.

The particular request here is that, as Rick was alluding to, we are dependent on that information. We build up down-stream systems dependent on that initial bootstrapping of security, knowing the registrars, who they are, and what's happening there. That's useful information for us even if we just use that as an indicator going forward and we have a separate primary point of contact that registrars can have. You need that first introduction as a way to kick things off and get it started.

Unless there's an objection? I'd really like to hear that comment if anyone wants to stand up an object, especially from the registrar side. We'd very much like to ask ICANN if they could start providing that information again. Then, if there are additional things that we need to do ... There have been a lot of discussions around here. A lot of

suggestions. I'm sure folks would appreciate it if ICANN would comment on those questions. I want to focus on our particular question. Can we get this information to start coming back to us again and get that turned back on? That really is important to our processes. It's important to all of us from a security point of view. Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you. It sounds a lot like, Edmon, your question, too. JC first.

JC VIGNES: Very quickly I wanted to violently agree with Reg, too, on the contact management. We had a few changes to our contact for all of our extensions. I still don't know why, but it was a nightmare. It took weeks. You guys have been super helpful, super patient. Still, there has to be a better way when you're dealing with many extensions, some of them with different entities. I'd want to believe our [donuts] friend do it.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thanks. Rick? Go for it.

RICK WILHELM: Just one clarifying comment on the heels of what Jim said. I did want to offer, in the face of where we are now regarding what we said about not having this information and the possible security implications, to let you know what we're doing at Verisign is that if we do get someone contacting us and saying that they are the primary contact for X

registrar we don't just take that at face value. We contact ICANN support desk and ask them to verify the data. ICANN support desk has been responsive to those verification requests. I mostly just wanted to let the registrars within earshot know that due to thing, at least at the Verisign process ... I would assume that in [Krupa's shop] it's the same way. There's not been a security process hole that's been opened up as result of this. It has been more work, both for us and for the ICANN support desk. We've recognized the issue and addressed it in real-time. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thanks, Rick, for that example. Go for it.

[KRUPA:]

I'll just respond to that. For Afilias, it's pretty much the same thing as well. For all of our TLDs, as well our supported TLDs, when someone comes and says, "Well, I'm the new primary contact," we refer them to ICANN. Then, once we get the notifications from ICANN on the weekly announcements, that's when we go ahead. We make the changes on our side.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Okay, thank you. Russ.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: Thanks. This was a really helpful conversation. [Krupa], thanks for bringing it to the forefront. I'm hearing two things. I'm not sure how to reconcile them, to be honest. I'm hearing from registries the desire to return to providing primary contact data. I haven't heard a single registrar actually second that opinion. I'm a little concerned with that. Maybe I'm just mishearing. Then, I did want to dispel one item. Reg, you had asked a different question about ICANN being able to contact different people at the registrars. That actually has changed, now, with the introduction of NSp. You have a registrar compliance contact that our compliance department will use to contact the registrar. That defaults to the primary contact just so everyone knows. The primary contact has the ability to change it in NSp to the person they desire. If you're interested in that you can take advantage of that. Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Reg, then Kristian. Go for it, Reg.

REG LEVY: As a registrar, I'm fine with you guys starting that e-mail back up again. It sounds like something registries really want. No skin off my nose one or the other. I'll get those e-mails and I'll forward them to the right people as I usually do.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Reg. Kristian.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: I'm also fine with you sending out that again. I think it was Reg who suggested that we have a registry primary contact instead. Until you make that within a reasonable timeframe you can definitely send the ICANN primary contact as a substitute.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: Okay, thanks. This is good feedback. We'll look into adding it back in. I also heard a request to not put it in attachments, counter to previous advice we had gotten from registries when consulting with them. Again, you can never please everyone, I guess. I think we're going to stick with the attachment format because it simplifies a lot of business process on our end. Hopefully, it's in a machine-readable format for you, which was one of the requests we had heard. It's also in our human-friendly way to look at it. You just have to click on the attachments to get it. I'm not going to commit to changing the format in terms of taking it out of the CSV files and the Excel files. We think that's an improvement on our end and one that we'll ask you to suck up a little bit if it's not an improvement on your end.

