ICANN Prague Meeting
Registrar Meeting 2nd session meeting- TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 26th June 2012 at 11:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Man: And also folks, I'm told that the tickets for the gala event here in Prague, which is tomorrow evening, are available...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Bob Connelly is joining the call.

Man: Hi Bob. Bob, you don't need a ticket to the gala tomorrow. So you don't have to stand in line. The gala tickets are available at the (CV NIC) booth, which is where the really long line is.

                 So if you want to get a ticket to the gala, then you'll need to stand in that line. It's tomorrow night.

                 And so with that, we are back and we've got the contractual compliance team in here with us. And I'll let them introduce themselves. And they did put a couple of slides together based on the topics that I had sent. So we'll let them walk through that.

And I will take a queue once they get started. So with that I'm going to turn things over to Maguy and let her introduce herself and the team. Thanks.

Maguy Serad: Good morning everyone. My name is Maguy Serad. I'm the Head of Contractual Compliance at ICANN. With me today in the room I have a couple of team members. I have Stacy Burnette. I have Owen Smigelski and Carlos Alvarez.

So thank you for this opportunity. And we're scheduled for 45 minutes. By request and per discussion with (Matt), there were a few questions submitted to us.

So who's (banner) here? Who's pushing the buttons? Volker, all right. So on our agenda today what I'd like to propose is that you allow us to go through the responses to the couple of submitted questions because they kind of tie in together.

We'll go through those responses and frame it in the content of the current state. And then be more thank happy to take the questions that were not addressed for these responses - for these questions.

Then we also have a second item that we'd like to bring to attention about common compliance issues we're seeing based on volume of complaints. And it's more for awareness, but also for us to be able to collaborate better.

The last bullet I have in there is high-level update. And the reason for that high-level update, I've restricted it to a couple of slides. But in the appendix you will find a lot more slides in there.

Please take a look at them. We'd be more than happy to talk to them. But there are a lot of changes from the systems and the process and the templates that are happening. And this is our forum to share with you.

So with that, next slide please. So the questions that were submitted yesterday were a few. And they all relate to the who is (unintelligible) problem reporting systems, know as who is inaccuracy.

So the first question was what are the recent changes to the who is complaint process? The process in itself has not rolled out yet. So there were no recent changes yet.

We've been communicating. And as of Costa Rica, we said there will be a change to it. And it will apply in the tool. So I've got a slide that we show this.

But to answer this question directly, the changes have not happened. There was a change to the tool in 2001 because one of the issues that we're assigned - an example given to us through this is that there is a repeat of notices sent to the registrar.

So what happens is there was an automation delivered in 2001. If the registrar does not respond to a compliance notice, there was an automated notice that goes out follow up on that one. So the follow through after few steps is still being done manually. Next slide please (Matt).

What are the (retinal) checks? Basically, again as it exists today, there are manual checks being done after the automated notices have gone through. And time has expired for those.

So the system does filter out duplicate complaints submitted during the past 45 days. The system is not perfectly correct because we know there are still some to ticket complaints that go through. So we have addressed that requirement. And it's on the list of things to be done. The next one please.

How are repeat false complaints handled to stop them from continuing? The ques - the answer to this one is still the same that we've given you before. There is no automatic mechan...

Man: Please (unintelligible) back into the conference. The call, it dropped.

Maguy Serad: (Unintelligible). That are happening. And one is immediately sending in the notification. The 15-day notice after that and then a 45-day. So those were all existing processes that I'm describing.

Then, after the third notice is when we, internally, our team takes it manually and processes through them. So the timeframe here is very long. And it's not really efficient and effective.

And when we were in Costa, and the second (cyber) addressed that. But before I go there, I want to also talk to the bulk. Many of you have shared in previous discussions, and we had a pilot team to discuss this.

The bulk today is submitted by one area only. It's still in beta. I have received lots of requests to use it. And I've said no because the tool is not production ready. And it does not follow a full loop of the process to be able to serve not only compliance, but you.

You get bombarded from that tool. And it's not planned right, let's put it this way. So that tool is not a full, long-term production tool. And it will - the requirement will go into the new system we're looking at.

So next slide (Matt). So this is currently what you see. The process change that's going to happen is this, as I shared in Costa Rica, the proposed process, which is now being coded.

So we have our IT team going through the enhancements. Our first and immediate short-term objective, we know we have the (few) fragmented tools, is to bring them all in alignment with the process that we have built over this past year.

It's very important to address all complaints in a consistent, three-step fashion, then enforcement. So we applied the changes to the C-Ticket because the C-Ticket did not have a lot of customization. And their configuration like the W-Ticket.

So the C-Ticket we wanted to make sure we rolled it up to the three-step process. And it's working fine. And it's in production.

Now the UDRP complaints intake system is also now, as of 20th of June, updated. Work is now underway to bring the WDPRS process to this three-step process.

So what's going to happen in the first notice, it's going to do that 15-day notice. And you will be immediately asked to provide proof of reasonable steps.

Followed by the second notice or inquiry. Followed by a third notice or inquiry. And then if by the third notice there is no valid response and there's still an issue, it does get escalated to enforcement.

So the process, again to answer that first, second and third. The process had not changed yet. But it will as soon as the enhancements are in the tool so we can make sure we're tracking it and reporting on it properly. Next slide please Volker.

So the WDPRS compliance process changes that will be applied, once this system has been upgraded, is the following. There (unintelligible) okay.

So with this slide, it concludes those three questions that were asked. So I'd like to do - if we can take the questions (Matt) that relate to this area or Volker. I don't know who's chairing the meeting today.

But if you can take the questions as it relates to the WDPRS because there are other slides that have - can address other areas too.

(Matt): Sure, thanks Maguy. So I'll start a queue. I've got (Ben). I've got (Jeff). And I've got a couple, there goes Elliot, okay. I've got (Rob). (Ben) go ahead.

(Ben): This is all fine and, you know, whenever there are genuine complaints or inquiries about who is, this process is fine.

What I'm more interested in is what framework or what (unintelligible) are you going to build around repeat offenders, people that continuously claim the who is is invalid but isn't. I mean we see the same guy over and over and over again.

And also, I saw the, did you say 45 days check to see if there's been previous complaints. And can that be linked with updates on domains or (some) in 45-days. I think 45 days is too short because we just keep on getting complaints about the same names and for just no good reason.

And I want to know what you're going to do to filter out what is becoming a nuisance?

Maguy Serad: Okay if you don't mind I'd like, Owen, if you can address the first question of the operations. Can you repeat that (Ben)? It was very specific to the complaint.

(Ben): I can't remember what I said. Yes. Yes, repeat offenders just, you know, the same person complaining over and over again at just about any old name.

Maguy Serad: Okay. So Owen if you don't mind sharing what is the team doing for this because you're one of the guys who processes a lot of those tickets? And then what are we going to do for the future? We'll go to that one.

Owen Smigelski: You're going to have to - is this on? Is this on? Okay. You said you'll handle the second part Maguy? Okay.

Man: Identify yourself first Owen.

Owen Smigelski: Oh, Owen Smigelski, I'm with ICANN. What we're doing now currently is the manual. There is no way to flag them actually in the system. So, you know, we do review them manually. And we see the common names that come up.

And so we are tracking them. You know, taking some notes on what is, you know, what they are doing. Seeing how they're coming up. And that's something that we're looking at and considering.

There hasn't really been anything decided on what to do yet. But, you know, we are looking at that. And, you know, something will be coming out of that we hope in the future.

Maguy Serad: So to address the second part of your question. The requirements to identify common offenders or repeat offenders, whatever is the right (pad access), whatever it's called, is a requirement that will be put not in the enhancements that are underway now.

I'm being very honest with you because we cannot apply the enhancements to that level in the current state. We're aligning it to the process. There's going to be an upgrade, which is our mid-term plan. And I have a slide on that.

And in that upgrade we're taking in the validation, the high, you know, capturing the repeat offenders. So between now and then it would continue manually.

And I'm being very transparent because we don't have the right tools to apply it to. I mean to upgrade the tool first under one system instead of three fragmented tools.

(Ben): Okay so I understand that now is today. But when is then?

Maguy Serad: I have a slide on that. I'll get to it.

(Matt): (Jeff). Microphone.

(Jeff): All right. So I wanted to first call out. I know it says coming soon. But you've already put these changes on us. So the change up from the old system to the new system is already in effect for, I know for us and a few other registrars. So I wouldn't put that as coming soon since it's already in effect.

But more important I think that if you look at the new system and how it's set up, and I'll say the effect that it's had on us. You've complained that it's a long and burdensome process to go through.

But what you've done is you've shifted the burden to registrars to sift through all the bogus complaints because at this point, if they're not corrected, then you're going to go to send the breach notice is how I see it.

So if you go back to those few other slides, we have to send you documentation on every single, yes, every single bogus request and who is complaint we see. Because if you look at the revised, first notice were prior registrars who provide proof of reasonable steps.

So we get, you know, thousands of these who is complaints. And some of them are for ccTLDs. Some of them are for people that say, hey I want to buy something on that Website. And they didn't send me a receipt. But they still send in a who is complaint.

And then we have to work through these. Send you notification. Send you the evidence, the documentation and because if not, it goes to enforcement. So I looked at our numbers. And of these thousands we received, only 3% were actually valid who is complaints.

So now you're making all these registrars here run through hoops, or else we're going to be in a breach notice for all of these complaints, which only a small percentage are valid.

So I don't see how, you know, how this becomes an effective system. Maybe it's more effective for ICANN because now you have less work. And you've shifted the burden to us.

But for us, this becomes almost an impossible piece to go through, especially when I mean we bang our heads against the wall because so few of these are valid. And you're asking us to staff up and do this. If not then you're going to send a breach notice. So I don't know, you know, how this system, how to reconcile that.

Maguy Serad: Okay thank you (Jeff). So let me stop, I tried to remember everything you sited from the beginning. You said we have applied the, okay. I would like to ask you to send me what you have received.

And you think it's applied because we have not applied it yet. It still goes through the first three current states like you see it on the top. But I don't want to say, I'd just like to see what is it you're referring to.

If you'd send me an email or two that you've received that would be great, appreciate it. Because again, like I said, the tool has not been upgraded. It's being worked on now.

From the other point's you've made, if I may say, let's keep it very simple. It's not about shifting burden. You, as much as everybody in this room and

outside this room, know and hear of all the activities around who is inaccuracy.

So, the efficiency we're bringing to the process, if you look and measure the time from Step 1 to 5 that happens today, that's over 60 days. If it's a who is inaccuracy and you are sitting on the right (sand) - on the different, you know, put yourself on the other area.

I hear it from the contracted party perspective. But I'm looking at from a neutral perspective. How can we make this more efficient? So the most simple approach I'd like to ask of you, which I've already asked of some other registrars.

They just shoot me an email, hey close this. It's bogus. We're tracking it manually. And we have several staff members tracking it manually. There may be a slip or two in there. And we are seeing those.

But I can tell you, some of your counterparts have sent an email, close this. It's bogus. And we capture the name. So I understand it's a little more manual. But again, this is what were hand - I'm not saying we're not doing changes.

Changes are happening. But we cannot roll everything together. It will be a disaster.

(Jeff):   Just a quick point to that. I would be happy if that's the system. But what you're saying is first notice will require registrars to provide proof of reasonable steps, including documentation.

If I could just send you an email that says, please close this one. It's bogus. Let's put that on the record. I would be happy for that. But the point there where it says include all documentation, which you have stated is correspondence with the registrants and proof that you have taken steps.

That is a different point than just sending you an email saying this is bogus. Please close it.

Maguy Serad: Well it has to be looked at on a case by case. If, you know, again I cannot generalize it to that level. But I know, I think (Matt), I don't want to put you on the spot. But you've send to me a couple that were Google or something. Can you share that example with your counterparts?

An example like that will be - make sense. But some of them are not as clear as that. And will require that information.

(Matt): Yes I can. The flip side to that is that I agree with (Jeff) in that I think what you're hearing from us is that if there is a manual review, then this stuff shouldn't even get to us.

And that's the point is that I shouldn't have to go back and say, this is bogus. Close it. And I'm doing it on the month that I get. And to (Jeff)'s point, he's getting a hundred X what I'm getting.

So it's a, from our standpoint it does feel like that burden is being shifted. And if there is a human review, then the same human that's looking at it at ICANN should be able to tell it's bogus just the same way that we can.

I've got (Rob). I'm sorry, the gentleman down at the end of the table as well and then Elliot.

Maguy Serad: (Matt), (Matt), just one second. You didn't share the example on Google.

(Matt): Yes so the example was I got a, you know, a complaint notice and I sent it to her and said it's bogus. And they closed it. That's exactly correct.

Man: What was the domain name?

(Matt):   Google.com.

Maguy Serad: So again, it's very obvious if it's a bogus name or not. So common sense will be applied. And I hear you (Jeff). I hear each and every one of you. The burden is not just on you. It's on us.

                    And we are working on it. And by Toronto you'll see it, and even before. Toronto is in October. You'll see it before.

(Matt):   (Rob) go ahead.

(Rob):   Similar question to the previous one. We don't see anywhere near as many as some of the larger registrars. But what we do see with the who is complaints is the same vexatious complainant bringing them up again and again and again. Even when there's nothing wrong with who is.

                    What detailed steps are you going to implement to stop repeat complainers making bogus complaints because that increases our workload? And you're telling us we've got to provide documentation. Or even send an email saying this is bogus over and over again for the same complaints from the same complainants.

Maguy Serad: Okay. Don't need to put Owen on the spot again, but today when - how do you identify - I know we're capturing it. So again, let me make sure it's clear. It's captured manually. And we can describe to you what happens manually.

                    The automation aspect is not immediately end of July. It will be the next phase. But Owen can you share that about bogus complaints?

Owen Smigelski: Yes. In that aspect we actually do, if there is something that reaches that 45-day limit, we see - we do manually review. We look at the who is, what the complaint is. What the correspondence has been with the registrar.

And we do classify what it is that that ticket was. Whether it was invalid. Whether, you know, it was a privacy proxy. And so, you know, we're looking at this over a course of time so that we can identify okay, who are the people who are doing a submission.

And what types of issues are they having. Is it invalid reports? Or are the things actually being suspended or updated? You know, so that we can track that data and be able to take the action that's necessary for it.

You know, we just can't shut that down. We need to be able to figure out what it is that those people are doing. And (unintelligible) so that we are, you know, the several of us who are reviewing those tickets are capturing that data for us to analyze and, you know, determine what could be done.

(Rob): So (you're not going sticky in the) system that says you made three bogus complaints. You can't make another complaint in 12 months.