On the primary contact, we'll take that back and look at how we can get that information back. I can't commit to a timeline right now. It's going to take us a little bit of time to think about how to do that. We'll get it back to you guys as soon as we can. Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Russ. Thanks for that good discussion. One last point on it and then we'll ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry, I just have a follow-up question. When can we expect an update on this? I know you said you don't have a timeline. When can we perhaps expect an update on the timeline?

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: How about early December we'll provide an update? First week of December coming back from our holiday? We'll provide an update. How do you guys want an update? You guys tell me you get too many e-mails already.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Via the stakeholder group leadership, I think, would be a great way.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: Alright, sounds good. I'll send a note on to them. Okay.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, everyone. Thanks. That was a great discussion. Before we move onto the next topic I note that just below that there was another question about changes to the weekly registrar notification e-mail. Catherine, I believe you mentioned that was yours. Does that satisfy that element? Okay. We can move that one and go on. Thank you. The SLAs for ICANN with contracted parties. Whose was that? Who would like to speak? Kristian, thanks.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Yes, that was me suggesting that topic. Sometimes when we communicate with ICANN we have no idea when we will get a reply. Sometimes it's two days, sometimes I hear two months. I think it would be great if we could have some kind of an expected time where we'd get a reply. It doesn't have to be the same in each case. We just need to know when to expect a reply from Compliance, GDD, or whoever we are communicating with.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Kristian. Would anyone like to comment on that?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Can I ask others what your experience has been in particular global services, Compliance or whatever you are reaching out to? Our engagement manager? I would like an idea of what your experience is. Go ahead, Reg.

REG LEVY: My engagement manager is extremely helpful and responsive but doesn't seem empowered to get a whole lot of stuff done. He gets back to me really fast but the departments that caused me to reach out to him in the first place aren't necessarily responsive. Other than that, my experience is basically the same as Kristian's.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thanks, Reg. Anybody else like to share their experience, trends, or anything else they've noticed?

[DENNIS CHANG]: Then, let me ask another question. What would you say is a reasonable response time that you would expect? What would you say is a time that you would expect, that you say, "Okay, that's a good business practice"? Go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: It really depends on the case. For some cases maybe a month is a reasonable time for you to get back. The most important is that we know what to expect. We talked, for example, with Compliance. They need to consult with ICANN Legal. Yes, that will take time, of course. We just need to know that, for example, "You can expect an answer within two weeks or a month." As long as we know that, we know that you actually got out mail. We'll just wait that month. That's fine.

[DENNIS CHANG]: If I'm hearing this correctly you're not getting an acknowledgment of your initial contact or request? That's what's missing?

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: We need to know the expected time for you to get back to us so that we know, "Okay, this is going to take," for example, "a month." "For this type of case, we can expect an answer in two days." As long as we know

what to expect, for most cases, that's pretty fine. Of course, I would like an answer within 24 hours on all cases. I know that's not something that will ever happen. I just need to know what to expect on each case.

CYRUS NAMAZI: [Kesh?]

[KESH:] Hi, Kristian. I think for cases where we're dealing with known knowns or known unknowns you might be able to give some estimation of how long. For unknown unknowns, we don't know exactly. It's the first time such a question may have arisen. We may have to do a lot more digging than you would see to answer such questions. I think the acknowledgment of at least receiving the e-mail and keeping an account up to date on the status of a request is fair. I think that's reasonable. Some things are easier to answer because they're repeat questions or you know exactly the point of response. Some would be more unknown unknowns. It's very hard to put an SLA for something like that.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Kristian and then Catherine.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Especially for me, I'm coming from a small registrar in the gTLD space. I have cases where it's the first time I look at some case types. If I'm

dealing with ICANN Compliance, I would be asked to reply within a certain time frame. That's expected from me. I feel I could expect the same from the other side of the table.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Catherine?

[CATHERINE MERDINGER:] I think there's something to be said for just saying, "This is an unknown unknown," and telling us, "I don't know how long it's going to take. I'll check back with you by whatever date." I think that more communication in that would be really comforting. At least we know that you didn't forget about us.

[KESH:] I think that's exactly the point I was also trying to make. Where it's a low bar, that has already been jumped by somebody else before, it should be so easy in some cases. You still need to update the individual, or the entity, that work is being done and keep them posted. I don't disagree. I agree.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you. Anyone else like to comment on the topic? Okay, well, thank you for bringing that up. The next one we have on tap is DNS abuse. Eight votes. Whose was that? Who would like to speak? Okay.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Dirk Krischenowski from .berlin and .hamburg. That came, incidentally, to my mind when I was asked. I'm seriously thinking, and we are in our team, what is the perspective with the DNS abuse in one, two, or three years? Are we sitting here in three years with that registrant identification in place and we are responsible for bringing down money laundering, trademark abuse, and everything like this? Should I hire a SWAT team that goes to the registrant, brings down a domain, and jails the registrant?

It has serious implications on our entire ecosystem. Many registries will have their contracts renewed in a couple of years. You need to have a perspective of what's going on, there. I just want to bring this up. What's in your mind? How will the scenery look like three years from now in this group?

CYRUS NAMAZI: First fortune teller, I believe, is Elliot, and then Rubens.

ELLIOT NOSS: I'll resist the urge to make a joke about that. Maybe later. It's a great question. I love it, especially coming from a new G. I'm going to give you a good way to think about it. The way that I'm thinking about it, we've had some excellent discussions this week on the topic. I think that there is a general consensus to a depth that I haven't seen before across the community. These are all the disparate elements. We can and should, in the very short term, focus on cleaning up the crap that's in front of us that is just left to be dirty in plain sight.

You heard me earlier commend Facebook for suing OnlineNic. Compliance shouldn't have had to. That should have been dealt with previously. I say that I absolutely believe the facts of that specific case. I think that there's going to be some very specific cross-community action, informal, not structured, that's intended to help Compliance clean up the crap that's sitting there.

You're one of two things in this room. The vast majority of people would just go, "Oh, thank God. Finally!" The couple of people who are making good money from that crap might go, "Party's over." As a new G ... Let me be specific. There are lots of new G's who have marketing programs that immediately become the magnet this month for every spammer and phisher out there. That's just dumb of us! Shame on us as a community. I'll give you an example of that. Then, I think that once we do an effective job, let's hope that that works, of cleaning out that crap then we have to pick our heads up, look at what's left, and then see what the state of play is. Things might look very different at that point.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Elliot. Rubens?

RUBENS KÜHL: What I see happen in three years is that we only two registrars, GoDaddy and Tucows, because all the other ones will give up on compliance. They will just outsource those pesky problems to those two parties. You don't need, anymore, to decide policy with someone. Just four people on a table negotiating rules. It will be a very simple market.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Alright, there's the answer. Anybody else like to comment? Thanks, Rubens. Okay. Well, thank you, everyone. We'll move onto the next topic, then. Oh, sorry. JC? One more for you. Then Graeme, I believe.

JC VIGNES: Because it's abuse. How could I not comment? We work based on a calendar which allows us the pleasure of seeing ourselves three times a year but Cancún is a long way away. Abuse was the definitely the sujet du jour. I don't think we should wait for Cancún to get dialog and concrete steps seen amongst ourselves and our community. It's possible within ICANN, as well. I don't know what shape it should take but I do believe that if Cancún is just step two you would have missed a great deal of time.

GRAEME BUNTON: To follow on to that point, part of the conversation we had on Registrar Stakeholder Group day was to spin up another sub-team or sub-group within the SG to deal with best practices and abuse. If you're a registrar and a member of the SG, or you're a registrar and you're not, you should join. What are you doing? Expect to see that notification come out soon. Cancún will come up pretty quickly. Hopefully we can begin to figure out what that work looks like between now and then.

I don't think we're going to solve this in the room today but I wanted to put it into people's brains a bit. Registries have a process that's like

ERSRER-something to get a waiver on ICANN fees for domains involved in abuse in some way. GDD is kindly talking to us about how to implement that for registrars, as well. That's great. That means we can take positive action on domains and not have to front the money for them.

That still leaves the biggest issue for registrars which is registry fees. I think we need to think together a little bit about, can we collectively come up with a process with ICANN registries and registrars that allows us to do the good things we're talking a lot about doing this week and none of us incur any costs? Putting that out there. Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thanks, Graeme. Any registries like to comment on that? Evan, let's start with you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Not on the fee part. Yes, I'm sure that's possible to arrange. I don't think that's a very challenging thing. On the group that you mentioned about spinning up is there a value for it to be joint with the registry as well? Or, at a later stage? I'm asking this to other registries as well.