Maguy Serad: So you said the key word, system. That's not in place yet. We're putting at it from a human perspective. And again, if everything is about bogus complaints, may I save the audience.

We hear you very loud and clear. And I'm, again I'm looking at the operational staff I have with us today. We'll take that back and see how can we improve the manual process that exists today.

And we will capture the requirements for - that's been already captured. But what I'd like to do, if there is a further clarification on those requirements before the automation takes place, we can come back to the registrar stakeholder team and request for pilot to discuss that with us.

So we take an action item to look at how can we tighten that manual process further to identify those bogus complaints and avoid them. But also please,

like I said, send it to us. And we will note it. But we will look at it internally too as it exists today.

(Matt):   Thanks. And so (Joyce), I got you in the queue. We've got a long queue at the moment. So if we can try to keep it brief. And also for the folks that are remote, please make sure to state your name when you're speaking, the gentleman down at the end of the table.

Daniel Greenberg: Daniel Greenberg from Ex Energy. We assist clients in reporting false information, especially when it relates to phishing and domain names used for fraudulent purposes.

And what normally happens is after the 45-day period, the who is information isn't updated, changed or nothing happens to the domain. And then we get an email saying, you know, a few options.

And you can select which option has occurred. And the one is nothing's happened. And then after that, nothing happened. And we just want to know, you know, what procedures are in place to make sure that it is enforced because in some cases it's clear phishing activities sometimes are used, blatantly false information.

And on the face of it, if there was a manual process something should have been done.

(Matt):   Great thanks for that. Let's see, Elliot, yes Elliot go ahead. Are you a registrar?

Elliot Noss: Yes. Maguy I'm troubled by three things. First, the point of systems is to create exceptions, which will then allow for discretion.

You know, I think what I've heard from, you know, you've made great recourse to don't worry, system's coming. And that doesn't comfort me at all because it's still going to rely on your group's application and discretion.

You used - and then in choosing to make your point, you called on Google.com. There are over a hundred million names in the generic space. If the exceptions are going to be Google and perhaps Facebook and Amazon if we're lucky, three of (Matt)'s clients might be taken care of.

But well over a hundred million won't be. And our systems can't bear that. What we've been experiencing, you know, to reinforce (Jeff)'s point is a really disturbing lack of willingness to exercise discretion.

And when I say discretion, I mean to look at very simple facts on their face and filter out things. So, you know, we're experiencing, you know, I mean (Jeff) talked about ccTLDs. That doesn't take a lot.

I mean I don't know who these, you know, I guess you use the exception. Yes, if it's Google.com we're okay. That's not comforting. You know, right now what's going on is, you know, nothing but a shifting of the burden.

And I want to make sure before I leave this point. Will you be dealing with registrars engaged in more serious issues than who is complaints later in your presentation? Good thank you.

Maguy Serad: So I think I've identified (Jeff) and Elliot's as a future perspective for further discussions on this exception reporting. And I'll leave it at that. I heard you. And I mean I don't have anything new to add to what I just said.

Elliot Noss: You know, the one thing that you should deeply think about.

Maguy Serad: Yes.

Elliot Noss: Feels as if compliance is getting more and more bureaucratic and acting in a defensive way. We certainly do not feel at all that you and I together are working to solve problems. That is not the tenor that's being set right now.

Maguy Serad: Okay.

(Matt):   So I've got...

Stacy Burnette: Can I respond to Elliot's question real quickly.

(Matt):   You can, but let's try to keep it brief because you guys have only got 15 more minutes left.

Stacy Burnette: Sure. Elliot if you can send us the examples of the domain names that are ccTLDs.

Elliot Noss: You're picking on one thing that was (Jeff)'s example. We have many other Stacy.

Stacy Burnette: Okay.

Elliot Noss: And when you say send you the examples, we send them to you and they keep coming back. So that's been tried and failed from our perspective.

(Matt):   Okay, (Joyce) quickly please.

(Joyce):   Yes I think that I can make - I can provide (unintelligible) with some link about the bogus who is request because we get the email from ICANN saying that I want to buy this domain name.

And the person is not responding to our request right. So we can - if we have a link to ICANN that say this is a bogus and let's delete it. And then on ICANN side maybe tell the complainants to say if you get rejected three

times, you can go through this form and file a griever complaint. And then that will probably save a lot of time for both you and us.

(Matt): Yes thanks (Joyce). Okay I've got (James), Nick, (Kelly), (Ben). And then we're going to cut it off there, (James).

(James): Okay really quickly, I'm not going to pile on. So I'm going to skip my comment about ccTLDs. Don't send them. Just make sure you're sending them to the right registrar.

When we get complaints from other registrars and we don't know what to do with them. Please refrain, and I'm talking now to your staff. I know we want to get out of the office too. It's 4 o'clock in the afternoon on a Friday before a holiday weekend.

That's not the time to dump 600 incidents on our team down in Arizona, Pacific Time, yes. We'll count, we'll start with the team day clock Monday morning at 9 in those situations.

And, you know, the final thing is, and this is not really necessary to bogus or fraudulent complaints or people just shaking the trees. But we should probably push into you the idea that once a name has been verified by a registrar, it is inoculated for a period of time.

And perhaps that's come up already in this conversation. I apologize if I missed that point. But, you know, it doesn't have to be a bogus complaint. It can just be a harassing complaint. And I think that that's something you should consider. Thanks.

(Matt): Thanks (James), Nick.

Nick Wood: I don't want to beat a dead horse, but if you could set up some kind of system where we could submit either repeat domains that get reported or repeat

complainants just somewhere that it was actually submitted. So it was on - some way to track both for us and for you, I think that would be highly beneficial and an easy stop gate until the system that's going to come in place actually is completed.

Maguy Serad: Okay I will - I'll look at that as a new requirement. And let me tell you why. That means you're going to compete with some validations that are really important.

So if you have specific ones that you know are bogus, I know you've heard your counterparts say we send them and on one hears. I'm telling you send it to me directly. And we will make sure it's captured.

And my account is working at ICANN okay. So if you have specifics, send it to us. I have the - some key operational staff with me today. We've taken action notes on how to best improve and address that. Okay thank you.

(Matt): Thanks (Maggie). (Kelly)?

(Kelly Registrati): (Kelly Registrati). I just wanted to actually clarify a point. I don't know if I miss heard it. It said in the manual check it was after 45 days is that correct?

So after we've had it for 45 days than it goes to manual check to see who's bogus? Is that correct? So we've been looking at it for 45 days and then you look at it to say was it bogus?

Maguy Serad: Though there is a system check up front...

(Kelly Registrati): Oh right.

Maguy Serad: (Owen) can you talk to that?

(Owen): Right now the - this is (Owen) from ICANN. The first - I'm just trying to - the first - three steps I think are automatic. And it's not until you get to that fourth that we actually look at it and when it reaches the 45 days that we'd do that. Before that the system's all automatic.

(Kelly Registrati): In the polling system obviously which is coming soon and it'd be good to have a timeline, an estimate of when coming soon is. Obviously that needs to be as soon as possible before we've wasted any time.

Maguy Serad: So what's coming soon is what you see on the second part of the slide. And we're eliminating those steps up front.

(Kelly Registrati): Oh good.

Maguy Serad: And it will have more of that gap stop...

(Kelly Registrati): Yes.

Maguy Serad: ...until we have the full automation for validation. It will have human intervention to look at those.

(Kelly Registrati): Okay. But there will not be a 45 day okay.

Maguy Serad: Okay.

(Matt): Thanks (Maggie). (Ben) you get the last word on this topic, shocking.

(Ben): Sorry I don't want to labor the point but, you know, we've seen these slides for the last three meetings in some form or another.

We've heard the same promises about changing things and we're still sitting here today talking about them.

Now I understand resource constraints. I also understand many other variable factors. But essentially this is creating a lot of - we're wasting a lot of time and energy on these things that we keep on telling you about. And, you know, you said send them directly to you.

We got called up for a meeting with you the other week because we had seven complaints out of 2 million domains, you know?

And then I tell you this repeat offender consistently and what do I get the next day? Ten complaints by the same person. So I just don't understand why it's so impossible for you to do.

Maguy Serad: So do you want me to show you what we've accomplished since we started this? Is that what you want to hear about because you said you've been hearing it. You're right.

Process changes and process implementation are two different facts. So you have to establish the process clearly, communicate it, and with like I said earlier we've rolled it out into the C ticket system.

I'm dealing with C systems guys. Until I have one I have to do it across three. Did it with C ticket, doing it with - I did it with UDRP. And the WDPRS is underway now to be completed going to production end of July if not sooner.

So that will align onto all these through processes. And again with the other issue of the bad complaint and seven bad actors as we get them manually we're tracking them.

I don't have a system yet until I finish rolling this out. I'm doing an upgrade and that will go in there. And that's right immediately in the same timeline.

(Matt): Okay. So (Maggie) we've got about ten minutes left if you want to continue to run through your deck?

Maguy Serad: Okay. So we're going to talk about some common compliance issues that we've observed.

And we want to provide you with some guidance to assist you in your interest in remaining compliant with the Registrar Accreditation Agreement.

And some of these you've heard before but we thought it would be a good idea just to go over them again because again we continue to see issues in these areas.

Keeping your primary contact information updated, it's a relatively simple process. And for whatever reason we constantly hear excuses oh, I moved and we forgot to send it.

So if you could just make this a priority if for some reason your fax number changes, your telephone number, the person who's acting as the primary contact it would be great if you could timely provide that information to ICANN so that you can remain compliant with your obligations. Next slide please.

Registrar accreditation and agreement records, pursuant to Section 3.4.2 of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement registrars are required to maintain registration agreement records showing evidence that there was an agreement between the registered name holder and the registrar on some form of consent.

And so often when we request and we're investigating a complaint we request records from registrars. And part of those records that are required under Section 3.4.2 include evidence of a registration agreement.

And unfortunately what we've observed is registrars are not - not all registrars of course but some registrars are not maintaining adequate records to demonstrate that they have an agreement with a registered name holder.

And so what they'll produce is a generic copy of the registration agreement. And that is not sufficient proof.

And so we have some examples of what we've seen some registrars doing to maintain these records. Next slide please.

So while it's probably not practical for most businesses in this day and age to keep a paper based document with the registrant's signature affixed there are some electronic ways to maintain this important documentation.

So you can use a timestamp record with an associated IP address and that would be sufficient evidence that the registered name holder is entered into an agreement.

You can obtain an electronic signature or you can - one example we saw with a registrar is they referenced the registration agreement and provided a link to it in the final message before finalizing the transaction for the domain name.

And they had a time date, a date stamp. And so that was sufficient evidence that they had that the registered name holder had entered into the registration agreement.

And so those are some examples that you might want to study. We've actually issued some notices of breach concerning this matter this year to e-name technology and Alantron. And you can find those on our notices page to get details about that. Next slide please.

Web site obligations in 2001 and the 2009 Registrar Accreditation Agreement require that you must provide an interactive Web site if you are offering domain names. And then the 2009 RAA requires registrars to provide valid contact details on their Web site.

So we get complaints that certain registrars are not providing Web sites or they don't provide valid contact information.

And so if you could just regularly check that especially if you know you've moved or your number's changed please make a reminder to yourself to update that information on your Web site.

Maguy Serad: So (Volker) if you don't mind please go on to the next one more. So again what have we done since we've seen you in Costa?

Like I said consumer complaint, I needed to check UDRP that was just launched when we got here to Prague. And the Whois ticking is scheduled for July 2012 to align with the process.

We've rolled out Document Management System to help us have a central location for all the documents receive from the contracted parties.

We also have completed a prototype for the reporting. Think of it like a Rubik's cube. We're going to do when we get to Toronto we will have a show and tell on all these.

In the slide deck I have attached a few slides to show you and I will leave that to you to look at please. It's in the appendix how and to what level of details we are getting to at this point.

We're going to be capturing more data. And as we improve and enhance our tools and upgrade it will give us more flexibility to slice and dice the data not only by level of domain name registration and location but hopefully by a lot more. So please take a look at that.

And again to address a lot of the concerns I heard today and (Elliott) you're right, the plan is I'm not going to get on that same soapbox.

We inherited what we inherited when I got here -- those three tools. We know they're not delivering so we're doing minimum on what exists today.

We conducted three feasibility studies this past trimester since Costa Rica to see what would be the right solution or midterm solution to get us to a one consolidated tool to address all complaints.

I don't want to think of complaints as C tickets or W tickets or UDRP. It's a complaint type regardless. And we'll apply the same process and would help us interface and validate more online.

So the feasibility study has - well conduct at the end of this week. And upon return we'll make a decision and we'll relay the plan for the midterm which would be one midterm around consolidated tool that will address a lot of the things that we heard about today.

The one thing I want to bring to your mind - to your attention please and we will have an outreach session in October.

Very important task, we never had an audit strategy for contracted parties. And as you - if you recall from Costa Rica we hired a new staff member who is very knowledgeable in audits and risk management.

We've been designing audit strategy for contracted parties. And that will entail and a lot of additional dialogues with you to share the approach and methodology.

And we hope to publish on our Web site what are the standard audits that we'll be doing by when and what we call will be on-demand audits. So we'll bring an update on these and some show and tell by October. Next slide please.

The last thing I'm going to leave with you - and one more slide please. One of the processes we've come to you before and we had a pilot group from the Registrar Stakeholders Team to help us define the referrals when law enforcement referrals referred matters to us.

We had a pilot team from this group and different stakeholder members of the ICANN community.

So now we turned it around. What if we receive complaints or what if in the process of complaint processing or audits we identified matters that are outside the contract but need to be referred to law enforcement.

This is if you see in big bold draft brainstorming activity that we are conducting. Please take a look at it. And I will get in touch with the stakeholder chairs to identify and send an email to ask for a pilot team members to discuss and have a dialogue on this.

It's a draft. What happens if we have a matter that needs to be referred to? And again this was leveraged on a previous exercise we did.

The next slide - let me know if you can open the link. I'm not sure. We tried to identify a standard form that regardless of the type of complaint that needs to be deferred to we want to have a standard approach of capturing the data.

So we took a first swag at it based on different dialogues and conversations in the community and we would welcome yours too.

With that like I said the appendix has a lot of information that will be important. One of them is the change in the IRTP that was in effect June 1st. If you have any questions let us know please.

(Matt): Okay thanks (Maggie). You know it strikes me that it might make sense for us to try and arrange some time with you over the telephone between now and October because clearly there is a lot of stuff going on on your site internally.