GRAEME BUNTON:

TBD. I don't think we know what it looks like. My hunch is that ... Maybe that hunch is wrong. My hunch is that there might be some different discussion inside of registrars. TechOps has a separate registry and registrar component as well as a joint. I don't want to overburden this

thing with structure already but we're certainly open to that idea.
Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Go for it.

REG LEVY: Just to speak on behalf of registries. We'd be happy to talk to you guys when you want us to, from the experience of the RSR. It's not just fees. It's what allows us to register those domains when we have to. Otherwise, we can't.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you. Anyone else? Russ? Paul?

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: Yes. I just wanted to clarify the RSR part for those that aren't familiar with it. That's essentially just ICANN trying to remove the friction for complying with law enforcement. If there's something that law enforcement's asking you to do, or telling you to do, and you think it violates something in your contract, that's the mechanism to come to us and get contractual relief on those things for particular instances. It happens to point out that it often is related to big abuse take-downs and things like that where it's registries registering names. Not using registrars in some cases, or using different provisions in the contract.

That’s what it’s for. It’s not just a free-for-all of, “Hey, we did a good thing and took down abuse. Give me money back.” I think we’re trying to continue to reduce the friction between good behavior and your contracts.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thanks, Russ. We’re coming back?

REG LEVY: Sorry, just two seconds to say that I did not do this. Brian Cimboric did. He gets the gold star at PIR. He’s worked with Russ and the team. They kind of have this down to a science. It’s the speed of it that’s really helpful, as well. As you said, reducing the friction. I think that if you work on it, if you get it down to something that makes sense and isn’t trying to say, “Just give me my money back,” then it’s super-efficient and pretty helpful.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Great, thank you. Anyone else like to comment? Okay. Onto the next one. We have about 15 minutes left. We’re doing very well. The next one is the channels of communication with ICANN. This time, Reg, I believe it was yours.

REG LEVY: This as mine. You’re correct. I think we discussed it sufficiently in the registrar primary contact changes discussion. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay. Since it was up there, does anybody else have a question on it? Nope? Okay. Moving on to the next one. Contracted party survey. Whose was that? Karen?

[CARLA HUGGINSON:] It was me. Hey, everyone. This is [Carla Hugginson] with GDD. As you probably were aware we put out a contracted party satisfaction survey. We've done it three years, now. The participation that we get is good. I'd love to try to get more participation. I wanted to at least offer it up to this forum to think of other ways that we can get annual feedback from you that is meaningful and actionable for us to be able to go up and say, "What are we doing well? What do we need to work on? Where are opportunities for improvement?"

It's anonymous. We don't know who has actually responded in the past. I realize that there is maybe some hesitancy from some of the larger contracted parties to participate in surveys like this. This is our opportunity to get feedback from you. We would really appreciate getting that feedback when we put it out there.

The question is, are there other ways that you would like for us to try to get that information from you outside of a survey that we do once a year?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Reg, thanks.

REG LEVY: How long is the survey?

[CARLA HUGGINSON:] We've reduced it a lot. Last year I took out a bunch of questions. It went from a tree of 25 to a total of 15. It's meant to take 10 minutes.

REG LEVY: One thing might be to split it into multiple surveys throughout the year so that ... I know 10 minutes is not long. That's fine. That's certainly better than 30 minutes. If you feel that you're not getting the data that you did before smaller snippet surveys might be a better way of getting more consistent data. You're constantly getting data and splitting up the questions. It's just an idea.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay. Like a typical survey response, we have low participation on this one. Would anybody else like to comment on a better way to ... Yes, over here?

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: This is something that has helped us gauge where we're at over the last few years. We're all being stretched thin on things to do. If this is something that you don't find value in, and we see diminishing returns in, maybe it's something to stop doing. I think what we're trying to get at is, is the survey that we do helpful? We produce the results, we've

published them just around the GDD Summit these last couple of years. We've come back to the stakeholder groups at times and given further detail about what it means to us and what we think we should be doing to continue to affect those results.