We're seeing registrars with some frustration on this side. And so maybe, you know, it might make sense for us in August or September to try to get a teleconference together where you can provide a briefing so that the group here can get a better understanding of where you are with your timelines and things like that.

So thanks for that and we're out of time so I appreciate you taking the time to come and present that. And we will send out the slides to the groups so everyone knows when it will be posted.

So I thank (Maggie) and her team for coming by and chatting with us. Thank you.

Maguy Serad: Thank you.

(Matt): And now we've got Marika. If we want to just take one or two minutes to let Marika come up to the front and let the compliance folks escape out the back door and we'll let Marika come up here.

Welcome Marika. Maybe you just - we've got some new members and folks in the room. Maybe you just want to give a quick introduction and then you can get started.

Marika Konings: Okay thanks. Hello everyone my name is Marika Konings. I'm a Senior Policy Director at ICANN. I'm actually based in the Brussels office.

And I mainly support GNSO policy development activities and that's what I'll be talking to you about today. If you go to the next slide so speaking to (Tim)

and also, you know, know your involvement in some of the issues we're working on I picked the following three topics to talk to about today.

But just to know that we actually have over 20 active projects in the GNSO so if there are any other issues you have questions about I'm, you know, I'm more than happy to try to answer those.

But I'll refer you as well to some other information sources where you can get updates on what's going on.

So I'll be talking about an inter registrar transfer policy part C, locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings and fake renewal notices if we can go to the next slide.

So maybe before going into the Part C - well I already put this one up.

Before going into the Part C I understood there were some questions on two of the outstanding recommendations from the IRTP, Part B PDP that are in the process of implementation.

So just very briefly those two related, the first one relates to a new provision that will be introduced in the IRTP in relation to the locking and unlocking of domain names.

I think with the requirement that a domain name is locked within five business days following a request by a registrant to have it unlocked.

And the other recommendation relates to a requirement for registrars to display a link in the Whois information in relation to the registrar lock status.

So it's a link that provides them further information to registrants on what that exact unlock status means so it would redirect to a ICANN Web site where that information is displayed.

So those are two items that are in the process of being implemented. So you should probably see further information on when those come into force in the near future.

So then going on to IRTP Part C well I don't have to talk to you about what the IRTP is all about but maybe just to mention that this is still the number one area of complaint when it comes to consumer complaint that the ICANN Compliance Team receives.

So from our perspective still a very important area to get new clarification and improvements in.

If we can go to the next slide, so the IRTP Part C Working Group is tasked to address there are three specific issues, the first one dealing with a change of control or change of registrant function looking into whether, you know, it would be a good idea to have something like that, a second question relating to whether forms of authorization should be time limited.

And a third question - bless you. And a third question asking whether a registry should be required to use IANA IDs rather than proprietary IDs.

So the working group actually starts off with a data gathering exercise. And I just want to thank all of you because we actually received I think 100 responses from registrars which really helped the working group in its deliberation.

Because it really provided some insight into, you know, what the current practices are of registrars and where you see issues so that has been extremely appreciated.

So on the basis of the data received and weekly conference calls, email deliberations we got input through our public comment forum and also feedback from some of the stakeholder groups and the constituencies.

The working group published its initial report just prior to this meeting. And if we go to the next slide I'll just briefly take you through the recommendations that are included in that report.

So relation to the first question as you all know there currently is no policy in relation to a change of control or a change of registrant.

But at the same time, you know, some use the IRTP for the purpose which, you know creates a number of issues.

And I think the working group also did some information gathering, you know, that your change of registrant is done in a lot of various ways and not always as easy or simple as it might look.

The working group also found that ccTLDs actually, you know, all the ones we've spoken to have a process in place to manage a change of registrant.

And we had a very - a good meeting with them and where they explained how their different processes work and gave us some insight on what, you know, might work in a GTLD context and what might not work or might not be appropriate to recommend in this space.

So as a result of that the working group is recommending that there should be a change of registrant consensus policy.

If we go to the next slide they've already sent out some requirements that I think should be part of such a policy.

First of all both the prior registrant as well as a new registrant need to authorize to change a registrant to really make sure that both parties are in agreement.

And there's a provision that, you know, this approval can also be provided in the form of a preapproval or a proxy.

Working group also extensively discussed that, you know, it's probably better not to have those two changes, a change of registrant and a change of registrar taking place simultaneously as, you know, this could create complications.

Although it doesn't mean that, you know, they couldn't take place shortly after each other. But if both changes need to be made the recommendation is that the change of registrant should be completed prior to initiating a change of registrants.

The real objective as well to really not create any unfair advantage or disadvantage for any segments of the domain name industry as, you know, you might be aware there may be different needs or desires from an aftermarket perspective to, you know, normal transactions and when it comes to change of registrar or registrants.

Let's go to the next slide.

However there are a couple of open issues that the working group is looking for input on. And I would really like to encourage you, you know, to think about these questions.

And if you have any strong views to either, you know, provide them as part of the public comment forum or come to the workshop that the working group is organizing later this week.

So the first question there is should there be a restriction once a change of registrant has taken place following an immediate change of registrar? So would - should a 60 day lock be applied?

And I think the thinking of some of the working group is that this might prevent a instance where a domain name is hijacked and it immediately gets transferred away, a change of registrant and immediately transferring out to a registrar and, you know, impossible to trace.

Well others in the working group think that this would unnecessarily prevent mobility and flexibility in the domain name market.

So would really welcome to hear your views on, you know, what you think would be appropriate.

And then there's also an open question what actually qualifies as a change of registrant? Is it, you know, just a change of the name of the domain - of the domain name holder? Is it, you know, just a last name that's changed? Is it the email address that has had a change of registrant?

So the other working group is also looking for input as what are those changes that qualify as a change of registrant?

Another question may be a more administrative question, should this become a standalone policy or should it become part of the IRTP or some kind of hybrid solution where you create a transfer policy? And one leg of that would be transfer between registrars and the other leg would be to transfer between registrants so an open question.

And then, you know, with all the recommendations the working group is really looking for input on as well other, you know, the recommendations that are being put forward.

Are there any unforeseen impacts that the working group hasn't thought about and they should take into account when they continue their deliberations on these issues?

So we go to the next slide please.

So than for our charter question B there are currently no restrictions on, you know, time limiting the use of FOAs.

Some have expressed concerns that this might result that an unexpired FOA could be used at a later time and when it would be an unauthorized transfer for registrant doesn't realize that at some point in time they did agree to the FOA. So there are some issues with that.

At the same time, you know, the survey found or the server we did that, you know, a majority actually don't see or haven't heard about any issues or seen issues as a result of not having a time limit.

But at the same time I think the majority of respondents said that they actually apply a time limit themselves.

So go to the next slide.

And so as a result of the information received and I think also the feedback that, you know, applying a time limit was not considered to be a big burden or very difficult to implement.

The working group is recommending that a new provision is added or is revising the IRTP which would then read that once obtained an FOA is valid for 45 or 60 (unintelligible). It's an open question the time period or until the domain name expires or until there is a change of registrant whichever occurs first.

And there's also a recommendation and it comes back to making sure that it works for the different segments of the markets, that it's - FOA is also enhanced to support pre-authorized or auto renewed FOAs by a registrant if that person has chosen to opt out of time limiting requirements.

And I think it's especially relevant in the aftermarket situation where someone might have put their domain name up for sale and doesn't want to have to keep on renewing their FOA if it takes (over longer) time period.

If you go to the next slide.

So (unintelligible) also a couple of open issues. I think the time limit the working group is currently considering is, you know, between the 45 and 60 days.

I don't think there are any strong views either way at the moment. So again if there any views on what we - would be more appropriate or if this is even too short or if this is too long it would be most welcomed.

There's also been discussion that the implementation of this recommendation should be accompanied by the appropriate security measures.

And I think that relates as well to the opt in opt out mechanisms and, you know, that those should be discussed in further detail and clarified in the final report.

And again the working group is looking for input if there are any, you know, unforeseen consequences of this post-recommendation.

Go to the next slide.

So the last charter question relating to the question on the IANA IDs, as you're probably all aware when you, you know, accredited with ICANN you get an ID assigned by ICANN.

But then a registry may also assign you a particular register ID or proprietary ID when you accredit with them.

So we get feedback from some of the registries that are using this system that they mainly do this for security purposes.

And some also commented that this is because you're also dealing with ccTLD registrars and, you know, that ccTLD registries in that case. Of course they don't, you know, have IANA accredited IDs.

So registrars have provided feedback that this poses difficulties at times to identify the registrar that, you know, is asking for transfer or that there is a link to a certain transaction.

So from that perspective there is a desire to have actually access to the IANA ID at all times.

Go to the next slide.

Also one of the observations was that, you know, the current environment it might be manageable but, you know, with new GTLDs this might change drastically with, you know, huge number of registries coming on to the field and, you know, might make things even more confusing.

And also as a result of the data gathering survey the working group conducted the feeling was also that, you know, many hadn't experienced problems but at the same time most did feel that a standardization might simplify transfer and then also felt that the effort to actually do so, you know, would be minimal to some.

So as a result of that if you can go to the next slide.

The working group is recommending that all GTLD registry operators will be required to publish the registrar records IANA ID and the TLDs Thick Whois.

But at the same time, you know, existing GTLD the operators or new GTLD operators or that want to use proprietary IDs can continue to do so but as long as they also publish the IANA ID in their registrar's records.

So you can move to the next slide.

And so again here the question is, you know, are there any unforeseen consequences that the working group hasn't thought about in relation to this recommendation? So if you have any suggestions please put those forward.

Go to the next slide please.

So what are the next steps? I said this report has been put out for public comment. This will be open until the Fourth of July and then a reply period will start which is open till 25th of July so you have the link here where you can submit your views.

Then there's also a workshop that the working group is organizing tomorrow from 9:00 to 11:00. So you're all invited to come there and share your views and then provide your input.

And following that the working group will review comments received and then continue its deliberations on the open issues identified.

And I think the objective of the working group is to finalize this report for submission to the GNSO council by, you know, the ICANN meeting in Toronto.

I'm just looking at (James) at the chair of this working group, don't know if he has anything else to add on this?

(Matt): Yes I was going actually give it over to (James) to let him comment. So go for it (James).

(James): Thanks Marika. Thanks (Matt) it's was good to know that everybody's looking out for me.

So as Marika mentioned I'm the chair - co-chair sorry, of the IRTPC Working Group.

And just to kind of put a button on this update there is a workshop tomorrow. There is an open comment period.

A year from now there will be - well sooner perhaps there will be new requirements for you under this policy.

So read it and please consider it and please give your feedback now because what we don't want to see is folks claiming that they were blindsided in, you know, March or April of 2013.

This is the - we're sounding the alarm now that these changes will be impactful and that will be coming down the pipeline by that time.

You know, we're getting a really good sense of perspectives from all over the spectrum of registrars but also the different use cases and business models and market segments that are served.

So let's keep those coming. Let's, you know, keep asking the tough questions about, you know, what the secondary market needs and balancing that versus what the primary protections that the primary market wants to have.

And, you know, I noticed that we had some feedback over the weekend from the registries about IANA IDs.

The fact that they have one GTLD and 100 country codes is that even a concern of ours, do we care, are they doing what compliance did earlier and just pushing the workload done us to make their lives easier?

You know, these are questions that we can address as part of this working group and I think we've got a good set of recommendations, we've got a great group which includes a number of registrars working on this and we'd love to hear more voices, more perspectives, more feedback.

Thanks. Tomorrow, 9 o'clock. Sorry. I can't say that enough. Tomorrow 9 o'clock. Where? Is (Carlin) which is where we were yesterday. Ups - mezzanine level, by the elevators.

Man: Yes, I think it (unintelligible), right?

Man: Got to queue (Rob). Anyone else?

Man: No, (Rob).

Man: It's almost exactly (unintelligible). If you're a registrar and you accept my names by transfers, if you're a reseller and you return the domains to your customers to your management at your chose registrar, you're active in the secondary market or even if you just sell domains on (inaudible), this policy will impact your business. We need your comments back.

Man: Agreed. One more (unintelligible), just so we're clear.

Man: Anywhere on the record, no one is coming back in Beijing to say that they didn't hear this and they didn't know about it, they didn't have a chance to talk about it, okay? Thanks.

Man: Nine o'clock, tomorrow morning. (Carlin 12).

Woman: Can I just make one...

Man: (Joyce)...

Woman: ...we have - we're trying to recruit new paying members, but I think that we should welcome a new member. I just met a new member, he asked me a lot of questions about the rules, can I sit there or should I sit there? Can I come in?

            So, let me introduce him, so (unintelligible) new member.

(David Yu): Well, (David Yu). Where we come from, (unintelligible) Chinese in Taiwan, you're just talking about Beijing. We are very interested about that. Thank you.

Man: Excellent. Welcome. Thanks for putting him on the spot (unintelligible). Luckily we're a friendly group.

Woman: Yes, and maybe we can get at least a new payment - a new member and (unintelligible).

Man: We take cash (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes, right.

Man: Okay, Marika back to you.

Marika Konings: Yes, if we can move on the next slide? The next one.

So with our policy development process is currently ongoing (unintelligible) but the main subject to you, the ERP proceedings. This is initial - first came up in the conversations in relation to the (IRT P Part B) and that was also raised and then - in the context of an issue report on the UDRP.

So the result of that, the council decided to initiate a policy development process and that limited specific issue only. And as most of you might know, there are - there currently is actually no requirement to lump a - domain names and the period between filing and commencement of proceedings.

And the UDRP itself doesn't, you know, include a definition of what a status quo or what locking actually means. We go to the next slide.

So the working group has a number of PDP or number of charter questions, it's time to deal with - going to read through these, but basically bottom line is, you know, should there be a process for how domain names should be locked and unlocked? Should it be a definition of what is locking in the context of this effort?

And what are the - should be any additional safeguards created as part of any potential new recommendations. Go to the next slide.

So this working group has formed not too long ago quite a big group of members, 28. I think we have representation of all stakeholder groups, as well as participants from (WIPO) and (ALAC), and then goes, you know, for people interested in this it's still not too late to join because you're ready in the - your starting phase of discussions.

So one of the first task the working group was assigned is to obtain community and public input on these issues. So as a first step the working group has developed a survey, one survey for registrars and another one for (UDFP) providers to really get inside into what the current processes and practices are and also what are the issues being encountered.

So really would like to encourage. You should have received all the e-mail, you know, via (unintelligible) the e-mail, linked to the survey also, were not through the ICANN registrar mailing list.