Again, it's work. There are other things we could be working on in support of you all, as well. Help give us some sense of, is this something valuable? Do you like the fact that we do it? Even if it's not the perfect survey is it good that we do it? Maybe annually is too often? Should it be every other year? That kind of thing. We're open to suggestions. Our bias/tendency at ICANN is once we start doing something we just keep doing it. Our current bias is to keep doing it. If you tell us, "Hey, maybe give it a rest," we're open to that, too.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thanks, Russ. Hopefully we do get a response from someone in the room. Anybody like to weigh in? Thank you.

[KRUPA:]

I think the survey is quite helpful. Once a year is fine for now. Maybe at some point in the future you guys can change up the frequency. For now, I think once a year is fine. That's it.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thanks. Anyone else? Remember, this is the un-conference. Unbiased, unfiltered. Anybody? Yes, right over here. Kristian, thanks. New speaker.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Just a quick comment that yesterday I had a Registrar Stakeholder Group meeting with Compliance. We actually asked Compliance that they should do a survey of their customers being registrars and registries.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: Thanks, Kristian. That's helpful. I'll touch base with Jamie. Maybe we can combine efforts.

CYRUS NAMAZI: We've got one more coming over here. Another new speaker.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. I should probably have sat down. Registrars did this great survey of how we felt about Compliance. Those interactions had surfaced some really good stuff. Lots of things that we hope Compliance will fix. Communication, SLAs, stuff like that. It was great. I had expressed to Jamie in that session that I really thought that survey should come from them. They should be checking in with their stakeholders about how they're operating. I know that's what we all do with our customers. It makes sense there, too.

Maybe it's better coming from GDD so that there's a removal from Compliance specifically. That would probably increase the trust in the results on behalf of registrars and, presumably, registries. I think it was

a really great opportunity for you guys to combine that, take that on, or add it as another piece of work. Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Great. Thank you, Graeme.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: Yes, thanks, Graeme.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Anyone else like to weigh in? No? I see some faces. Anybody on the row of phones in the back want to look up? No? Alright. With that, we'll move on to the next one. They're already in the naming services portal on mobile. That leads right into my next one.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Who needs to talk about this?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Nobody. Alright. As you know, we'll use that time as an announcement that the Naming Services portal is live and RADAR has been Sunset. If you have any questions about NSp, and logging in or anything, please do feel free to use it. Familiarize yourself with it. Contact us if you do have any questions. Reg, yes?

REG LEVY: What in the world is going on with that acronym and the tiny, tiny P?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Yes, that’s a good question. I don’t have an answer for it. It’s better than alternatives.

[DENNIS CHANG]: I’m going to share something and you guys have to promise me not to share it outside of this room.

CYRUS NAMAZI: I think we can trust them.

[DENNIS CHANG]: Okay, turn off the recording. Naming Services portal. Well, if you’re a techie it’s really not a portal. What is it? It’s an application. If you used the word “application,” what would the acronym be? Get it? That’s why we could not. I have to tell you, I’m the one who said, “Absolutely not, we can’t do that.” At the last minute we changed the name of this thing to Naming Services portal, P being, “It’s not really a portal but it’s kind of a portal. It doesn’t deserve to be capitalized so let’s stick with a small P.” That’s why. You now know the history of NSp. There it is.

CYRUS NAMAZI: JC responds to that.

JC VIGNES: Sorry. While we're on the topic is there a possibility to have some redirections or easier URL for NS-little-P? I always have to Google it to get back to it. I now I could bookmark it but ... Anyway. Just a thought.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Did you get that?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Proving the URL for the NS-portal.

JC VIGNES: Yes.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay, thank you. [Bukesh?]

[BUKESH:] I was going to as Dennis if the small P was ever going to grow up.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Version 3.0.

[DENNIS CHANG]:

Yes. Maybe one day when it deserves a larger P. You guys will let us know when that is, okay? We'll keep talking about this, probably, at every Round Table session. Now, is that the end of the ...? I think we exhausted all the topics. Oh, there's one. Five minutes left, perfect.