So really would like to encourage you to, you know, take a few minutes to go through the survey, we've made it as easy as possible. Most of the questions are just ticking the box and explaining what your currently doing, because that will really help inform the working group in deciding on how to tackle this issue.

So there was a question against the chart actually, (unintelligible) talks about locking of a domain names who actually clarified in our weekend session and recommendation should also include information on how to unlock.

So that's closely linked to each other. So the working group will be looking at both those issues, you know, when, how to lock, and then also when - how to unlock. Go to the next slide.

Man: You're finished with the slide? (Unintelligible) get a chance to...

Marika Konings: Okay. So you want me to talk slower or pause at the end of every...

Man: At least (unintelligible) a chance to read the slide.

Marika Konings: Okay. So, I'll go a little bit slower. I think the slides will be available as well or maybe they are already available. You know, I'm happy as well to take questions later on my e-mail or, you know, clarifications if needed.

So the next steps on this (unintelligible) the deadline for survey responses is the 10th of July, so really hope that, you know, many people will have a chance to complete it. I think - I checked I think over the weekend and we already had 34 responses from registrars, but I'm really hoping that we can, you know, match the responses we got for the IRTP survey where we got, I think 100 responses.

So, please if you have not answered yet, complete this.

Following the review, the responses received in the survey, the working group is going to have a look at that and then the plan is also to then open a public common forum which might have some questions inspired by the feedback received on the survey, and also request input from all the stakeholder groups, constituencies as well as other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees, to really make sure that input is received early on in the process and that can all be considered as part of further discussions.

The working group is just getting started. They haven't really decided yet when they would like to publish the initial report, you know, depend a bit on how long it takes to gather all the information, all the data, of course how long it takes from there to get to a recommendation. And so the working group is still working on outlining its work plan and the approach for tackling all the questions at least in the drafts. We go to the next slide.

So if you're interested in this working group, they are having an open session this week on Thursday from 9 to 10:30. I believe it's actually in this room if I'm not mistaken, but I've included the links so you can find there where it's actually taking place and also the link to the work space of the working group.

So you can find there, you know, for those that want to read more about the charter and the charter questions, you can find all that information here. I'm

just looking at Michele Neylon who's been the Chair of this working group to see - anything else that he wants to ask.

Man: Thanks (May) for putting me on the spot.

The only thing I suppose is the survey that you should know about. I think (Tim) (unintelligible) the main notification thing, so I mean there has been quite a good response so far. It would be helpful to get more responses.

(Unintelligible) input we have the easier (unintelligible) and basically it's the same with all the other working groups. You know, if you can give us input and what comes out the far end will hopefully be more realistic and will reflect reality, and again, this one I don't think is going to blindside anybody or that have cleaned up, you know, in common with all the other working groups through our common periods.

There are plenty of opportunities that we do at the meeting this week. First day 28th, 9 to 10:30 (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) any question on this specific topic. So move around to next item. Fake renewal notices, go to the next slide.

So I think you're all familiar with fake renewal notices and then there's (unintelligible) many of you (unintelligible) completing about it on the (unintelligible) it is.

So this is actually an issue that came up in the discussion of the registration of use policy's working group. And I think it completed our work actually (unintelligible) about two years ago. And they actually recommended that a policy development process should be initiated to address this issue.

But after further discussions in the council they actually decided that they wanted to have a bit more information on, you know, what it actually is and

what degree of problem is before deciding whether or not to go forward with initiating a PDP. If you can go to the next slide, please.

So the result of that, requesting the council, a small drafting team was formed and I think several of you are - (James) you were on there. Michele were you on that as well? So the fake...

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Woman: ...renewal notices...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Mikey) and you know, (unintelligible) four guys.

Marika Konings: Was a very small group (unintelligible) because the idea was to really to prepare a specific request for information to the registrar stakeholder group as, you know, (unintelligible) ones affected by this issue to really get input and - so we did as well a small survey there. We got 19 responses, but feedback was a bit mixed as the response are basically split by half of the registrars saying that this is really a serious problem and really a nuisance, and the other half actually saying well, no big deal at all.

So, (unintelligible) of it, you know, in the middle. So - but they did - then discuss as well again what could potential next steps be for the council to look at this issue. Let's go the next slide please.

And so they submitted a report already a while ago in March 2012, but the council decided as the work developed I, you know, about the small group of people and we didn't really do any public comment at that stage, you know, might be helpful just to put it out and see whether any community who use them on the report itself and the recommendations in there.

So we actually got, you know, six contributions. I think some people commented on definition issues and it should be more (unintelligible), you know, what is advertising versus, you know, fake or misleading notices?

And some as well expressing, you know, support for initiating a (PEP), some also suggesting alternative approaches for dealing with that. So the (unintelligible) you're requesting a drafting team to look at those comments and then decide whether, you know, on the basis of that they wanted to make any changes and they did, made a couple of changes and submitted it back to the council again on the 21st of June. You go to the next slide.

So just to briefly mention, you know, some of the options the drafting team has put forward for consideration and you know, now it's for the council to decide which ones, you know, if any or other options, you know, to pursue.

So the first recommendation of the working group is actually consider adding a section to the (RA) that addresses business practices. So really make clear that, you know, sending misleading notices is not accepted business behavior.

Another proposal is to actually add this to, where one of the current or one of the upcoming IRTP, PDPs as, you know, the ultimate objective of these notices, is usually the transfer of the domain names, so the question is, could it possibly be addressed as part of the IRTP?

Another suggestion made is adding this issue to the upcoming PDP on the (I-Relay), you know, if it's too late to add this to the negotiations that are undergoing, maybe could be an option to actually - and then take it as part of the PDP on the (REA) as it's going to deal with, you know, those issues remaining.

And some also suggested that linking this to a possible upcoming PDP on who is. Go to the next slide. You're going?

Man: Sorry.

Man: Sorry. Just wanted to clarify, maybe you said and I missed it, but these are not all of the options. These are either or options. These are what's (unintelligible) most important - they're mutually exclusive to some degree.

                 These are options not on list of recommendations.

Woman: Right. But if you'll go to the next slide, there's actually I think some of them are not mutually exclusive.

Man: Okay. Because I saw some eyebrows raised for the first one about the business practices. We wanted to be clear from the drafting team, that option I think to do it a little bit more justice was that, you know, you can't claim to be the sponsor registrar of a name that you are not.

                 It's very clear and seems very straightforward but it would certainly be undermining this practice. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Right. (Unintelligible). Most of these, you know, (unintelligible) the drafting team, a vision, you know, following all these avenues is a more choice between what will be the (unintelligible) probably most time effective way of doing it. If you go to the next slide, then there's one recommendation that's probably not, you know, mutually exclusive.

                 First (unintelligible) to the first one, this is all the recommendation on initiating, not only focused (FDP) just on this specific issue only. And the previous slide was talk more about adding it to other projects already ongoing or starting in the near future, but another suggestion is to just do a PDP and this really (unintelligible) focused issue.

And I think that's something that we'll strongly support as well by the (ALAC) and their commons because they feel this is an issue where, you know, we could really show that we could do something quickly and address it.

And then next option I think that's one of the ones that's, you know, trying to be in parallel to any of the other recommending next (unintelligible), you know, ask the (ALAC), you know, work with them to really encourage better education and awareness of this type of use amongst the end user community.

So when people receive these notices they actually know about, you know, what to look for and not fall into a trap.

Another suggestion was to raise this issue with the FTC, the Federal Trade Commission in the United States, to see if registrar's in compliance with development law. Of course (unintelligible) find a registrar in space there, but this issue was I guess (unintelligible) was added as well as this is what happened in the past, I think with one of the regular offenders.

And then of course there's the option as well to not proceed with any action at this time. And to the next slide.

(Unintelligible). So (unintelligible) basically it's now in the (unintelligible) the drafting team will be presenting to (unintelligible) council come on Wednesday on the report and you know, explain what was changed based on the comments received.

And then it will be for the council to decide what to do next, and I think that really as well for your stakeholder group as, you know, the ones really affected by this issue to probably provide some guidance to the council what you think will be the best way to approach this issue when - which of those recommended next steps might be a viable way to approach it and then address it.

Go to the next slide please. Here just the links and the public comment for further information. You go to the next one, please.

And are any questions on this topic? And are any questions on this specific issue?

Man: Well, thanks Marika.

To follow-up plans, just - you could (unintelligible) theme for Marika's presentation that in a lot of the working groups we have the same members that are participating, so number one, thanks to them.

But number two, really would like to try to get more folks involved in the stuff and later Michele and (James) can speak to the stress that would take off of them, always participating in a lot of these workers.

But really I mean the stuff that these folks are working on directly is going to impact all of you potentially. And so to be able to have a say in how that policy is developed is important, so I'll put a plug in for participation on the worker stuff (unintelligible), (James), Michele, again will get put on the spot but, if you guys want to try to put a plug in as well, just to make your lives easier.

Man: Well, it's been better. I think lately we've had some new folks, new faces, especially in the transfer working group. I think it was a while there where we were down to our last three registrars, and then one of them got acquired and dropped off the face of the earth.

So, you know, that was - it was getting a little touch and go. What I would say is that we're looking for more feedback. You know, Michele has a certain perspective, the European registrar very extensive country code experience.

I like to say that we have a good experience as a large retail registrar and as a large wholesale registrar but, you know, we lean on (unintelligible) as a corporate registrar, but, you know, more is better.

Thanks.

Man: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes, thanks.

Just want (unintelligible) first of all thanks (James) and Michele's involvement. And the theme that we were discussing earlier on about decisions that need to be made at council level.

I think this also is part of it. The more people understand or follow what's going on within these working groups that from the heart of the policy development process that the (GMS) council does, I think the better and the more effective we will be as a group in handling the work that's being done there which is you can see from Marika's descriptions and what you've heard earlier on today does impact or can impact us, at any rate maybe it won't but it should - it probably will, can impact us quite a lot.

So, I think it's important that, you know, we as a group we follow it, and probably get more involved. And just to remind everybody and those that aren't used to the GNSO processes, these working groups are open to everyone. I think it's important to just say that.

Again, you don't have to be a GNSO counselor, you don't have to be a member of the GNSO, you can - these are all inclusive working groups. So, you know, I think it would certainly warm the cockles of my heart if more people are in there.

Man: Well (unintelligible). I would also just encourage folks if you do have a
              question about, you know, how to get involved and how the process works,
              and just a little bit of flavor about, you know, how it's been in our experience
              both were probably more work on you guys.

              Both (James) and Michele I'm sure will be happy to just talk to you about, you
              know, their experiences. I, you know, there's - there are other people that
              have done work groups, you know, that participated (Jeff), myself. I'm sure
              others (unintelligible) that I'm forgetting, so, you know, feel free to ask those
              folks what it's like and continue to get involved.

Woman: And maybe (Mark) I just - I could (unintelligible) as well, I'm more than happy
              as well. We have several presentations well - on how policy development
              works (unintelligible), so we just adopted the revised policy development
              process for which we develop quite extensive graphics and expenditure
              materials that are on the GNSO Website, so, you know, and happy to take
              any questions on that as well, whenever (unintelligible) wants.

Man: Thanks (unintelligible). Michele.

Michele Neylon: Just a couple of things. First off, before I (unintelligible) and her team for the
              (unintelligible) work (unintelligible) they put in around a lot of the stuff. I mean
              most of the policy team within ICANN are based in Brussels, in this time zone
              and you choose - you see e-mails and other things from them but all the
              times (unintelligible) I mean (unintelligible) these people do have lives too,
              they do have families.

              So, you know, they do put a lot of work. Yes, we are paid for it, yes, but, you
              know, still (unintelligible) a lot of work.

              In terms of participation in this, you know, we have more people joining
              various working groups which is absolutely fantastic. It's not rocket science,
              you just need to (unintelligible) the bar is very, very low. You just turn off.

There's some very large registrars where I've heard - where I'm going to (unintelligible) and - because, you know, they're very, very large and you have the notch turning up.

And then they're turning around and saying, oh we didn't know about those. You know, it's not that hard. You know, keep an eye on the ICANN Website. If you're not sure what's going on, ask those of you who are keeping track of this stuff.

But ultimately if you don't participate, you're going to end up with policies you don't like because ultimately (James), myself and a couple of others will be the only ones who will provide any input.

If you're happy with us, fine. If this - if what I'm saying upsets you, good. And hopefully you'll do something about it.

Thanks (unintelligible). (James)? Okay. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I just have a couple more slides and just go to the next - no I think that's on the mark.

Man: Well, you are nothing if not polite.

Marika Konings: There's some other issues if you go to the next slide. So I knew Michele was going to say nice things so I already put a slide there, (Roshawn) thank you.

As I mentioned before, we do have many more projects that are active in the GNSO. You know, I picked the ones that I felt were, you know, most relevant to what you do on a daily basis. So but if you want to have a regular update and keep track on what is going on, you know, we have a GNSO project list which is updated prior to (unintelligible) GNSO council calls. You can go in there, and a short description on what the project is about, right as well

information on, you know, who's the Chair, who's the staff support for that, and gives you, you know, like a status on what has changed and then what's going on.

So that would probably give you a good inside and then - as well a little bit of an alert (unintelligible) when you need to stop paying attention to certain things or which projects you might want to get involved in.

And then there's also the monthly policy updates, which is provided in several languages, in which the different supporting organizations and advisory committees provide updates on the activities that are going on in their area and that's why we also always publish any call for volunteers or their call for public comments so you can find more information on that.

I think that was it.

Man: Good. Thanks, Marika.

              Any other questions for Marika?

Man: (Don)?

(Don):   I see lunch on the agenda, I didn't know. I didn't know if we were going to, you know, enjoy the rhapsody of each other's company or get out of this (unintelligible) space because my dermatologist said I needed to get some sun. Ouch.

              Listen, I'm just happy to see you (unintelligible) (John). That's...

Man: You're trying too hard.

(Don):   Yes.

Man: You're trying too hard.

(Don):   So again, thanks to Marika. And I would also, I don't think she's in the room, but Liz Gasster who's come and presented to this group many times over the past years, the (unintelligible) organization this is her last ICANN meeting and so while (unintelligible) beer in the room I thought we'd just like to give her a round of applause and thank her for her years of service.

                And now we do have either a lunch or a nap break, if you'd like to go and snuggle up with Stephane, I'm sure he'd be open to that. And we will meet back here at 1:30 again. I'm giving everyone an extra two minutes. Sorry (Mason) you didn't get ten, but you got two.

                Thanks guys, we'll see you back this afternoon. And for those of you on the (Adobe), the connect bridge will be back in 60 minutes. And you can stop the recording.

                                END