What I would like to do before we conclude and say goodbye is I would like to ask Russ to wrap this up for us and maybe talk about this Round Table session itself. I know you guys wanted a nicer moderator. I think that means me. Maybe we can accommodate that, too. Go ahead, Russ.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN:

Sure. First, let's give a hand to Dennis and Cyrus for leading this. Thank you, guys. I appreciate it. I know it's hard work to try and get everyone participating. Also, thank you to everyone who did participate. I know it's a big group, now. I really liked that we expanded it to registry and registrar this time. I thought there was really good dialog. I wanted to get your sense of, is that a positive step forward? Is it better if we split the group?

My sense was this worked really well. Despite it being a bigger group of people, which sometimes increases the barrier to participate, I think we still had good discussion and that there were new and interesting topics that were able to be discussed. One of the things we want to do is try and create more opportunity to facilitate a dialog between the contracted parties and ICANN and think about the market as a whole as opposed to always thinking about registry-specific, registrar-specific. That was the intent behind it. If there's feedback you have for us let us

know. Reach out to any of the people at GDD. Alright. Now we have a few minutes.

RICHARD MERDINGER: Hi, Rich Merdinger with GoDaddy. I just want to say that having the group together is overdue. Not as a criticism. I'm just glad it's here. I want us to continue. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thanks. I saw some thumbs up over here, as well. Thanks, Edmon. Anyone else? Likes, dislikes? Personal attacks? Anyone? More thumbs up. Alright, Rick?

RICK WILHELM: I agree with Rich. I think it's very helpful to have the group together. I could imagine that there might be times when either stakeholder group would want some time with GDD staff on their own. In this case, we had some good topics. Particularly, the contact one really benefitted from a cross-stakeholder group discussion. It allowed it to get to closure quickly. Thanks.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN: Great, thanks. I think we'll call this a new tradition and try and keep them together. In addition to this, the GDD staff is typically invited to the stakeholder group sessions on Tuesday. The constituency day sessions. We've been able to participate in those and have the more

focused conversations there. Here, it's good to have everyone together. We'll keep doing that. Looking ahead, just a couple of plugs. We have our GDD Summit. Oh, sorry ...

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Just a quick thing occurred to me before we move on to something else. I'd like to build off of what Rick had just said. Yes, these joint meetings, we should keep them up. In the spirit of the possibility that there might be an individual topic you want to discuss maybe the right thing to do is also take back an action. Talk to the stakeholder group leadership as you're coming into a meeting to find out if they want a separate meeting and if they have something on their mind. Otherwise, the default is just to have a meeting together in the spirit of allowing for that. Thanks.

RUSSELL WEINSTEIN:

Absolutely. In terms of specific topics, we often have three or four meetings with parts of the GNSO Registries Stakeholder Group or Registrar Stakeholder Group for different discussion topics on things. This is more the bootstrap at the end making sure everyone had a good experience and get off anything off their chest that they needed to get off at the end of the conference. Things that weren't discussed. Often, this is a good place to have the operational discussions that we don't get to have during the ICANN meeting which was so focused on the policy aspect.

That leads me into the thing I was going to plug which was we have our next GDD Summit coming up in Paris in May. I hear the weather's terrible in May in Paris compared to here in November. That's another opportunity for us to talk more operations. I know the ICANN travel schedule is often heavy on the policy folks. Think about bringing more of your operational folks to that event in Paris as opposed to the policy folks. The policy folks are welcome. Let's have more conversations about how to make the operations and the friction of doing business together between registries, registrars, and ICANN ... Which I think have been a really positive outcome of the summit.

That's our opportunity to have these kind of meetings. I just wanted to plug that. Carla and Andy on my team are going to be coordinating with the stakeholder groups and with the people that attended last year who indicated they wanted to participate in the agenda-building. We're going to start that in the next couple of weeks. We're leveraging the feedback we've gotten from past surveys which I think will help make this year's summit even better. Please, get involved. It's one of those events that putting the up-front work into the planning of what content to present, what content needs to be talked about, is going to be really important to what event we have. I just want to plug. Get involved early. That's all. With that, I'll say thank you to everyone for attending. I wish you well on your travels back home, near or far. Thanks very much.

[DENNIS CHANG]:

Thanks, everyone. I'll see you at the public forum.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]